

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—THIRTIETH PARLIAMENT

25 Elizabeth II

VOLUME XII, 1976

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF MARCH, 1976,
TO THE FOURTH DAY OF MAY, 1976, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 23, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSED REVIEW OF SEASONAL TARIFFS ON FRUITS, VEGETABLES AND FLOWERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity relating to the signs of spring, delayed this year by the heavy snows and other storms in the east, which have been so little in evidence in the nation's capital but which are manifest in the daffodils of my riding of Esquimalt-Saanich, made available in the lobby to all hon. members. With your indulgence I seek unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That the Minister of Agriculture, in consultation with his colleague, the Minister of Finance, undertake a review of the regulations relating to the imposition of seasonal tariffs affecting fruits, vegetables and flowers imported into Canada so that the fruit, vegetable and flower growers in the garden riding of Esquimalt-Saanich, and elsewhere in the garden belt of Canada, shall be able to continue their commercial operations and provide those of us who have to spend so much of our lives under the snow in the east with the symbol of spring which the daffodils now available to honourable members so graphically provide.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion, if it were to be debated, would require the unanimous consent of the House pursuant to Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED USE OF SURPLUS MILK PRODUCTS IN EXTERNAL AID PROGRAMS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on an important and urgent matter, and I am sure that no member will dare refuse such a motion.

Considering that the Canadian International Development Agency manages a budget of about $950 million; considering that current foreign assistance programs maintain underdeveloped countries in their underdeveloped position; considering that Canada has a responsibility towards underdeveloped and poor countries; and considering that, according to the latest statistics, industrial milk surpluses for the present campaign will reach 1.5 billion pounds, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That this House enjoin the government to take all the required steps in the nearest future to increase the distribution of milk products and by-products in underdeveloped countries, through the Canadian International Development Agency, with a view to avoiding as much as possible that the Canadian government use the quota system and thus refrain from penalizing overproducing milk producers on the pretext that we now have milk surpluses.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Under the provision of Standing Order 43, the motion requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED DISCONTINUANCE OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH LOCKHEED AND CONSIDERATION OF OTHER TYPE OF AIRCRAFT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43. I refer to the proposed purchase of Orion patrol aircraft from the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. In view of the fact that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) has stated that the Canadian government is considering raising a loan of $300 million from banks to help finance the production of Orions, and in view of the fact that the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, because of its wasteful expenditures on bribery and similar methods of securing orders, is in a shaky financial position and is unable to raise the necessary financing in the United States or elsewhere, and, further, in view of the fact that the necessity of purchasing such expensive patrol aircraft has never been demonstrated to the Canadian public, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House directs the government to discontinue forthwith its effort to raise such loans, and further directs the government to reconsider whether a refitting of the Argus or purchase of a less sophisticat-

ed patrol aircraft at a much smaller cost will not meet the need to protect the sovereignty of Canada's waters.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

SUGGESTED DISCONTINUANCE OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH LOCKHEED PENDING DETAILS OF BRIBERY ATTEMPTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in the United States, has said that the United States was exporting a corporate Watergate through the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation when it paid $24.4 million in bribes to various persons throughout the world, and in view of the fact that the Deputy Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Robert Ingersoll, has announced that the State Department will supply the Lockheed data to other countries, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That the Canadian government break off contract relations with this corrupt corporation until all the data of Lockheed's bribery attempts are made known.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE STUDY OF EFFECT OF MILK PRODUCT IMPORTS ON PRODUCERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with an important matter of pressing necessity.

Considering the contradictory statements made by the federal Minister of Agriculture and by government members concerning dairy product imports and exports which determine the level of income of the industrial milk producers of Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House ask the Standing Committee on Agriculture to examine very carefully what Canada's actual requirements for dairy product imports have been these last two years, as well as the implications of these import policies for the industrial milk producers of Canada.

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

[Mr. Brewin.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTATIONS FROM REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, the government House leader and the Minister of National Defence, to whose department my question relates, I address my question to whoever is the Acting Prime Minister in that ramshackle government over there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Shame, shame.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I pulled in a lot of big fish with that one, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Minister of National Defence said that he was satisfied that the Lockheed Company "made no payments or commissions to any Canadian". I assume the minister was not referring to the contract the consulting firm of Reisman and Grandy Limited has to help Lockheed Limited win and hold the LRPA contract. Would the Acting Prime Minister tell the House whether, in the course of the current negotiations concerning the Lockheed contract, he or the Minister of Supply and Services received representations, directly or indirectly, on behalf of that company from Messrs. Reisman and Grandy?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should advise the hon. member that the Prime Minister, who is presently having a meeting I believe with the Premier of Prince Edward Island, will be in the House shortly. In the meantime, I can assure the hon. member I have no information with regard to the representations he has suggested.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

SUGGESTED PROHIBITION AGAINST RETIRED EMPLOYEES WORKING FOR CORPORATIONS WHICH MIGHT USE THEM TO INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the immense influence this firm of former deputy ministers has that could have been used to give Lockheed the inside track on this con-

tract which could cost the federal taxpayers twice as much as the St. Lawrence Seaway cost, is the government now going to bring in guidelines on the freedom of retired public servants to go to work for corporations precisely in order to lobby in areas of their intimate government expertise and with former colleagues. I ask this question in view of the fact that even customs and excise officers of the Department of National Revenue are prohibited for two years from setting up customs brokerage houses. Why, at least as a stricture, ought such a regulation not apply to these men who are by no means poor as a result of their service to the Government of Canada.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would agree that both gentlemen to whom he has referred have set a high standard of ethics during their period of service to the Government of Canada. Surely, I am certain that that same approach would be followed in their private life. I recognize with the hon. gentleman that he has raised a point of some importance, but to my knowledge no jurisdiction has yet succeeded in directing the behaviour of persons who have left the public service and who have become private citizens. That applies not only to members of the bureaucracy but also to Members of Parliament and ministers.

POSSIBILITY MR. GRANDY HAD CONSULTING CONTRACT WITH PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE OR GOVERNMENT AGENCY SINCE WORKING FOR LOCKHEED

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I have a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that some governments have the moral and ethical standards to at least try, Mr. Speaker. My final supplementary is this: Since this consulting firm went to work for Lockheed Limited was Mr. Grandy also working on a consultation contract for the Prime Minister's office or any other central agency of the federal government, and if so when was that contract terminated or completed if it was so terminated or completed?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice. I have no information on that point.

* * *

FINANCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE REPRESENTATIONS FROM MR. REISMAN CONCERNING FINANCING—MINISTER'S VIEW OF GOVERNMENT-BACKED LOANS

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Has the former deputy minister of finance, Mr. Reisman, since his employment by Lockheed made any representations to the minister or to his officials concerning the financing of the Lockheed LRPA contract and in particular concerning guaranteeing bank loans? Also could the minister tell us whether he supports in any way the concept of the government backing such a loan.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): With regard to the financing, Mr. Speaker, I met personally with the new management of Lockheed when they were in town some few weeks ago but the question of interim financing was not discussed. Indeed, it was merely a meeting on our part to ensure they would continue to be in a position to perform on any contract. With regard to my officials, I would have to make an inquiry as to whether they were directly involved in the discussions in this regard. My recollection is that the discussion has been conducted by the Department of Supply and Services' officials.

● (1420)

On the question of the financing arrangement, that is a matter that is now before the government and upon which a decision will have to be taken.

MR. REISMAN'S ACCESS TO OFFICE FILES SINCE RETIREMENT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): I do not think that the minister stated whether or not Mr. Reisman was involved in these discussions. Perhaps he would do so in answer to my first supplementary question. Since Mr. Reisman's retirement as deputy minister of finance, has he had access to his former office files, and if so when?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I have not met Mr. Reisman in this or indeed in any other business context. I will have to take notice and report on either the contracts that he may have had or indeed on the more specific question which the hon. gentleman has asked. I will do so and be glad to report to him.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED CONSIDERATION OF OTHER AIRCRAFT THAN THE ORION

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the confusion and maladministration by the government of this very large contract and the question of conflict of interest, is the Acting Prime Minister now willing to open the negotiations and consider options other than this $59 million aircraft? I ask this question in the absence of the Prime Minister.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

* * *

FINANCE

DEFICIT RESULTING FROM CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTO PACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the figures which were released today indicating that Canada has a $1.9 billion deficit in Canada-U.S. automotive trade, the largest in the eleven year old history of the auto pact, and a 50 per cent increase over the deficit for last year, what plans does the government have to turn this

deficit around to one which would at least put Canada on a basis of parity with the United States?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): The government of Canada, principally under the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, is examining the current operations of the auto pact and the most recent performance under the auto pact and would anticipate some time later in the year being in a position to make some decisions with regard to the future of the arrangement. At the moment, I cannot be any more enlightening to the hon. member than to say that this is receiving very active study within the government.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, would the minister confirm that, according to figures which have not yet been released, for the first time in the history of the auto pact we are running a deficit for the first three months in 1976 in vehicle trade with the United States which, if it continues, will mean that the situation in terms of the over-all trade for this year will be considerably worse than it was even last year?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to check that figure.

CANADIAN SHARE OF INVESTMENT RESULTING FROM AUTO PACT

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Can the minister tell the House why the government has not insisted up to this point—or why it is going to wait for a few months perhaps—that Canada get its share of new investment in that industry which is at least proportionate to the amount we consume in terms of the output, the most recent figures indicating that Canadians consume about 10 per cent of the output in the industry but we only got something less than 6 per cent of the investment last year?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I can say to the House that the former minister of industry, trade and commerce had insisted on just such a recognition of Canada's role in the auto pact. Our proposal is to make a full analysis of the facts leading to some further decisions as to what we would do about this arrangement.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF REGULATION DISQUALIFYING THOSE WHO WORK MORE THAN FOUR AND LESS THAN EIGHT WEEKS

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Would the minister tell us if he plans to make an early proposal regarding the abolition of the disqualifying practice which makes a recipient of unemployment insurance not eligible for four consecutive weeks. I believe we call this "card breaking"; it consists of disqualifying recipients who are in their extension period if they work more than four but less than eight weeks, given the fact that this procedure is considered inefficient and unfair even by Unemployment Insurance Commission officials.

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, that very issue is being examined with considerable interest. I cannot make a commitment now as to if or when the change will be made, but it is one of the major suggestions we are examining with considerable interest.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT—MEASURES TO ASSIST YOUNG PEOPLE—ESTIMATE OF NUMBER OF JOBS TO BE CREATED

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I had a question for the Minister of Public Works regarding the ganging up theory, but in light of the fact that recent unemployment figures are in and around the neighbourhood of 7 per cent, affecting some 800,000 people, and in light of the fact that this summer will be a very difficult one for our young people in terms of employment, I wonder if the Minister of Finance could advise whether he is aware of this and whether we can expect some new, imaginative and bold steps—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: —in order to reduce this unemployment, and in particular, to assist our young people this summer?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the difficult situation and the unemployment figures. I am particularly concerned about the fact that through much of this year we will continue to be in a difficult situation in that regard. Of course, any program proposed by the hon. gentleman would involve a very substantial increase in government expenditure, and I have listened equally carefully to the hon. gentlemen when they have said the federal government should reduce its present rate of spending below 16 per cent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: I reject that cop out by the minister and indicate that there are certain priorities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: All I can say to the minister is that he is off the track somewhat. However, I will ask him another question. The former minister always indicated in this House in a gentlemanly way the number of jobs he expected to be created in any particular year. Would the minister give us the benefit of his wisdom in this regard and indicate just how many jobs he expects will be created this year as a result of the programs of this government.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me that if there is any cop out, it is by the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Out of one side of his mouth he says cut down government expenditure, and out of the other he says increase it.

With regard to the unemployment figures, the hon. gentleman will have noticed that these were given in the course of a budget statement, and I have indicated I will be making that in the month of May.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

REASON FOR DEPORTATION ORDER AGAINST MR. DUDZIAK

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Is the minister aware that a deportation order has been issued in the case of Boguslaw Dudziak, that he will be picked up by immigration officers at 3 p.m. on Thursday, March 25 and returned to Poland, even though Mr. Dudziak immediately contacted immigration officials upon his arrival in Canada on August 15, 1975, having left his ship in Halifax, and claimed refugee status because he had remained a Roman Catholic during his life in Poland and sought refuge in Canada because he was not a communist?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe I have heard representations with regard to that particular case very recently, and we are examining it. Claims for refugee status are examined very carefully, usually at two levels. One is interdepartmental committee, and if its answer is favourable, that settles it. If it is not, the person claiming refugee status has access through the appeal system to the appeal board. If he has been through those two stages and still the decision indicates he is not a refugee and a deportation order has been issued under a special inquiry, then my hands are somewhat tied. However, I am aware of the representations, and I am looking into the case.

Mr. Coates: The minister says he is looking into the matter but the individual has only about a day and a half left in this country unless the minister takes some action. Can the minister explain how a deportation order could have been issued without any contact with me by either himself or his department officials and even though I forwarded all available details to him by hand at his office on March 4 and March 9 and spoke to him privately asking that he examine the case in the hope that he could take action which would prevent this calamity from occurring?

● (1430)

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member should understand that once the process has reached the stage where a special inquiry has been held, I do not have jurisdiction. It would probably be improper for me to have jurisdiction once a deportation order has been decided upon. The exact time frame the hon. member refers to I would think, without having had an opportunity to confirm, would fit here at post inquiry stage.

Mr. Coates: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain to this House how a young man who sought refuge in this nation because we stand for freedom of choice in both politics and religion, who has a firm offer of employment, who has received support from the citizens of the town of Truro as well as from myself and the hon. member for Halifax, on his files, can be forced to return to a communist country while the notorious General Quang is allowed to receive sanctuary in this nation?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I expect to settle the issue on the second part of that question very soon. The circumstances are quite different and I think the hon. member will understand that it would take too much detail to explain at this time. In so far as the first part of the question is concerned, it all hinges on the validity of the claim of the applicant to refugee status. Criteria are clearly established as to how that is judged. Unfortunately, ship desertion from countries behind the iron curtain does not necessarily influence the decision about the validity of refugee status. Those are very carefully looked at. There are circumstances in this case that I will have to look at, but I think it is probably past the inquiry stage and beyond my jurisdiction.

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate the hon. member for Parkdale and myself with our two colleagues opposite in this matter and indicate that I have been writing concerning this matter well before—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Some hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

INCREASE IN LANDING FEES FOR PRIVATE AIRCRAFT—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Would the minister take this opportunity to tell the House how he will be responding to the many submissions of protest against the government's decision to impose landing fees for private aircraft at Department of Transport airports, and whether consideration has been given to people in the frontier areas, mainly northern Canada, to whom the private aircraft is an indispensable mode of transportation rather than a luxury?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated on an earlier occasion the proposal in relation to landing fees is a rather modest one having regard to the lack of increase for many years. We have been having discussions with owners and pilots associations and others, however, and I have been having discussions with members of the Liberal caucus who have a great interest in flying.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: Rather than terminate these discussions abruptly and reaching a decision before we have been able to consider all the circumstances, we have decided to tolerate some modest postponements while we are looking at the question of whether the objective is sound and is generally accepted, that is, imposing user fees and obtaining money from those who have the advantage rather than from the general taxpayer. While that objective is being agreed upon, we are looking at alternative ways of collection so that we can minimize administration problems.

Mr. Oberle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the House if he will use this interim period to discuss with his officials and people who are interested in flying—apart from the Liberal caucus—whether it would be advisable to establish a system that would apply to people living closer to the metropolitan areas and larger international airports and not those living in remote and frontier areas of our country? Would the minister also tell the House whether it is the intention to establish a system by which the Department of Transport airplanes will pay to land at air strips not under its jurisdiction?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we are trying to look at all the circumstances in determining the best means of collection. I can assure the hon. member that I always get the best arguments from the Liberal caucus.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

KNOWLEDGE OF PRIME MINISTER OF REQUEST OF MR. DRURY BY MR. OUELLET FOR INTERVENTION WITH JUDGE

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. On Wednesday, March 17, the Prime Minister told the House that he did not learn about the request for an intervention until Monday, March 15. The Prime Minister stated, as recorded at page 11866 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ouellet told me about that precise request he made to the minister on Monday of this week.

Is the Prime Minister telling this House that he did not at any point before March 15 ask the Minister of Public Works if the former minister for consumer and corporate affairs had made a "precise request" for an intervention on his behalf?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question.

INQUIRY WHETHER PRIME MINISTER REPORTED ALLEGED INTERFERENCE WITH JUDICIARY TO QUEBEC ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for the Prime Minister. I am sure this one has not been put to him. In light of the fact that the Minister of Public Works said at the beginning of this situation on March 3, as reported at page 11457 of *Hansard:*

> Indeed, the only intervention that would be contemplated by me would be one to see that he—

Meaning the judge.

> —was in full knowledge of the facts and did his duty.

In light of the fact that the government seems to be supersensitive to the words "improper", "wrongful" or "illegality", may I ask if the Prime Minister would advise the House whether he has reported the facts told to us by the government, unknown to us, known to them, to the attorney general of Quebec to determine whether there was an offence.

An hon. Member: Go back to school.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I put that question again.

Mr. Paproski: A little slower.

Mr. Woolliams: May I ask the minister if he has reported to the attorney general of Quebec the matters told to him by the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs and the admission I just read with reference to the Minister of Public Works?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think it is related to the preamble of the question about us being sensitive to words like "illegality" or "impropriety". The answer is we have admitted— the minister has admitted some impropriety and has apologized for it. Illegality is something else again. If there is illegality or we have cause to believe there is illegality or hon. members opposite have cause to believe there is illegality, first of all the hon. member for York-Simcoe would not have withdrawn his statement if he had some evidence of it. He does not seem to have any evidence of it and we do not have any evidence of it. If we had we would, of course, turn it over to the attorney general of the province who would be entitled to prosecute.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PREMIER OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, HONOURABLE ALEX CAMPBELL

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before recognizing another questioner may I call the attention to the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished visitor, the premier of the very important province of Prince Edward Island, the Honourable Alex Campbell.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ENERGY

SYNCRUDE PROJECT—APPLICABLE EMISSION STANDARD FOR PLANT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources? In view of the fact that the governments and the companies participating in the Syncrude agreement have overcome one hurdle in respect of the rate of return for the pipeline and utility plant built by the government of Alberta and since this brings us one step closer to a final agreement, does the government intend to insist that there be inserted in the final agreement a provision for a standard of emission—which at the present time is projected at 287 long tons per day—and insist that the 40 tons per day recommended by the Department of the Environment be enforced in an agreement with Syncrude?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

MINISTER'S VIEW OF EMISSION STANDARDS FOR SYNCRUDE PLANT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Since the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources does not seem to be at all interested in the health and welfare of the people who live in that area may I direct my supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment who on January 29 at page 10425 of *Hansard* in answer to a question from the leader of this party said:

● (1440)

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman that I will insist on having this present emission reduced.

Answering a supplementary question, the minister said in part:

I think what the hon. member suggests is something the department of energy is ready to do.

Since the minister indicated that the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is not prepared to insist on emission standards for sulphur dioxide, does he intend to fulfil the commitment he gave the House on January 29 and insist on emission standards much lower than the 287 long tons per day envisaged by Syncrude?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I shall stick to the commitment I made previously. We are insisting on the reduction of sulphur dioxide emissions in the air at Syncrude and trying to convince the government of Alberta as well as the Syncrude company. I know the hon. gentleman knows that I have no legal power to compel the company or the government of Alberta to do this.

Mr. Broadbent: But you are the minister.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What figure has the minister in mind for emission standards? Also, since the government is represented on the management committee, will the minister use his good offices to persuade the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to insist that figures the Minister of Environment thinks are reasonable for emission standards will be inserted in the Syncrude agreement?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, not only is the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources interested in this; the Alberta government also has an interest in, and power to establish, emission standards at Syncrude. I am ready to talk to my colleague. I hope that somebody on the other side of the House will talk to the government of Alberta and convince it to act.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTATIONS FROM REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence having entered the House, may I ask him if, in the course of current negotiations concerning the Lockheed contract, he, the Minister of Supply and Services, any member of their departments, or departmental agencies received representations, directly or indirectly, on behalf of Lockheed from the consulting firm, Reisman and Grandy Limited?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Not to my knowledge Mr. Speaker.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSSIBILITY MR. GRANDY HAD CONSULTING CONTRACT WITH PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE OR OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister is present may I direct my supplementary question to him? Has Mr. Grandy, of the consulting firm of Reisman and Grandy Limited, worked on a consulting contract for the Prime Minister's office or any other central agency of the federal government since this consulting firm went to work for Lockheed limited? If so, when was that contract terminated or completed?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time the matter has been drawn to my attention. I shall certainly look into it.

Oral Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—TOTAL COMMITMENT OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of National Defence. What is the total proposed Canadian government commitment to the Lockheed Corporation?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there is no commitment other than that we have begun negotiations to lead to a contract under which we shall agree to purchase 18 Lockheed long-range patrol aircraft for $953 million. We have not entered into a final contract. We are still negotiating the final terms of the contract.

Mr. Paproski: Is that the total commitment? I notice that the minister nods his head, as if to say yes.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED BY MINISTER AT MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS—DETAILS OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

Mr. Yves Caron (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

After his meeting this morning with his provincial counterparts, would the minister tell the House which questions have been discussed? Has there been an agreement concerning the dairy policy for 1976-77? If so, when will the minister announce this new policy? Moreover, will the minister take into account the recommendations made by the Quebec members, and will this policy be equitable for all Quebec industrial milk producers?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, meetings with officials of my department are continuing. Every aspect of industrial milk production in Canada has been discussed. According to law, a policy must be announced or a statement made by April 1. All representations are being considered. At present we are in a difficult position, as there is a surplus not only in Canada but throughout the world.

SUGGESTED USE OF SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS IN EXTERNAL AID PROGRAMS

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture concerns the same subject. We need to turn milk deficits into cash and foreign charities into trade. Will the minister examine, for policy purposes, the sale of surplus Canadian dairy products to CIDA at cost price, under our present subsidy system, and consider distributing those products at the same prices, as carried on our books, to needy countries now receiving cash by way of CIDA charitable donations?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

REDUCTION IN BUTTERFAT QUOTA FOR PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture? Has he received the interim report of the Prince Edward Island legislature's committee on agriculture, which was unanimously adopted by the legislature and forwarded to him, and which deplores the fact that the Prince Edward Island quota for butterfat has been reduced from 6.7 million pounds to 4.8 million pounds, a reduction of 28 per cent? It asks the minister and the Dairy Commission if an additional, upward adjustment can be made to the much reduced quota for Prince Edward Island.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the premier of Prince Edward Island met with me last night to discuss this matter. The very important document alluded to was delivered by hand from the legislature of Prince Edward Island. We discussed the matter. I point out that the Dairy Commission and the supply management committee set quotas for each province, not the Minister of Agriculture. They agree on what the quota should be for the whole country. They are discussing this and will discuss it further, because they realize the difficult position of Prince Edward Island producers, who are isolated and cannot produce other commodities. Other parts of Canada are in the same position. It is not easy to decide whose quota shall be cut, and by how much.

Mr. MacLean: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Was the minister able to give encouragement to the premier of Prince Edward Island who must have made representations to show the special case of Prince Edward Island, where only about 10 per cent of provincial production is used as fluid milk; therefore, the quota proposal will have a much greater impact on the industry of the province than it will in other cases. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Maritime provinces are only about 40 per cent self-sufficient in the production of dairy products.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, provincial ministers of agriculture, including the minister of Prince Edward Island, have made these representations to me. Of course, other ministers of agriculture feel the same toward producers in their provinces. They are all concerned about how much quotas will be cut, for whom, and who will be affected. It is safe to say that not many ministers of agriculture want to cut the production of their own dairy producers. It is unrealistic to say that we should not cut production; because, if we do not cut production, we shall be wasteful.

* * *

THE MINISTRY

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF CASE AGAINST STATION CFCF MONTREAL BY SOLICITOR GENERAL—VIEW OF PRIME MINISTER AS TO PROPRIETY

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. This morning on radio station CJOB, Winnipeg, the Solicitor General openly and freely

expressed an opinion concerning station CFCF of Montreal, the station which has been charged with failing to conform to CRTC regulations concerning broadcast laws. Does the Prime Minister consider it proper that a minister of the Crown, who is responsible for seeing justice is done, should discuss publicly important questions presently before the courts?

● (1450)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will have to take note of the question. I am not sure what the matter before the courts is to which the hon. member is referring.

Mr. Epp: A supplementary question. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the action taken by the Solicitor General in Winnipeg this morning violates the guidelines the Prime Minister has stated are to be observed by all members of the cabinet and, if this is the case, what action does he propose to take.

Mr. Trudeau: As described by the hon. member, it does not violate the guidelines; it may be incorrect for some other reason but the guidelines, as I described them some days ago, were not infringed.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN POSITION ON INVOLVEMENT OF CUBA IN AFRICA

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Having regard to the right hon. gentleman's reported statement following his visit to Cuba that Premier Fidel Castro was sending troops to Africa with a great deal of thought and feeling, could the Prime Minister tell us whether he has received any new information concerning the Cuban involvement and, if so, what is the current position of the administration with respect to this unhappy situation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I must point out that the hon. member has grossly and inaccurately misquoted me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: If I am grossly and inaccurately misquoting the Prime Minister so did the *Globe and Mail* this morning.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Stevens: Bearing in mind that Cuba is now involved in eight African countries with some 12,000 troops or other personnel, would the Prime Minister inform us whether the government has registered any official protest concerning this war involvement on the part of Cuba and, if so, what was the form of the protest?

Mr. Trudeau: I am informed that the misquote in the *Globe and Mail* was a quote from some American paper, so the hon. member is twice removed from the truth by two very big barriers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: As to our position on the presence of Cuban troops in Angola, our position was made very clear by the Secretary of State for External Affairs before I went to Cuba, it was made clear again when I was in Cuba and it has been made clear since. We are opposed to that kind of intervention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DATE OF DECISION ON CLOSING BASES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the extensive unrest and uncertainty prevailing in all parts of Canada in connection with the rumoured closing of military bases and reduction to nil strength of certain units, could the hon. gentleman indicate by what date he anticipates making a definitive announcement concerning this whole question so that if things are to happen people will know just what is going to happen?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): I cannot say more than I have said on other occasions. I will be making recommendations to cabinet in the very near future, probably within the next two or three weeks, but I do not know how long cabinet will take to consider those recommendations.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

USE OF INTERPRETERS—ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR INTERPRETERS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State of Canada.

Given the fact that in a few months Montreal will play host to many visitors from various countries and that interpreters will be needed to help those various nationalities communicate with each other, can the minister tell the House whether COJO officials have made a request for this interpretation service? If so, how much will be earmarked for this service?

[*English*]

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am not aware of the request but I will look into it and report to the hon. member.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR MORE LOCAL PROGRAMMING—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): A further question to the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. In view of a growing number of representations concerning the cen-

tralisation of the CBC has the Secretary of State re-examined the position of the Corporation with a view to allowing greater latitude for local programs within the Corporation?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I think the hon. member should update his information. One of the more significant things the Corporation has done in the last two years has been to decentralise, and this is manifest by new buildings in Vancouver, prospective buildings in Regina, etc. all designed to support local programming.

Mr. Friesen: I should like to update the information in the possession of the Secretary of State: I received complaints yesterday with respect to farm programs which have been deleted from CBC programming, and this is one area of local representation which has been lost.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

ALLEGED INTERFERENCE WITH SEAL HUNT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of State for Fisheries. I wonder if he has read the question I put to him last week which was answered in part by the Minister of the Environment. If not, I can put it again. It appears at page 11901 of *Hansard* and reads as follows: Has the minister or his officials now any control over the members of the Greenpeace Foundation or other characters of the same kind who are at present engaged in illegal interference, this time on the ice of the Atlantic and the Gulf of St. Lawrence where the seal hunt is taking place?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I believe the measures which were taken proved effective since both protest movements seem to have given up. In the meantime, I would invite them to read scientific reports and refrain from publishing half-truths as they do.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF WORLD FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that all my colleagues are pleased that I ask a question of general interest. My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture.

I view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has just said a moment ago that the problem of industrial milk producers is connected with a world surplus, could the minister tell the House whether the world population is saturated with this product and that there is no need to meet, or whether there is a lack of consumer purchasing power, either at the national or the international level?

[Mr. Friesen.]

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to say there would not be some place in the world where there would be a need for this product but it is not at all easy to distribute unless those countries want it, because they have the sovereign right to say what they want for their people who happen to be in need; you just don't throw it at them and hope they accept it like some scraps we are distributing. The world price of skim milk powder is little over one third of what it was two years ago. Under our CIDA program and our other aid programs we have offered assistance to distribute this product in any fashion as long as it can be put to proper use.

[*Translation*]

WORLD CONFERENCE ON FOOD NEEDS—DISCUSSION OF CANADIAN MILK PRODUCTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

As once against this year the Minister of Agriculture attended a world conference on food needs, can the minister tell the House whether milk was discussed, with regard to feeding the peoples of the world and whether possible exchanges of dairy products on the one hand, and various products from other countries, on the other, excluded milk products, or whether the discussions dealt with exchanges capable of meeting the needs of humanity as well in Canada as in other countries of the world?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the nutritional aspect of food aid was certainly discussed at great length and one of the ways in which people can get proper nutrition is by being in a position to feed themselves. Canada is doing a tremendous job in helping them set up their own dairy herds and other production entities in those countries.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CENSUS

TABLING OF CENSUS COMMISSIONERS' APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I have the honour to table copies, in both official languages, of the 1976 census of Canada Census Commissioners' appointments.

● (1500)

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the tabling of documents. Yesterday, the Secretary of State for External Affairs signed an important extradition treaty with the American ambassador. I would have assumed that because of the nature of the material and its importance to our country it would

have been tabled today by the Secretary of State for External Affairs or by the Minister of Justice who will have responsibility for administering this important treaty.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the treaty which was ratified yesterday was tabled last October.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I realize it is sometimes very difficult to assess whether a member is putting a preamble to his supplementary question. The reason that I mentioned the four members concerned was clearly to indicate to the minister concerned that interest in this case ranged all the way from Toronto to Hamilton, to Halifax and to Truro. I thought the supplementary was fairly important in that in a letter I have in my possession one of the officials indicated that perhaps the parties concerned are in another country. My supplementary was, if he could not go to his own country, did it not indicate that there was some concern about returning to that country?

Mr. Speaker: The more the hon. member is persuaded of the importance of his supplementary, the more important it might be to him to put his supplementary without a preamble.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS ANTI-NUISANCE ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE DISINCENTIVE FOR MEMBERS TO DELAY BUSINESS OF HOUSE

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-428, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Speaker, this is an act to be cited as the House of Commons Anti-Nuisance Act. The purpose of this bill is to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act to put an end to members attempting wanton delay and disruption of the House of Commons by proposing dilatory motions which they know to be unlikely to carry. According to the main estimates for 1976-77, it costs $109.11 per minute to operate the House of Commons. That is the penalty set, $109.11.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mrs. Holt: The annual cost—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) might be given sufficient attention to add one other sentence of explanation.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This is not explanation; it is argument.

Mrs. Holt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is the cost per minute to keep this House operating, under the current estimates. The annual cost is $57,347,185.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the circumstances, I would think the explanation given by the hon. member is sufficient to enable hon. members to understand the nature of the bill. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, before we give our consent to this motion, I rise on a point of order. I hope the hon. member realizes that if she is objecting to dilatory measures that waste the time of the House, she is in fact referring to most government bills which are introduced.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marshall: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I state to the hon. member that I timed her, and she wasted $218.22.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): On the same point of order raised by the leader of the NDP, Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that the remarks he made about government bills apply to interventions from the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the House should understand clearly the question before it. At this stage it is solely the question whether or not the bill should be read the first time and printed, so that it can be circulated. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois), Laval (Mr. Roy), Beauce (Mr. Caron), Lévis (Mr. Guay), Gatineau (Mr. Clermont), Portneuf (Mr. Bussières), Saint-Jean (Mr. Smith), Mercier (Mr. Boulanger), Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) and Québec East (Mr. Duquet) has been filed with me, pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec.

[*English*]

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: May I also inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Yorkton-

Melville (Mr. Nystrom), Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman), Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth), Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), Cape Breton East Richmond (Mr. Hogan), Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), and Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) has been filed with me, pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

In accordance with past practice of the House, is it agreed that these objections be printed as an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings?*

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane) moved that the second report of the Special Joint Committee on the National Capital Region, presented to the House on Thursday, March 18, 1976, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

PRESENTATION OF PETITION TO INCREASE OLD AGE PENSION TO $350 PER MONTH AND LOWER ELIGIBLE AGE TO SIXTY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table of the House a petition signed by 4,860 senior citizens from 58 different points in Saskatchewan. The petition contains nine points. I shall not ask the leave of the House to read them all—I might have trouble getting leave to do so—but may I say that among other requests the petition asks that the basic pension be raised to $350 a month, that the pensionable age be lowered to age 60, and that there be a special department to deal with senior citizens. I present this petition, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those who have signed it, their representatives being with us today, and I commend its proposals to the consideration of the government.

Multilingual Project		1971/72	1972/73	1973/74 (started October 1/73)	1974/75	1975/76 Estimate and Expend.
Multilingual Biblioservice	Purchase of Books	No expenditure	35,736.00	18,729.00	63,431.00	90,000.00 (74,124 to date)
	Other operating expenses and salaries	"		33,932.00	171,536.00	202,000.00
Ethnic Newspaper Project	Purchase of newspapers and films	"	25,638.57	29,928.61	7,252.05	8,000.00
	Other operating expenses and salaries	"	2,014.68	9,762.87	10,752.44	13,650.00
Total Expenditure			63,389.25	92,352.48	252,971.49	314,650.00

[Mr. Speaker.]

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,512, 4,038, 4,054, 4,062, 4,087, 4,097, 4,122, 4,130, 4,132, 4,138 and 4,581.

[Text]

FUNDING OF MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMMES

Question No. 3,512—**Mr. Forrestall:**

By department and agency, what has been the funding provided for multicultural programmes and activities in each year since 1971?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):

Secretary of State Department Fiscal year		National Film Board Fiscal year	
1971-72	$ 617,000	1971-72	$129,000
1972-73	1,465,000	1972-73	315,000
1973-74	5,376,000	1973-74	390,000
1974-75	5,307,000	1974-75	390,000
1975-76	5,260,000	1975-76	300,000

National Museums of Canada Fiscal year		Public Archives Fiscal year	
1971-72	$ 91,000	1971-72	$ NIL
1972-73	525,000	1972-73	NIL
1973-74	1,450,000	1973-74	215,700
1974-75	1,450,000	1974-75	327,300
1975-76	1,450,000	1975-76	340,000

In addition to its general services, which are available to all Canadian libraries, the National Library of Canada provides funds for two multicultural projects. These are its programme to purchase and microfilm Canadian ethnic newspapers, and the Multilingual Biblioservice, which acquires and makes available on a long term loan basis books in non-official languages to the provincial library systems. They in turn distribute these to the public libraries which service ethnic communities. The funds spent for these projects since 1971 are as follows:

CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS—PRIVATE INCOME

Question No. 4,038—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

Is the private income of individuals taken into consideration in the assessment of applications for Canada Council grants?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: No, except to establish the amount of leave fellowships for university scholars and the amount allocated for subsistence under the explorations program.

REFLECTIVE MARKINGS ON RAILWAY CARS

Question No. 4,054—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Is the government giving consideration to requiring more visible markings on box cars and flat cars so they can be seen more easily at night at uncontrolled level crossings?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The application of reflective markings to the sides of railway cars is provided for by Section 202 (1)(c) of the Railway Act and an Order of the Canadian Transport Commission. Work on this program, which began with the issuance of Order No. 97799, dated May 1, 1959, is progressing, with contributions made from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund. As of June, 1975, 125,523 cars have been equipped with reflectorized discs, with a total grant from the Fund of $504,321.68.

CN—IMPROVEMENTS TO RAIL LINES IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 4,062—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Regarding the 1975 CN improvements to rail lines in Newfoundland, what is the status of the (a) installation of new rail and upgrading of two bridges and the location of each (b) 33 mile, 100 pound rail between Deer Lake and Kitty's Brook (c) 12 mile, 100 pound rail between Badger and Millertown Junction (d) topgrade ballast between Gambo and Gleenwood and preparation of the roadbed (e) replacement of the 175 foot span on the Flat Bay Bridge (f) upgrading of the bridge at Cape Ray?

2. What are the details of the progress of the (a) $900,000 in new buildings (b) $750,000 in new track laying equipment (c) $250,000 in new machinery (d) $50,000 in new equipment (e) 360,000 tie plates (f) 205,000 rail anchors (g) 45,000 track ties (h) 33,000 board feet of treated bridge ties?

3. What were the total freight handlings in (a) 1974-75 (b) 1975-76?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. (a) Installation of rail complete. Flat Bay Bridge complete. Cape Bay Bridge complete. (b) Complete. (c) Complete. (d) Complete with exception of four miles. (e) Complete. (f) Complete.

2. (a) Corner Brook Express Building complete. Corner Brook Maintenance of Way Building now nearing completion. (b) Delivery completed. (c) Delivery complete with exception of one machine expected to be delivered first quarter of 1976. (d) Delivery complete with exception of one unit expected to be delivered second quarter of 1976. (e) Complete. (f) Complete. (g) Complete. (h) Complete.

3. (a) Calendar Year 1974—1,418,900 revenue tons. (b) Calendar Year 1975—1,036,930 revenue tons.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—DEPARTMENTAL CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED NATIONS DRUG ABUSE FUND

Question No. 4,087—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare contributed for the past three years to the United Nations Drug Abuse Fund and, if so, does this contribution amount to $1,000,000?

2. Does the Department plan to continue contributing to a similar programme and, if so, in what amount?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. For each of the fiscal years 1973-1974, 1974-1975 and 1975-1976, the Department of National Health and Welfare granted* $200,000 (for a total of $600,000) to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.

---

* Please note the distinction between amounts "contributed" and amounts "granted" by reference to the Treasury Board's Authorities Manual, Chapter 30, 0.3.11.3.

2. The Department of National Health and Welfare does not intend to grant funds to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control in the 1976-1977 fiscal year.

CANADIAN PENITENTIARY SYSTEM—PSYCHIATRIC, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL WORK RESOURCES

Question No. 4,097—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Are psychiatric, psychological and social work resources available to the Canadian penitentiary system at (a) William Head (b) New Westminster (c) Drumheller (d) Prince Albert (e) Archambault (f) St. Vincent de Paul (g) Dorchester (h) Millhaven (*i*) Kingston and, if so, what are they?

2. In each case, how many staff are (a) full-time (b) part-time?

3. In each case, how many prisoners receive psychiatric, psychological and social work treatment on a (a) full-time (b) part-time basis?

4. How many prisoners were treated at each Penitentiary during the period 1973 to 1975?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. Psychiatric, psychological and inmate classification services are available to all inmates at all of the above mentioned institutions except as follows: (i) There is no psychologist available at William Head. (ii) Psychiatric services are available within the following institutions: New Westminster, Drumheller, Saskatchewan and Dorchester Penitentiaries. (iii) Psychiatric services are provided to the following institutions from the adjoining Regional Psychiatric Centres operated by the Canadian Penitentiary Service: Archambault, Laval (St. Vincent de Paul), Millhaven and Kingston (Regional Reception Centre).

2. There are eleven full-time psychiatrists and three part-time psychiatrists employed by the Canadian Peni-

tentiary Service. Full-time psychiatric services are available to inmates at New Westminster, Archambault, Laval (St. Vincent de Paul), Millhaven and Kingston (RRC). Part-time psychiatric services are dispensed at Drumheller, Saskatchewan and Dorchester Penitentiaries. All psychologists and classification officers are employed on a full-time basis. They are employed as follows:

Institution	Psychologists	Classification Officers
William Head	0	7
British Columbia	3	19
Drumheller	2	16
Saskatchewan	3	16
Archambault	2	10
Laval (St. Vincent de Paul)	2	7
Dorchester	3	12
Millhaven	3	10
Kingston (RRC)	4	10

3 and 4. The only inmates who could be considered as receiving psychiatric treatment on a full-time basis are those on register at the three Regional Psychiatric Centres operated by the Canadian Penitentiary Service. The number of inmates considered to be on full-time psychiatric treatment are as follows: (i) Regional Psychiatric Centre (Quebec), 64; (ii) Regional Psychiatric Centre (Ontario), 86; (iii) Regional Psychiatric Centre (Pacific), 95. No statistics are maintained on the other inmates not hospitalized at the Psychiatric Centres who occasionally receive psychiatric treatment on an out-patient basis. No inmates receive psychological or social work treatment on a full-time basis. No statistics are kept on the number of inmates receiving psychological or social work treatment on a part-time basis. Such treatment is given on request, if needed, and when it is appropriate (or on the basis of need identified by diagnostic testing and given to all inmates on admission and when required during sentence) or in relation to observed abnormal behaviour. All inmates receive the services of classification officers from the beginning to the end of their sentence on a part-time basis.

RESEARCH DATA ON ZOONOSIS

Question No. 4,122—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does the government have research data on "zoonosis"?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The Department of National Health and Welfare has available to it the most up-to-date data on infectious diseases transmissible under natural conditions between vertebrate animals and man. (Zoonosis)

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND OPERATIONAL MAINTENANCE ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY AIRPORTS

Question No. 4,130—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What was the combined total of capital expenditure and operational maintenance assistance for community airport project developments for each year 1960 to 1975 in (a) Yukon (b) Northwest Territories (c) British Columbia (d) Alberta (e) Saskatchewan (f) Manitoba (g) Ontario (h) Quebec (i) New Brunswick (j) Prince Edward Island (k) Nova Scotia (l) Newfoundland?

[Mr. Poulin.]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport):

	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64
Yukon	$ —	$ —	$ —	$ —	$ —
Northwest Territories	29,907	5,056	15,000	—	—
British Columbia	6,771	52,962	85,402	69,446	40,390
Alberta	6,879	37,336	5,648	10,108	5,547
Saskatchewan	27,133	8,436	6,740	12,619	24,248
Manitoba	20,255	6,294	21,992	17,243	30,124
Ontario	44,129	8,766	25,467	—	—
Quebec	46,227	48,771	26,281	8,178	43,626
New Brunswick	11,591	146,794	23,825	35,379	38,116
Prince Edward Island	—	—	—	—	—
Nova Scotia	3,897	3,773	—	3,537	2,594
Newfoundland	—	5,273	14,727	—	51,597

	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Yukon	$ —	$ 9,824	$ 14,409	$ —	$ 4,007	$ 9,198
Northwest Territories	—	—	—	—	—	64,730
British Columbia	44,493	36,261	53,270	523,013	243,064	438,722
Alberta	16,528	146,912	196,284	99,199	331,282	78,114
Saskatchewan	18,409	16,837	18,659	60,570	75,619	254,736
Manitoba	57,814	72,519	153,778	38,005	400,051	125,801
Ontario	—	216,084	153,626	585,702	503,129	224,074
Quebec	45,050	135,666	418,233	161,471	380,866	499,792
New Brunswick	6,223	16,163	99,092	69,519	171,785	85,095
Prince Edward Island	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nova Scotia	—	7,347	4,000	23,248	6,189	35,233
Newfoundland	—	405,606	22,250	14,473	11,973	72,293

	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Yukon	$ 17,897	$ 17,953	$ 9,673	$189,692	$ 21,727
Northwest Territories	20,012	13,375	—	—	—
British Columbia	516,939	345,194	213,141	687,128	358,006
Alberta	172,167	112,406	533,943	586,050	820,590
Saskatchewan	183,865	245,805	167,664	89,276	92,472
Manitoba	466,916	251,746	821,226	380,123	327,308
Ontario	275,986	508,697	998,286	850,820	642,006
Quebec	329,138	287,448	1,009,841	558,600	483,474
New Brunswick	48,603	58,253	39,682	39,939	57,149
Prince Edward Island	—	—	—	68,150	—
Nova Scotia	46,979	87,884	66,962	19,358	61,845
Newfoundland	104,630	158,303	397,698	43,193	489,800

CBC—COST OF FRENCH TELEVISION PROGRAM "MONSIEUR B. EN TUNISIE"

Question No. 4,132—**Mr. Lapointe:**

What was the cost of the CBC French television program "Monsieur B. en Tunisie" of December 7, 1975?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide information about the costs of individual programs. The background of this custom is explained in detail in the reply to Question No. 2530, May 22, 1975.

FUNDS TO QUEBEC SCHOOLS UNDER BILINGUALISM PROGRAM

Question No. 4,138—**Mr. Matte:**

Since 1974, has the government directed funds to Quebec schools, as part of its bilingualism programme, for the learning material improvement programme and, if so, in what amount?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): The Department of the Secretary of State has not directed funds to Quebec schools for the learning material improvement programme.

RCMP—SERVICES TO MUNICIPALITIES IN THE CONSTITUENCY OF CHAMPLAIN

Question No. 4,581—**Mr. Matte:**

Did the Royal Canadian Mounted Police offer its police services under contract to some municipalities in the Constituency of Champlain in 1975-76 and, if so, what was (a) the total cost for such services (b) the number of police officers, by municipality (c) the name of the municipality concerned (d) the salary of the RCMP officers?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): No.

* * *

● (1510)

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 3,259 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC SERVANTS TRAINING PROGRAMMES

Question No. 3,259—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. As of December 31, 1974, what was the number of public servants on temporary training programmes (a) Language Training (b) Special Assignment Pay Plan (SAPP) (c) Career Assignment Programme (CAP) (d) Career Orientation Programme?

2. What was the number of public servants in each programme for each incumbent level of the occupational groups in the administrative and foreign service category and the administrative support category, as of December 31, 1974?

3. What was the average length of time public servants were expected to spend on each programme for those enrolled as of December 31, 1974?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED GOVERNMENT PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY RESUMING ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham) moved:

That this House condemns the government for increasing the threat posed to mankind by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and in particular by its present negotiations to resume nuclear assistance to India.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong when the only way we can have a debate on the most critical man-made problem facing the future of mankind, namely, the growing proliferation of nuclear weaponry and the major part this country plays in its continuance, is for the opposition to force a debate against the wishes of a reluctant, tight-lipped, secrecy-prone and grouchy government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: This is another facet of the secrecy syndrome infesting official Ottawa today—and if it does not stop, and stop soon, I warn our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) that the long tradition and history of a bipartisan foreign policy for this nation will come crashing down around his ears. Things are changing here in Ottawa. Things are changing across the country, and if fresh winds do not start blowing through that architectural monstrosity on Sussex Drive that looks like an old-fashioned fortress, and is guarded like one, called the Pearson Building, then those winds will not only blow the minister and some of his advisers away but they could help to blow away this government as well.

We have drafted this short, blunt and pointed resolution with four thoughts in mind: to initiate a debate on the lack of nuclear safeguards in the world today and the failure of the world community to stop the spread of nuclear arms; to examine and, hopefully, force our government and this particular minister to explain and defend Canada's policy of selling nuclear power generating plants to other countries; to drag out of the minister, if we can, for the first time some rational explanation, if one exists, for the intended resumption of nuclear assistance to India; and finally if, as I suspect, there is no rational explanation, to embarrass those government members who are either unthinking enough or partisan and disciplined enough to vote willy-nilly for the government's resumption of nuclear aid to India, the timing of which, the circumstances of which and the merits of which are simply incomprehensible to the people of Canada and to the nations of the western world.

Make no mistake about it, sir, we in the official opposition are going to take special steps to make sure that the nature of the vote of government members on this particular resolution is communicated back home to the people in the constituencies, and we intend to point out those members who endorse this senseless policy of the government. Members can take that as a threat if they want, but if an appeal such as we are making today to government mem-

bers to stop this give-away of the very means to manufacture nuclear weaponry to either untrustworthy or unstable foreign governments is not halted, if they themselves do not revolt against the policies of this minister, and especially his departmental advisers, and change the course of events which surely is leading us to a world holocaust, then we have no other course but to emphasize to the electors in the constituencies that their own MP voted in favour of this policy. We will do it, and they will hear of it. Vote with the government on this one, not only at your own political peril but, in the name of the future of mankind, at your own personal peril.

Others from the official opposition will be dealing today with the general world situation which is sadly deteriorating. Others will deal with the Middle East situation which is quickly deteriorating. The Argentinian tinder-box is about to ignite, with one Canadian reactor working and another being built at a time, in a place and by financial and legal means which to say the least are extremely shaky. The South Korean transaction will be examined and our conclusion will be that a worse example of Canadian participation in this whole nuclear industry simply could not be found anywhere.

Each of Canada's contracts in these and other nations will be exposed, not as being for the general benefit of world peace, understanding or development—and certainly not for the benefit of Canada nor, in some cases, of the other country itself—but, instead, as a giant hand-out or give-away of resources, technology and manufacturing capability, at direct cost to the Canadian taxpayer, under the subterfuge that somehow, somewhere, this is going to be paid for by others when actually we in Canada will be paying for these installations. My part in the debate is simply to introduce it and to try to goad or to pry out of the minister, or even his Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), some rational explanation of why we, as a country, are doing what we are doing.

May I also give a short history of India's nuclear connection with Canada. In 1945, Prime Minister Nehru of India, in the tradition of Gandhi before him, proposed an end to the testing by anyone, anywhere, of any type of nuclear device. That was in 1945. On May 18, 1974, at a site in the Rajasthan desert east of New Delhi, the Indian department of atomic energy exploded a nuclear bomb, it cannot be called anything else—the yield of which was between 15 kilotons and 20 kilotons which is approximately the same force as the bomb which was exploded over Hiroshima. Canada supplied the original materials, the original financing, the original knowledge and the original technology. These contributions, inescapably and inevitably, led to the Indian development in that desert almost two years ago.

In 1956, Canada established, as foreign aid, the Canada-Indian research reactor at Trombay, India. It produces no power, but it can, and does now, produce annually 10 kilograms of weapons' grade plutonium and it has produced in the ten-year period from 1964 to 1974 at least 50 kilograms—enough plutonium for at least ten fair-sized nuclear bombs. The Cirus heavy-water reactor was built at a cost of $70 million. Of this total, $35 million in credit financing was accepted by the Canadian Export Credit Insurance Corporation, with an additional $5 million in nuclear technological information transferred to the government of India without cost or deduction from the Colombo plan or other aid assistance.

In addition to the Cirus reactor, another reactor based on the Douglas Point power reactor has been built, with Canadian assistance, at Rama Pratap Sagar in Rajasthan state. It was to be the first of two Canadian-aided plants of 200 megawatts each. But completion of the second plant is currently being held up by Canada's decision not to supply further nuclear assistance without assurance that the plutonium coming from that plant will not be used for nuclear explosions. That is enough plutonium for 50 nuclear bombs in India. Financing by the EDC for the Rajasthan projects has amounted to $47 million over four contracts dating from April 27, 1964, to May 5, 1971. While India is a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and both a signatory and ratifying member of the partial test-ban treaty of 1963, she has neither signed nor ratified the non-proliferation treaty. Moreover, her actions of May, 1974, are pretty clear indications as to the stand of Mrs. Gandhi and the congress party on nuclear explosions.

● (1520)

One further reactor at Narora in Uttar Pradesh, and another at Madras, are planned to come into service by the mid-1980s. These plants will be modelled on the Rajasthan reactors, but 80 per cent of the project will be built from Indian resources. Reactors already in operation include two boiling water reactors of American design at Tarapur, near Bombay.

That is the situation today. Is Canada blameless in all of this? What part, really, did Canada play so far as the entrance of India into the nuclear club is concerned? In the last issue which came to my desk last week of the slick, in-house departmental organ called "International Perspectives", another academic apologist for the government infers that the Canadian government was as appalled and surprised as the rest of the world when the Rajasthan bomb went off.

What are the facts? Not once, but many times during the disarmament conference from 1965 through to 1970, and perhaps even beyond, the Canadian delegation was specifically warned by other nations of the use the Indian plutonium from the Canadian reactor was being put to. Indeed, in the United Nations itself at least once in May, 1965, and later in July, 1965, at Geneva, the Indian representatives themselves hinted that India's only alternative to the Red Chinese threat was to build the bomb. In October, 1965, Mr. Shahi, the Pakistan minister of foreign affairs, specifically detailed that India was building a nuclear arsenal from Canadian plutonium—publicly, not privately.

In April, 1967, the Indian external affairs minister, Mr. Chagla, came out in the open and threatened that his country had to develop and explode the bomb. In 1971, our Canadian Prime Minister went to New Delhi armed with these reports and came away docilely, trustingly, on the assurance of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi that the Canadian aid was not in any way going to be misused. Well, whether it was misused or not, Canada stood by, assisting, providing, co-operating—not warning, threatening or cutting off aid.

In May, 1974, the Indians blasted their way into the nuclear club and blasted away not only the ineffectualness of the non-proliferation treaty, not only the façade of the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency, but also, I would hope, the physical and mental stagnation of our own Canadian policy respecting nuclear assistance. For ten years the Canadian government had aided and abetted the proliferation of nuclear arms in India, and all the time they must have known what was going on and did nothing. They had full inspection and control powers in respect of what went into and came out of Indian reactors.

As in the case of the judges' affair, the Prime Minister of Canada should have known what was going on. I suspect he did know what was going on but, like in the judges' affair, he kept quiet; he did nothing. Surely, now, we are entitled to ask the government, "Why didn't you pay attention to the warnings? Who did you have doing the inspections? Where are those inspection reports? What did you do to stop this mad rush to world disaster? Why didn't you cut off assistance when India's policy became obvious? Did you even threaten to do so?" And, above all, "Why, in heaven's name, with the same minds in even greater auocratic, if not dictatorial, control in India today, is India any more trustworthy in 1976 than it was in 1974?"

Mr. Speaker, when conditions in the Far East and in the Middle East are more jittery now than then, when there has been a systematic destruction of parliamentary and democractic institutions as we know them in India, and when India herself is making deals to supply nuclear material and knowledge to other countries in the Arab bloc, which surely cannot be looked on anywhere with satisfaction, considering the potential, and when India's competitors, such as Pakistan, openly admit they are in a nuclear race on the subcontinent, the question has to be asked: Why now? Or, better still: Why ever? Why, when no one has devised a remedy, sanction or penalty when a nation does develop a bomb?

What do you do if India, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, Brazil, Argentina, Korea, Chile, South Africa, Egypt, Spain, Taiwan and Indonesia develop atomic bombs? Do you slap their wrists? Do you make them pay up on their UN appropriation? Surely, you make sure they do not have the means to make them in the first place. We are rapidly leaving behind that "first place" option. What are you going to do if India makes a hydrogen bomb, as Prime Minister Ali Bhutto openly declared they are doing in Madras when he was here in Ottawa last month? What is this government's answer? This government now says they are negotiating to resume nuclear assistance. Mind you, it is not the minister who said that, but Canada's version of Kissinger, Mr. Ivan Head. Perhaps he could be more fairly described as Canada's version of Chester Bowles. In any event, on March 10 Mr. Head announced that success had been reached so far as an agreement with India for resumption was concerned.

● (1530)

The only small detail left, of course—and I gather Mr. Head did not give too much importance to this merely routine item—was that it still had to be approved by the cabinet. This was done at a time when the International Atomic Agency had only 47 inspectors to report on well over 200 nuclear facilities worldwide. This was done at a time when we had already provided a country such as India with a developed nuclear arsenal which Canada itself would not dream of acquiring for herself. This was done at a time when Canada's own manufacturing and technical capability is to be strained to the utmost over the next ten years to provide our own nuclear power plants for our own nuclear domestic needs without in any way adding to the stress and strain of providing CANDU reactors to others, and when we had the sneaking suspicion that our reactors were wanted so that those nations which acquired them could more easily make weapons' grade plutonium from a Canadian reactor than from the American light water reactors. Surely, if this is so and if the suspicion exists—and I assure the minister that the suspicion does exist—this places an even greater burden on Canadians generally.

Finally, this deal was concluded at a time when Canadian government expenditures are at an all time high and must be cut down. Each one of these assistance programs, each one of these CANDU reactors in foreign lands, costs the Canadian taxpayer directly, at the very minimum, 55 per cent of the capital cost of each one of them—and usually much more than 55 per cent because of the man years and the expenditure of Canadian knowledge and Canadian experience with them. I merely ask this: Are our priorities straight? Is our thinking correct? Is the government right when we siphon so much effort, so much time and so much money into a program which in India's case has been misused and will likely be seriously abused in the future? The time to stop this type of transaction and this type of deal is now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lawrence: And the way to do it is not to send Mr. Head on any more expeditions. The way to do it is to reprimand the government in the vote in this place tonight.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) has done a commendable service in introducing a motion which will provide an opportunity for a public debate regarding a matter which is of vital concern to all Canadians and to the peace of the world. The nuclear bomb represents a greater threat to human survival than anything that has occurred in the history of mankind. With the development of every new weapon, man has increased his power for destruction. For the first time in all the long history of man on this earth, we now have the power not only to destroy cities or to lay waste countries but even to destroy all forms of life on this planet.

From 1945 to the present time this threat has mushroomed. In 1945, the United States was the only possessor of a nuclear capacity. Today, some 14 nations either have the nuclear bomb or have the capacity to produce one. Moreover, there are over 650 nuclear plants in 38 different countries, all of which produce radiation waste from which plutonium can be produced. In this situation Canada has greater special responsibility than any other country. The reason for that is that we have managed to produce the CANDU reactor which produces twice as much plutonium as does the light-water reactor which is used in the United States and in most of the countries of western Europe. Not only that, but the spent-fuel rods from the CANDU reactor

will produce plutonium daily, whereas the light-water reactor can produce plutonium only at a scheduled refuelling shut-down which occurs only every 12 or 18 months. The CANDU reactor has some advantages, but there is no doubt that its greatest danger lies in the ease with which its radiation waste can be recycled into plutonium, the most dangerous substance known to modern science.

How has Canada discharged this great responsibility in handling the CANDU reactor? In my opinion we have discharged our responsibility shamefully. The Canadian government, through the Atomic Energy Commission, has gone around the world peddling the CANDU reactor whether or not the proposed customer is either reliable or stable. We have made a very heavy investment in producing CANDU reactors and the government is anxious to secure sales so as to get its money back. As a matter of fact, we have gone so far as to lend great sums of money to prospective customers. In the case of Argentina, we sold them a reactor on such generous terms that unless the contract is renegotiated we stand to lose over $100 million. In the case of the sale to the Republic of South Korea, we lent them $300 million and, if my memory is correct, I believe that in the case of India we actually gave them a CANDU reactor as a gift.

Who are these countries to whom we are either selling nuclear reactors or providing nuclear technology or nuclear fuel? We have India, to whom we sold a nuclear reactor; we have Argentina, to whom we sold a nuclear reactor; and we are now carrying on negotiations, since the visit of the prime minister of Pakistan to this country, with his nation. Not one of those three has signed a non-proliferation treaty. With reference to South Korea, with whom we have already entered into an agreement, they have signed the non-proliferation treaty but they have not ratified it. Do you see what happens? Every time we sell a nuclear reactor, nuclear technology or nuclear fuel to any nation, we start all its neighbours on a shopping expedition. Give India the capacity for a nuclear bomb, and immediately Pakistan is in the market. Make an agreement with Argentina to sell them a CANDU reactor, and now Brazil is in the market. Of course, with reference to South Korea, where there has been merely an armed truce for several years, there is no doubt that this has strengthened the hand of North Korea in securing some nuclear capacity from its allies.

● (1540)

What ought to disturb the government and this House is that almost every one of these countries with which we have been carrying on these negotiations has been, is now or is planning to procure recycling or reprocessing plants the only purpose of which can be to take the radiation waste from the CANDU reactor and produce plutonium. The production of plutonium, of course, means that with only a few pounds of it they are capable of producing a nuclear bomb.

In the case of India, India produced its own separation plant. In the case of South Korea, though they ordered one from France they agreed to cancel the order, but there is no guarantee in the agreement that if they change their mind in the near future the agreement is null and void. Argentina already has an experimental reprocessing plant which is just as capable of producing plutonium as India's plant.

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

Brazil, the neighbour of Argentina, is now negotiating with West Germany to get a recycling plant. Surely, no country could do anything worse for the peace and safety of the world than to sell nuclear reactors into areas which are trouble spots, such as India and Pakistan, Argentina and Brazil, or North Korea and South Korea, particularly when those countries have expressed an interest in, and in many cases have acquired the technical facilities for, extracting plutonium from the radiation waste which will come from our nuclear reactors.

The motion moved by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham makes special reference to India. The negotiations with India have been carried on under a cloak of secrecy and evasion. When we first began to see the newspaper reports from New Delhi of a delegation there, of whom the main spokesman seems to have been Mr. Ivan Head of the Prime Minister's office, we asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) what sort of proposals were being made and what was the purpose of the meeting between the Canadian delegation and the government of India. We were stonewalled. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said that the delegation was in India and until it returned he was not in a position to say what agreement it might be discussing.

Did the minister not know before the delegation left Canada what it was authorized to discuss and what type of preliminary agreement it had authority to sign? Was Mr. Ivan Head acting under the direction of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or was he taking his orders directly from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)? We have not been able to find out. When the delegation did get back from India, we asked questions of the minister and he said that the matter was before cabinet and he could not discuss it until a decision had been made. This means that parliament and the people of Canada will be told nothing until an agreement has been signed and we in parliament are faced with a *fait accompli*.

Surely, if the Canadian delegation in New Delhi could tell people there what proposals were being advanced, and if the Indian government could disclose some of the suggestions it was making to the Canadian delegation, could not the Canadian people and members of parliament also be told what the proposals were—not as to a final decision, but what proposals were being put forward—so that we could discuss them and the Canadian people would know what was going on? For instance, is the ban on nuclear weapons to India to be lifted only for the purpose of supplying some important components to the reactor at Rajasthan? And when that is over, are we making any commitments with reference to supplying nuclear fuel for the reactor? The report which came from New Delhi is rather interesting. It appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of March 8, 1976 and contains this very enlightening sentence:

—one informed source here indicated it contains at least an oral commitment by India to refrain from any further nuclear explosions while the Canadian assistance is under way.

What happens after the Canadian assistance is completed? We received a pledge from India that none of the nuclear capacity we were giving it would be used for making an explosive device. That pledge was broken in 1974. Is there any reason to think that it will be kept now? There is an old saying that if they fool you once, shame on

them; if they fool you twice, shame on you. Surely, the minister has a responsibility to stop playing this game of hide-and-seek. He has a responsibility this afternoon, in the course of this debate, to tell the Canadian people whether we are thinking seriously of lifting the ban which we very properly placed on India after it broke its pledged word. Also, if we are going to lift that ban, to what extent, and for what purpose?

Let us not allow the minister to tell us, as he has done so often, that we are insisting on the very highest safeguards in the world. Safeguards are worth nothing unless the people who give them are the kind of people on whom we can reply. Certainly, none of the safeguards the government has been able to produce to date have been worth the paper they have been printed on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What we in the New Democratic Party have been demanding is that there be a moratorium on the sale of nuclear plants, technology and fuels until such time as the seven producing nations have been able to formulate a treaty which will place a ban on nations which have not signed the non-proliferation treaty and all those nations which are not prepared to forgo purchasing reprocessing plants. No single nation can enforce provisions like that. Only the seven nations which sell nuclear technology and nuclear plants are able to do that if by treaty they agree that when any nation breaks the safeguard agreement, that nation will not be able to purchase from any of the supplying countries either plants, repairs, parts, uranium fuel, heavy-water or anything else which they require to carry on their nuclear operations. Until we get that kind of agreement, and until the producing nations are prepared to institute that kind of treaty which will enable the producing countries to impose sanctions and to enforce their safeguards, then I say that we ought not to be selling nuclear reactors outside this country.

When this was suggested to the minister on the day on which he announced the sale of the nuclear reactors to South Korea and Argentina, I thought the reply of the minister was one of the most damning indictments I ever heard any minister make of himself and of the government to which he belongs. As reported at page 10493 of *Hansard* of Jauary 30, 1976, the minister said, with reference to a moratorium:

> Probably it would result in Canada's losing sales to other nuclear suppliers, and we would also lose whatever influence we are exercising—

That it would result in Canada's losing sales is a significant statement. Josh Billings once said that when a man says, "It ain't the money, it's the principle of the thing—it is the money." I think it is very significant that the monetary consideration seems to have taken precedence over moral considerations in the matter of the sale of nuclear reactors. Of course the people of Canada want to trade with other countries; of course they want to develop export sales. But I submit that the great majority of the Canadian people are not willing to pay the price of endangering the peace of the world in order to enable the government to sell two or three nuclear reactors in the trouble spots of the world.

● (1550)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I hope that the minister will today make a full and detailed explanation to this House of the negotiations that have been going on with India. We are not asking the minister to tell us what will appear in the final agreement; but when he sent, or somebody else sent, the delegation to New Delhi they must have had some idea of why the discussions were going to be carried on. They must have known whether Canada, under certain conditions, would consider raising the ban on nuclear sales to India. We ought to know what those considerations are. Surely this House ought to know that long before an agreement is signed.

We are dealing with something that is far too important, in terms of human survival, to follow the old, diplomatic conditions of the nineteenth century which say that a government has power to sign an agreement then toss it on the floor of the House and give members ten or fifteen minutes to express an opinion on it. Surely the time has come, on so crucial a question, that these matters ought to be discussed in this House and in the standing committees of the House. Members of this parliament ought to have some input before the government makes a decision which could bring the world into a conflagration.

I do not think the Canadian people are going to accept the idea that all these negotiations regarding nuclear sales should be carried on in the hush-hush of diplomacy and that parliament and the people of Canada should be kept in ignorance of something which may well affect them, their children and their children's children for generations to come. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we want the minister to come clean; to tell the House what is going on, and whether he is willing, in view of what happened with India and in view of the reprocessing plants that have been bought by some other countries with which we have been negotiating, to consider a temporary moratorium until such time as the seven supplier nations, who have been meeting and making some progress, are able to devise an arrangement by which we can guarantee that sales of nuclear reactors will not increase the nuclear capacities of countries which may use them to disturb the peace of the world and threaten the survival of mankind.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, the motion now before us makes us think very seriously and very deeply, indeed. As a matter of fact, a country such as ours, known first and foremost for its peaceful role, as an example for all nations of the world, how can such a country justify nuclear aid to a country such as India?

I want to commend the mover of this motion because, in my view, we must act in a logical manner and with what is known as good horse sense. Mr. Speaker, geographically Canada is in such a situation that we wonder ourselves why we accept to have nuclear weapons. We are even wondering why we accept to have all kinds of weapons we could do without because between the United States on the one hand, our neighbours to the south and the Soviet Union on the other hand, our neighbours to the north, it is quite obvious that with our small population, we look like a pygmy between two giants, and it is absolutely ridicu-

lous to have any kind of weapons to try to compete wth them.

I hope I can be excused for digressing a little bit but I happen to think I should emphasize the fact that we could radically alter our position by cutting down on defence expenditures, and this might even prove very successful in curbing inflation. Now, to come back to what I was saying, I would say that the government is definitely to blame for providing nuclear assistance and we must change our policy. We must give the example and not take advantage of opportunities to encourage the proliferation of nuclear arms. Is it not particularly illogical, Mr. Speaker, for us to provide such assistance to a country where almost one third of the people is undernourished and where thousands and thousands starve to death every day?

When we hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) declare over and over again that we have food surpluses, in particular milk and powered milk, but cannot systematize our food assistance to starving countries while we find ways to help them out in a useless and dangerous area like this one, which could lead to its destruction. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this flagrant contradiction must be denounced with the utmost vehemence. There is no getting away from the fact that mankind is now living under constant threat.

And newspapers were again reporting last week how it could even be possible that the Guatemala earthquake had been caused by American nuclear tests in Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that such is the case, but there are hypotheses leaning in that direction.

There is no doubt that our role is certainly not to act in such a way as to encourage anyone along those lines. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we fully support the motion. We hope the government will recognize the necessity of changing its policy in that field so that Canada can keep its role and its reputation as a pacifying country and not as a country capable of contributing, even indirectly, to practices that simply can generate conflicts throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will bear in mind the remarks we are making, and I hope this House will vote as it should to show clearly that Canada is a peaceful country which does not want human life to be destroyed.

● (1600)

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity provided by the motion to comment on Canadian policy with respect to nuclear sales abroad and to underline the dedication and interest of the Canadian government in the cause of non-proliferation. As hon. members have said, nuclear proliferation is a danger in the world. It is a broad, political problem which arises from the transfer of one state's nuclear technology to another and also from the vertical proliferation in the arsenals of the superpowers of the world. It seems to me hon. members took a limited view of Canada's role in coping with the problem, particularly of the reasons for Canada's transferring nuclear technology in certain cases to other countries of the world in discharge of treaty obligations.

[Mr. Matte.]

The subject is extensive. I should like to deal with it under the following headings: first, why are we in the business of transferring nuclear technology, nuclear material and nuclear equipment; second, what effect would the moratorium which has been advocated by all previous speakers have internationally and domestically; third, there is the safeguard system, what it can do and what it cannot do; fourth, what is Canada's role in the London club and what were the recent conclusions of the suppliers' group which the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) mentioned; and, finally, there is the special case of India.

As a country and as a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty we have undertaken to transfer technology to other countries for peaceful purposes. We all know that at present throughout the world nuclear power is the major alternative to hydro resources and fossil fuels. We also know that a number of developing countries and developed countries require nuclear power to further their economic and social development. So far in this debate not one speaker has mentioned the cry of the world's developing countries for access to nuclear technology. Most developing countries have adhered to the non-proliferation treaty. They say, "We have undertaken these obligations but developed, industrialized countries of the world are failing in their responsibilities to make available to us nuclear technology." That technology is urgently needed in certain developing countries as a source of power. It is not urgently needed in all of them, though it is in some.

When the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands recited our association with countries such as India, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, and Argentina, he failed to underline that each of those countries is a developing country urgently in need of additional power resources in order to maintain their development and inch forward a bit in humanity's struggle for an improved standard of living. About this aspect not one word was said. Every spokesman on the other side ignored it totally. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) put the matter clearly when he said in his speech to the Nuclear Association, in Ottawa on June 17, 1975:

> It would be unconscionable under any circumstances to deny to the developing countries the most modern of technologies as assistance in their quest for higher living standards. But, in a world increasingly concerned about depleting reserves of fossil fuels, about food shortages, and about the need to reduce illness, it would be irresponsible as well to withold the advantages of the nuclear age—of power reactors, agricultural isotopes, cobalt beam-therapy units.

In Canada we have developed this high technology. It is one of the show pieces of Canadian industry and has application throughout the world. This afternoon hon. gentlemen are saying, "Sit on it. Look inward. Keep this technology in Canada because we do not want to be as other countries and take risks". We take some risks, admittedly. They say, "We prefer to withdraw than to confront the dilemma proposed by our policy, namely, how can we share this technology with the rest of the world and at the same time avoid the proliferation of nuclear weapons?" That is the dilemma.

The hon. member said it was a moral issue, but he ignored the moral question which we, as a rich, developed country would face if we did as he proposed and refused to take risks which other developed countries take—and

there are risks—in sharing this technology with the rest of the world. The hon. member mentioned trouble spots. Of course there are trouble spots in the world. I wonder which parts are trouble free. Is there any part—the United Kingdom included, which has troubles with Northern Ireland—of which it could not be said that because of internal difficulties our most cautions policy would be to withdraw entirely from participating with that part of the national community.

Hon. members spoke about a moratorium. They were explicit: we should stop making available nuclear power reactors, nuclear materials including uranium, the fuel for power reactors and nuclear technology. Previously I presented the position to the House honestly. It was a statement of fact. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands said it was an indictment. If we were to cease our participation, sales of the CANDU reactor would be picked up by other countries. That is a fact. It is also a fact that whatever influence Canada has exercised, and continues to exercise—and it is considerable—in upgrading standards among the nuclear suppliers of the world would be less. The policy advocated by the hon. member would totally eliminate the considerable influence which Canada possesses at the present time.

● (1610)

I wonder whether hon. gentlemen opposite have thought through their proposals. They would affect indiscriminately the power programs of both industrialized and developing countries. Accepting the proposal they advance would constitute an abrogation of Canada's responsibility both in the field of international co-operation and in the area of adequate nuclear safeguards that would be part of our obligation under the NPT. Hon. members asked why this country did not join the NPT and take on these responsibilities. We have taken on these responsibilities, and one of them is to share our expertise and materials in this field with other countries of the world. Such a policy as advocated by the opposition would not only mean the cessation of sales of the CANDU reactor; it would have grave consequences domestically and internationally.

The power requirements of Canada's nuclear partners would be seriously jeopardized in the case of CANDU which in each instance is an integral part of the power program of those states. Pakistan is a good example. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) would presumably want us to throw our weight around in Pakistan. That is a possibility; we could cease co-operation and we could black out the city of Karachi by denying them their power source. That is a possibility which could be considered. In the case of uranium sales, the vital energy situation of some of Canada's most important trading partners, such as Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom, among others, would be jeopardized. I suggest, too, that a moratorium, if it is said we exclude uranium, would bring about a radical dislocation of Canada's uranium mining industry which, following the downturn demand over the past decade, is only now able to develop its full potential and play the important role in the economy of which it is capable.

I was in the House of Commons in the sixties when the bottom fell out of the international uranium market, resulting in the dislocation of the industry at Elliot Lake and a consequent need for immediate compensatory action on the part of the federal government. So if we cease to participate in these developments, if we cease to supply equipment, technology and fuel, the consequences would be both domestic and international. In addition, we would lose whatever influence we have as a partner in this business of upgrading general nuclear standards. It is a policy which I do not recommend to the House of Commons, and I doubt whether anyone on this side of the House will find much difficulty in voting against the ill-conceived motion put forward by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham.

Mr. Beatty: Your speech is bombing.

Mr. MacEachen: As long as it is not a nuclear bomb, I am all right. Hon. members opposite have been complaining about secrecy; they say they have been kept in ignorance and do not not know what is going on. Mr. Speaker, on January 30 I tabled the agreements we signed with the Republic of Korea and with Argentina. I have also tabled a comprehensive statement on Canada's nuclear safeguards policy, the total background for the benefit of hon. members who wanted to be enlightened, who wanted to be in possession of more facts, who wanted to dispel the ignorance in which they have been so deeply immersed by members of the government. I notice that in the three speeches made, not a word was said about the safeguards policy; not a word was said about the agreements. No suggestion was made as to ways in which we might improve, if possible, the system of safeguards we have in effect.

The safeguards as reflected in those two agreements are extremely important. Hon. members clamoured for those agreements; they were clamouring for an opportunity to study them. Today we find ourselves engaged in a debate on the subject, and I have been waiting for some enlightenment as to means by which those safeguard agreements might be improved. None was forthcoming. Maybe hon. members across the way would like a moratorium on those, too. Perhaps they believe we should stop making these agreements and get out of the international field entirely. I want to tell them that safeguards are an extremely important aspect of the international non-proliferation system. There are others, of course. It must be recognized that proliferation is a political problem, one which stems from inequalities and imbalance within the international community.

If we want to succeed in the task of ensuring non-proliferation, we must cast the net wider. We must consider the causes of international tension and do something about the disparities which exist in the world. We must do something to bring about a better and more equitable international economic system. The safeguards constitute a system of legal commitments and a system of verification. The recipient state undertakes, legally, to observe certain preconditions and in particular commits itself not to undertake any explosive activity. In every negotiation in which we engage we attempt to add to the strength of this legal commitment.

As hon. members know, adherence to this legal commitment is verified by an international inspection system. Unfortunately, that system was downgraded by the hon.

member in his speech. It is being constantly improved. It is implemented not only by personnel but by mechanisms. No one has ever said—and the Prime Minister made this clear in the speech to which I referred a few minutes ago—that it is a 100 per cent foolproof. But the degree of statistical certainty is high and there is a high level of inhibition against diversion. We have recently completed a series of meetings with other nuclear suppliers in an effort to improve our system of international safeguards.

Mr. Stanfield: What are those safeguards?

Mr. MacEachen: I will outline them a little later, for the benefit of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield). International standards, as hon. members will realize, are not static. They have been in evolution since the first agreements for co-operation in the peaceful application of nuclear energy were concluded in the 1950s. The trend in safeguards evolution has been one toward increased stringency both in the legal commitments and verification mechanisms which are required.

● (1620)

The most significant development, of course, that has taken place in the evolution of the safeguards system was the entry into effect of the non-proliferation treaty in 1970. Nuclear suppliers, who have certain generally defined obligations under the NPT, met for a number of years in order to define these obligations to a satisfactory working level. In August, 1974, countries that shared or were about to share these obligations, including the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Canada, reached a basic consensus, one which was notified to the International Atomic Energy Agency on August 22 of that year, setting out their interpretation in some detail.

The policy of the countries which accepted this consensus required, as a minimum, that in transfers of certain nuclear equipment and materials to non-nuclear weapons states not party to the NPT the safeguards system of the IAEA applicable to individual projects be applied. The participating countries, which were later joined by others, also stated an undertaking by the recipient not to use the supplied items for any explosive or other non-peaceful purposes as a prerequisite for the transfer. Recognizing the non-proliferation treaty as the keystone for international safeguards, Canada participated in these discussions and accepted the norms which were already consistent with Canadian policy as a basic standard for the safeguards it required. We did, as a country, go further than this particular consensus to which I refer; we went beyond the breath of the "trigger list", which is fully outlined in the background paper that I tabled in the House on January 30. The details of that policy are clearly set out in that document.

In line with the argument that has been made today by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, the government was acutely conscious of the fact that one supplier cannot succeed unilaterally in raising the international safeguards standard and that Canada's forward position on safeguards and exports would only have real value and significance if the other major, significant suppliers also agreed to a similar set of policies.

Accordingly, a number of bilateral discussions have been initiated by Canada since the end of 1974 both on the level of officials and in the context of meetings held by the Prime Minister and myself. In part—and I think in significant part—as a result of these initiatives meetings among the officials of a number of countries have been held over the past year to examine the question of safeguards in great detail. There were diplomatic discussions of a sensitive nature, as the hon. member pointed out earlier, and in such cases it is up to the participants, if they wish to do so, to outline their role and policy. I should like to do that today on behalf of the government of Canada. I might say that all major suppliers presently on the international market shared these consultations, and more may do so. Let me only say this, that as a result of these international meetings Canada has notified certain other interested countries of the standards of safeguards required under its national policy pursuant to the consensus. This was also done by other participants.

This position reflects much, though not necessarily all, of the policy set out in the background paper I have tabled. It is, however, fully consistent with that policy, stipulating, as it does, that transfers of certain equipment, materials and technology will only be authorized on the basis of a formal governmental assurance from recipients to exclude uses which would result in any nuclear explosive devices. These transfers would also trigger the application of the safeguard system of the IAEA, and their retransfer to any third country could only be done on the basis of the consent of the government of Canada.

It is also stipulated that safeguards should apply to the items covered for their useful life as well as to the subsequent generation of nuclear material produced. It refers to the desirability of imposing provisions for mutual agreement between supplier and recipient on arrangements for reprocessing, storage, alternative use, transfer or retransfer or any plutonium and highly-enriched uranium that is covered. The observance of recommendations and standards for the physical protection of nuclear materials and facilities forms part of this undertaking. The standards also call for safeguards to be triggered by the transfer of technology for heavy-water production enrichment and reprocessing. Canadian policy, I should say parenthetically, places safeguards as well on reactor technology, which as I understand it was not agreed to for various reasons by the group suppliers.

It also sets out some of the areas where the government considers progress necessary for promoting non-proliferation, such as the promotion of regional fuel cycles. These are described in the background paper. The standard does not, as Canada would have wished, stipulate that safeguards be applied to the full nuclear program of the recipient country. Such a requirement is not, however, precluded and achievement of a consensus on this question may be a future result of efforts in the suppliers' group.

I have just given an exposition of Canada's position. This position, or policy is, of course, shared by the other supplier countries concerned about the problem. As the Prime Minister has stated, however, there has been no secret agreement or binding international treaty enforcing this standard. What there has been, as a result of consultation among senior technical officials, is a consensus deci-

sion expressed in unilateral form by a number of countries to accept certain safeguards principles in all cases of nuclear exports to non-nuclear weapon states, whether party to the NPT or not. More countries are likely, on the basis of review, to make such a decision.

The Canadian government has pressed, in its discussions, for the highest possible level of safeguards to be applied to all nuclear transfer. We are satisfied that much progress has been made as a result of this effort and that further progress can be made. It is one further stage in the evolution of the international safeguards system. The London club conclusions, as the suppliers' meetings have been called, have been a success and, I believe, in line with the reasoning put forward by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. We have covered one of the difficulties that is encountered by a single country acting alone.

● (1630)

May I say a word about India, because it has been a matter of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret that I have to interrupt the hon. minister, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the minister to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stanfield: Come clean in your extra period of grace.

Mr. MacEachen: I have been invited to come clean in my explanation, and indeed I will be quite prepared to oblige because the situation with regard to India, or the question posed by our negotiations with India at the present time is a clear and easily understood question. The basic attitude I have taken in these negotiations is, in effect, what policy to be pursued by the government of Canada is in the best interests of non-proliferation in respect of India? I was going to make a political comment, but I had better not do so as my time is short. I will keep to the substance of the subject by saying that following the explosion in May, 1974, discussions have been held with the Indian government to ensure that existing safeguards on the RAPP reactor be strengthened, that the withdrawal of Canada from nuclear co-operation with India should not produce a collapse of the safeguards, and that India should carry out a responsible policy as a potential exporter of nuclear technology, material and equipment.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I regret very much to interrupt and intrude upon the time of the minister. I only wish to point out that there seems to be an open microphone in the booth over there, and I am getting a personal conversation rather than the scintillating words of the minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure that our technicians will look into the matter immediately.

An hon. Member: Is it a good conversation?

Mr. Brisco: I am still getting this personal conversation and it is getting more delightful by the minute.

An hon. Member: What channel are you on?

Mr. MacEachen: Following the explosion that occurred in India in May, 1974, Canada suspended its nuclear co-operation with India. It did so because in our view the carrying out of that explosion was in clear violation of the understanding that had been reached between Canada and India. In my view, no amount of argumentation can conceal the fact that the Indian government knew perfectly well that any kind of explosion would be contrary to the understanding that had been reached between Canada and India. That is clear to me.

The other argument has been put by India to the effect that you can have an explosion for peaceful purposes. We claim that the technology required for a so-called peaceful explosion is the same technology that leads to nuclear weaponry. No valid distinction can be drawn between an explosion for peaceful purposes and an explosion for weapons' purposes. That is our position, and it has continued to be our position up to the present time, although studies apparently have been launched, or are proposed to be launched under the auspices of the NPT respecting the suggestion that you can have an explosion for peaceful purposes.

We suspended our nuclear co-operation with India. The power reactor is not completed, but the shipment of materials has been suspended. Under the agreement with India that we entered into, we have an obligation to complete the shipment to the reactor, both of material and fuel. That is the obligation that is now in suspense. It is suggested, I believe, by the hon. member very clearly that at this stage Canada should put into a permanent state its suspension of co-operation with India. That is a possible line of policy. But I ask the hon. member, has he considered the risk that might result if India then allowed the safeguard system at that reactor to disappear entirely?

They have, at the present time, on that reactor a safeguard system and part of our objective, if we continue our relationship with India, would be to upgrade the existing safeguards on the RAPP reactor. That is a question hon. members have to consider, and it is a question that I am presently considering. We have no intention of staying permanently in India. The purpose of our negotiations is to get out, and get out we will. The question is, do we get out now, or do we get out when we complete our current obligations; and in completing our current obligations, are we doing more for the non-proliferation system; and if we do get out now, do we leave that RAPP reactor unsafeguarded? Basically, this is one of the main questions that is now under consideration.

The hon. member has asked me to come clean with the House. I should like to put before the House some of the questions I am presently considering before making a final recommendation to my colleagues as to whether we ought to complete this particular aspect of our co-operation with India prior to terminating it altogether, because that is the total objective of our policy in the long-run.

What would be the consequences of making permanent the suspension of supplying nuclear co-operation to India? What would be the consequences on the safeguard system? Would the Indian government consider that the co-operation obligations of Canada had been breached, and that the safeguards—which are an integral part of the co-operation agreement—should be removed? To what extent should co-operation be resumed in order to permit an upgrading of existing safeguards on the RAPP reactor? Is the proposed agreement effective in ensuring that spent fuel from the RAPP reactor will never be used for explosions? To what extent does the proposed agreement represent new and significant safeguard obligations for India which would bear on the development of its nuclear policy? How would any upgraded system relate to this particular reactor about which we are concerned? How would such an upgraded system compare with Canadian and other suppliers' standards? Would our completing this single, particular program by which we might upgrade the safeguard system, lead to an over-all upgrading in the situation which other suppliers could accept and respect?

● (1640)

Other questions are: Would the completion of our particular project with India be an inhibiting or delaying factor regarding a further explosion in India? Would we have any effect or, indeed, would a second explosion be delayed or be out of bounds in India? These are some of the main questions that are now before me. They are questions which have been considered by the negotiators in India who have been acting under my instructions and have reached an understanding with their India counterparts.

I have not reached any conclusion on these understandings because there are further questions I want to ask and further refinements I want to achieve in respect of the interpretations of various terms that are being employed. But the simple test, really, is which is best for non-proliferation? Is it to get out, as the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham suggests, or to complete our particular single project and thereby achieve an upgrading of the safeguards system on an important nuclear reactor which, in the absence of the completion of our program, might be left unsafeguarded long into the future? That is the basic issue we face in so far as the India situation is concerned.

It has been a great disillusionment for Canada and the Canadian people that this unhappy and tragic explosion did take place in India. It certainly was against the understandings that we had reached and it had a serious effect upon all of us, I believe, in an attempt to reassess and reagonize over the dangers in respect of proliferation which exists in any transfer of nuclear technology, nuclear materials or nuclear equipment. We have reached the conclusion that even though there is a very difficult balancing to be made between the objective of sharing and the objective of non-proliferation, those two objectives can be pursued simultaneously and, as a responsible supplier, we probably, as a country, will do more to reach the objectives put forward this afternoon by participating energetically with principles rather than by withdrawing within a Canadian cloister.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the minister prepared to answer a question by the hon. member?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes.

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would add a few questions to the list he is asking his officials.

Mr. MacEachen: I am asking myself.

Mr. Lawrence: Then I will ask the minister right now whether the safeguards, for instance, in respect of the original reactor we provided for India are retroactive? Will the safeguards, for instance, cover the new reactors near Madras in which Canada will have very little input? A third question might well be: If, for instance, India exported some of its own technology and material to a country, let us say like Iran, and the deal is being made now, do these safeguards cover the whole nuclear industry in Iran, rather than just the small portion which may come from India? There is one other thing: would the minister please remember the old saying, "Once bitten, twice shy"?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not this minister.

Mr. MacEachen: I believe these are extremely pertinent questions. The hon. member asks whether the original reactor, the research reactor Cirus, would be subject to safeguards.

Mr. Lawrence: One even before that.

Mr. MacEachen: This is the one from which the plutonium was produced, the RAPP reactor. These are questions we are now examining. I would ask the hon. member, if I may, rhetorically, whether he would prefer to have all of them, or would one or two be better than none?

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, there seem to be a few smart alecks around today. I think most of us recognize we are discussing perhaps the most serious question that confronts any of us in the world today. The minister, during the course of his remarks, said that the Indian experience had been a great disillusionment to the government and the Canadian people. I have no doubt that is so. However, I am concerned today that the minister and the Canadian people may have some even further disillusionment as a result of the policy he and his government are pursuing.

I think we are all agreed upon the importance of the question. This represents one of the great challenges of our time. I think we are all agreed on the very obvious danger to mankind. We have learned, in a way, to live in a certain balance of terror between the two superpowers. But proliferation, to other countries, smaller countries and countries which may react with fear and desperation, obviously greatly heightens the menace to mankind. We, the opposition, have been addressing ourselves mainly to the minister and to the government today. I want to make clear that so far as I am concerned, this problem is not the responsibility just of the government of Canada.

I do not think we can be very happy about the behaviour of the international community generally with regard to

the nuclear threat and the threat of nuclear proliferation. The countries which have nuclear technique want to retain it and use it for their own purposes. Some manufacture bombs for their own purposes and some, like Canada, use these techniques for peaceful purposes. The countries which have the technique are trying to persuade those which do not to accept the fact that half a dozen countries or so have the technology and the others do not.

The means of persuading these other countries to accept this fact is the sharing of the technology which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) emphasize so frequently. They emphasize that this is part of the obligation Canada undertook in signing the non-proliferation treaty; that is, the obligation to share. But the Secretary of State for External Affairs almost took the position today that one is either for or against sharing. That is not the point we are making.

I do not want to overemphasize the importance of the development of power by nuclear technology. I do not want, necessarily, to subscribe to the view expressed by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that the development of nuclear technology is necessarily the main alternative to the development of power from fossil fuel. He may be right. However, I notice that the *Economist*, for example, questions this. The *Economist* is quite critical of the fact that the AIEA, which is supposed to be an international control and inspection agency, is spending two-thirds of its budget on promoting the development of power from nuclear sources around the world. But even if the Secretary of State for External Affairs is right in thinking that nuclear power is the main alternative to power developed from fossil fuel, do we have to accept one or the other alternative that he has put before us today? Are we prepared to sit here and be embarrassed by the fact that he chastises us and suggests that because we are critical of the conditions under which Canada is sharing its knowledge, and under which it is entering into contracts, we want to be isolationists; we want to simply sit on our knowledge and we do not want to share anything—in fact, that we want to be inward-looking? I reject that.

● (1650)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I like and admire the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but I have to say to him that it is a cheap debating manipulation to suggest that those who were criticizing the government for the deals it is making are simply inward-looking, dog-in-the-manger people who are not prepared to share advanced technology with the rest of the world.

The question is: Can we not work out methods under which this technology can be safely shared? Those who are urging a moratorium are, I am certain, not taking the position that they want to be dogs-in-the-manger, nor that they want to prevent the development of underdeveloped countries; but they think it is wiser to take a little more time in the international community, particularly among those nations which have the technology, working out, in co-operation, a safe method of sharing this technology.

So it is not just a question of sitting on it; it is not a question of members in the opposition parties either being in favour of the government's programs or against any kind of sharing at all. What we are concerned about, and what we are prepared to face and confront, is the great challenge that is not put fairly before the House or before the Canadian people by a minister who suggests it is either a question of sharing they way this government is sharing, or simply taking a narrow, inward look.

I say that Canada has particular reasons to be careful in discharging its responsibility, for two reasons. First, there is the fact, as has been pointed out frequently, that the CANDU reactor generates more plutonium than the alternative methods of developing power from nuclear sources. Second, there is the bitter experience in India to which the minister referred this afternoon. Yet Canada seems to be prepared to run risks to make sales of its reactors.

Let us look at the customers. South Korea is in a very unstable part of the world. It is in the process of negotiating a deal for a processing plant. It is said that it has no longer the intention of acquiring a processing plant; but so far as I know, the government of Canada has not received an assurance, for whatever it might be worth, from the government of South Korea that it will not acquire a reprocessing plant during any definable term of years. Argentina is not a signatory of the non-proliferation treaty. Terrorism is rampant there and there is instability in the country. Yet Canada is now negotiating the contract and it has very quickly entered into a contract for nuclear technology without any real care about ensuring an adequate standard of safeguards.

Then there is the Italian deal under which Canada was licensing an Italian company to manufacture CANDU reactors and re-export that technology. What has happened to that deal? Where does it stand? What assurances can the minister or anybody give us about safeguards with respect to that arrangement? Then there is Pakistan which also is not a signatory to the non-proliferation treaty. There must be a great temptation for the government of Pakistan to try to develop a bomb in response to what has happened in India. Then there is India itself which has used Canadian technique and resources to achieve a nuclear explosion.

I think it is right, and I think it is our duty to ask ourselves whether we should be in this business on these terms, taking these high risks. The minister admits that there are risks involved, and I suppose there will always be some risks. But is it good enough simply to boast that our safeguards are the highest in the world, when he admits that there are risks and everybody can see that? Has the minister any real confidence that these safeguards are adequate? Has he any real confidence that these safeguards can prevent happening in other countries what has happened in India? Why does the government want to impose this kind of a risk on the conscience of the Canadian people?

The minister says we want to enter into a moratorium. A moratorium does not mean that we will forgo all this business for all time; it means that we will not make any deals until we are satisfied that we have made a real effort to get an international mechanism that really works. He says we will forgo sales. I think the Canadian people would be prepared to forgo sales to permit that kind of

effort to be made. Far from that causing us to lose influence, I think the fact that Canada is prepared to forgo or postpone these kinds of deals will increase our moral influence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The minister and others have said that we do not provide any aid to customers who have not signed a non-proliferation agreement. We may make a deal with a country that has not signed a non-proliferation agreement, but we will not provide any aid. I have to say to the minister that I do not believe that because the government is not prepared, for example, to disclose the terms under which these loans are made. It was not prepared to do it in the case of South Korea, and I do not think it will be prepared to do so in the case of Argentina. How can the government expect any of us to believe that these loans are made on purely commercial terms and that there is in them no aspect of aid to countries which have not signed a non-proliferation agreement when they want to enter into a deal with us?

History has indicated that Canada has been pretty anxious to make sales. I do not want to be unfair. I think that Canada has been sufficiently anxious to make sales, but it has not been sufficiently anxious to provide adequate safeguards, not in the case of India nor in the case of Argentina. I wonder if the government and those who are advising the government are not acting on the premise that these potential customers are going to get the bomb anyway, and Canada might as well get the business.

● (1700)

An hon. Member: Come on, you can do better than that.

Mr. Stanfield: I might be able to do better than that, but that is doing pretty well: that is putting it pretty bluntly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: Merchants of death!

Mr. Stanfield: This government has certainly adopted a very lofty attitude toward this House and, despite what the minister says, a highly secretive attitude. The one thing which disturbs me is not just that this government is very secretive about the whole thing, but that the so-called London club, the club of the countries which have nuclear technology, is being exceedingly secretive. The minister did not disclose the terms of the consensus today. I suppose he is not authorized to do so. Those countries which reached consensus have been so secretive that I understand even the IAEA, which is supposed to enforce these things in so far as they are enforced, has not been told the terms of the consensus reached by the London club.

What is going on here? Are we back in the days of Maeterlinck and the Congress of Vienna; or are we living in the latter part of the twentieth century, trying to deal with one of the gravest problems which has confronted mankind? How does the minister justify coming into the House of Commons unable to disclose what Canada has agreed to? I understand there was an exchange of letters in January incorporating this consensus. How does the Secretary of State for External Affairs justify this highly secretive approach? This consensus is either so inadequate that it will not stand the light of day, or there is something wrong with it. While the Secretary of State for External Affairs is certainly not responsible for all the deficiencies of international relations, or for all the deficiencies of international efforts to secure some agreement on this subject, surely he can come into this House and tell its members why members of the suppliers' club are ashamed of publishing the consensus they claim they reached.

We would like to see the consensus so we can judge whether it is in any way adequate, so we can see to what degree it is inadequate so we can see the total context, and so we can get a picture of the situation in which Canada is entering into contracts bilaterally; so we can assess the risks Canada is taking and so we can assess the risks to which the government of Canada is exposing the world and the possible shame and humiliation to which our government is exposing the Canadian people in making these deals.

Can we not have a little openness? Even if the government of Canada thinks, because it is elected to government, that it has to keep the opposition at a distance, even if it feels it has to keep the opposition in its place and exercise its traditional right to enter into an agreement and then place it before the House for ratification—even if it feels it has to maintain that kind of relationship, surely the government of Canada can insist, before its associates in this club, that it must be able to come before this House and the people of Canada and tell us precisely what the consensus is so that the people of Canada have the facts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Apart from anything else, the Secretary of State for External Affairs is not discharging his duty to this House or to the people of Canada by being unable to come before this House and tell us what this consensus is so that we know what the facts are.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Let us not have any more confusion thrown around by the government whip or by anyone else. I have read the safeguards put forward by this government. They are not the same thing—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Oh, you did?

Mr. Stanfield: Let the hon. member keep quiet for a minute. If he would listen to me, or even to his minister, he would know that the safeguards proposed by the government of Canada is one thing, and the safeguards agreed to by this club of exporters is quite a different thing—and the people of Canada are entitled to know the safeguards agreed to by the exporters. Surely, even the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) can get through his head that the people of Canada are entitled to know that, because it would enable them to assess to some degree the risks the government of Canada is taking, the risks to which the government of Canada is exposing the people of Canada in exporting nuclear technology and nuclear reactors to South Korea, Argentina and all these other countries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I suspect that my time is getting short. I did not really rise to preach to the minister. However, before I sit down I should like to say to him that in this desperately important area of trying to control nuclear proliferation, we are seeking the same kind of international fumbling and bumbling which we have seen in the past and which has led to international disaster. This time, the government of Canada cannot shrug its shoulders and say that this kind of international bumbling is something undertaken by the great powers, over which we have no control or with whom we have nothing to do. This is not a mess being imposed upon us by others; this is a mess in which Canada and its government are participating. I warn the minister that this is what is going on. It is not a matter of Canada not having any part to play, because the members of this government are right in there pitching—and "pitching" is a pretty good word to use, because the sales pitch is obviously a very important part of their thinking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1710)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of his comments, the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), indicated to the House that there was no opportunity to launch a debate on the role of the Canadian government in the sale of nuclear equipment and that it was as a result of an allotted day that he could question the minister on the matter. I would like to point out to the mover of the motion, Mr. Speaker, that he had some opportunities and that he took advantage of them. He had two opportunities on March 6 or 7, 1975 and on March 13, 1975. He had another opportunity on May 22, 1975 and his last opportunities were on December 2 and 12 last when indeed he directed some questions to the minister about Canadian policy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to commend the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) for his excellent speech and the clarity with which he delivered it and I hope that this time all opposition members have understood what is the Canadian policy governing the sale of nuclear material to countries which signed the non-proliferation treaty.

Mr. Speaker, within the next 15 minutes that are allotted to me, I would like to refer in particular to that part of the motion which deals with the sale of nuclear material to India. I wish to refer as well to the nuclear explosion that many of us—and I see that the mover has made the same mistake—consider as an atom bomb explosion. There is a huge difference, Mr. Speaker, between exploding an atomic bomb and a nuclear explosion.

What happened in Ragasthan in 1974, Mr. Speaker—and it was told to me by Indians and not by Canadians—is that first of all this explosion was not a bomb and second, the Indian people could have used their expertise, their ability to detonate a nuclear bomb well before 1974.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that people from India are telling us that they had no need whatsoever for our expertise or our equipment for the 1974 explosion. They could even have released that bomb before the Chinese, that is to say almost ten years ago.

Therefore I wonder what prompted this hysterical crisis which caused huge problems to the Indians, particularly if you recall the co-operation program we have been pursuing with India for almost 20 years, since they got their independence, and especially for the past few years.

And if one considers the importance, the amount Canada contributed for these unfortunate people and the importance they attach to the Canadian contribution, one will easily understand that they may wonder about the future of our cooperation program and about the way India is using the nuclear material Canada sold her. Surely it is not to fulfill the ambition to produce atomic bombs and use them. The Indians were a pacific people. They have been much more often under occupation or attack than they were either occupants or attackers. These people need the assistance of Canada, it is not endowed with natural resources as we are in Canada. As everyone knows, industrialized countries helped them by building a system of irrigation channels contributibg to make the unproductive land a little more fertile, but there are still other needs. Energy is one of the great needs the Indian economy is faced with, and this is why, Mr. Speaker, we insist so much on the participation of Canada for the maintenance of this co-operation program in which we have been involved for such a long time.

There is not a single Indian I met who believes for one minute that his country has any ambition to develop and produce an atomic bomb or even to deliver it. I do not know this simply from speaking to from the man on the street, Mr. Speaker. Like other delegates in India last November, including some from the motion sponsor's party, I had the opportunity to meet India's Secretary for External Affairs of India Kamas Singh who assured us, Mr. Speaker, that in no way were there any ambition to develop atomic bombs and spend fabulous amounts in that area. Quite the contrary, it is that expertise, that knowledge they want to develop, mainly to foster economic development in a country which has such a need for it. They also wish to help generate rather cheap power. They are not the only ones to do so, because in the last few months this has become the less costly, the most economical way to produce power. Already at the end of 1974, there were no fewer than 170 reactors in 19 countries around the world. Those 170 reactors were producing at least 73,000 megawatts of electricity, and it is estimated that by 1980 some 28 countries may produce 185,000 megawatts.

Should we Canadians deprive a developing country, a country in dire need, should we deprive Indians of the right to use that economical form of energy, capable of being installed anywhere in their vast country? Clearly, India's intention is not produce the atom bomb. As I said, there are assurances from the major part of the people, from those who are in places of responsibility.

I believe some of my colleagues who were acting as delegates in India November last were exposed to comments by the leaders, by the Indian parliamentarians who entertained us. Of course they convinced some of us of the urgency for Canada to continue its negotiations as fast as possible so that India may continue to benefit from the Canadian assistance program.

This faith that we Canadians gave to the Indian statements is shared by almost, I would even say all members of the delegation which also included Progressive Conservatives. A member of our delegation even said in a public speach—and to be charitable I will not mention his name, my colleagues who were with me are here to confirm it—that he understood the Indian government for having produced a nuclear explosion; he believed that India had no ambition to produce a nuclear bomb and that he wished—this Canadian delegate is a Progressive Conservative—that our negotiations and our agreements with India would continue.

So, the views of the members of this party on that subject are very different. They went to India and had the opportunity to study on the spot what the production of cheap energy represents for that country. We are not in a position to evaluate what it could represent for India as we are excessively wealthy when it comes to hydroelectric power and, traditionally, in some area of the country, we have always produced our electricity through other means than those at India's disposal. When a country like India depends almost exclusively on oil and coal to produce its electricity it is obvious then since 1973 this country is at grips with tremendous difficulties and the enormous costs that it might represent for India is certainly much more important than what it could represent for instance for the province of Nova Scotia that had to raise its sale tax by one cent effective Monday morning to compensate for the rising cost of oil used to produce electricity.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I know that there could be some arguments about the moral issue whether or not Canada should decide if a nation should have its own nuclear bomb. I do not think we wish to play this part. We expressed it repeatedly to our parliamentary colleagues in India when we met them on this touchy subject. We told them it was not fair from some countries to make us play this part. We put trust in some countries as they accepted like us to sign a non-proliferation treaty.

Who will determine who can come into power, and who can obtain and produce a nuclear bomb, Mr. Speaker? I do not believe that the Canadian people would be interested. However, we cannot remain indifferent to the very great needs that are apparent when we visit the large country that India is.

Mr. Speaker, I said that I only wanted to attack the part of the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) that concerns the continuation of our agreements with India. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my speech will have succeeded in convincing some of my colleagues, those who did not have like me the opportunity to see for themselves the great sincerity of the Indian people and the threat with which these people, who are surrounded by hostile countries, have been living for so many years. I invite those who have not done so to read for instance the book entitled *Cette nuit la liberté* and to see with what mentality, with what philosophy the Indian people can accept the reluctance of people like ourselves, like Canadians, to resume an assistance program which is valuable for them, and which, in many cases, is essential for their survival, Mr. Speaker. Of course, there is no question of wanting to produce expensive nuclear devices, it is simply a matter—and I hope that I have succeeded in convincing some of my colleagues of this—it is simply a matter of the wish to produce energy less expensively and as quickly as possible to continue the industrialization program which India introduced a few years ago and which is, in fact, very successful.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the question of our agreement with India can be settled as quickly as possible and that our agreements can be continued.

• (1720)

[*English*]

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, today we are debating perhaps the most important subject ever raised on an opposition day. This government's attitude to its international responsibilities and continued nuclear assistance to India rank high on the list of moral decisions which the government must make and the people of Canada must accept or reject. I was amazed to hear the position of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), for whom I have great respect. Although many countries involved with nuclear technology and the production of nuclear materials and equipment are re-evaluating their positions, the minister apparently, despite his well-known sensitive, political antenna is not re-evaluating his position in considering domestic aspects and international responsibilities.

I was also surprised at what the minister said about safeguards and obligations under the non-proliferation treaty. Apparently he considers continued negotiations concerning treaty obligations as sacred as the Holy Writ. Certainly, his relating of obligations to the ultimate terms of the non-proliferation treaty is surprising. The minister no doubt recalls the evaluation of William Epstein, assistant director of the United Nations Disarmament Division, at the five-year review session on the non-proliferation treaty which took place last year. According to Mr. Epstein, the conference results were "poor" and confirmed the opinion of many non-signatory nations which observed the proceedings that signing the treaty was not worth it. Mr. Epstein said this to remind us of the dangers of proliferation and to show that the problem will not be solved merely by entering into new, extended treaties. The solution involves complex factors relating to the economic field, not just technical safeguards. The mere ratification of the treaty alone is not enough to ensure that India, for instance, or other countries receiving nuclear assistance will not again explode an atomic device.

The International Atomic Agency has indicated that by the year 2000 the annual rate of the world's plutonium production will be about one million kilograms, enough to make 100,000 nuclear explosive devices. Needless to say, Canada's contribution to this potential is significant and disturbing. At present, 30 countries are capable of producing nuclear materials which can be used for weapons. By 1985 it is said that 50 countries will possess at least one nuclear plant capable of producing plutonium for weapons.

We must face the fact that an increasing number of nations of various political stripes and of varying responsibility will acquire the capability of producing nuclear material. Not all of it will be used for the production of electrical energy. We must also consider the increasingly large stockpiles of radioactive wastes in the world. These

will increase at an exponential rate. Before long, 120 tons of plutonium will be lying around in the world.

The question is not so much how we are to deal with the situation today, which seems to concern the Secretary of State for External Affairs: it is, what are the long-term implications of this build-up and is there an alternative?

Dr. Frank Barnaby, writing in the *New Scientist*, estimates that in ten years the 120 tons of plutonium will increase to about 1,400 tons. Testifying on United States nuclear non-proliferation policy before a Senate committee of the United States, Secretary Kissinger said:

—we support the worldwide goal of finding alternative sources of energy to reduce reliance on oil.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs alluded to this. Secretary Kissinger went on to say:

Yet a progressive pattern of proliferation could set back, if not cripple entirely, the continued growth of peaceful nuclear energy to service mankind's needs, as exporters and importers alike came to lose confidence in the ability of the international system to find effective techniques for realizing the peaceful benefits of nuclear energy while eliminating its inherent security risk—

Mr. Kissinger, whose country is involved with the exporting of nuclear technology and materials, has expressed far greater caution than that expressed by the minister in giving the sort of assurances he gave us this afternoon.

Miss Bégin: My goodness; what is that? You are wrong.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): My goodness; I am right.

Miss Bégin: No, you are wrong.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I hope we shall hear the views of the parliamentary secretary later in this debate.

Miss Bégin: Be assured, you will.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Perhaps she can correct her mentor, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and give the kind of assurances he could not give this afternoon. Unlike a few other countries, we are not exporting nuclear weapons per se. Yet we are certainly trafficking in the nuclear hazard and the potential for destruction. Proliferation does not merely mean that there is to be a spread of nuclear weapons to more nation states who to a varying degree have a stake in the present international system; proliferation means that there is a greater likelihood of such weapons falling into the hands of disenchanted individuals or terrorist groups. I did not hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs allude to this fact which is of growing concern to many countries—not merely to those directly involved in the export of nuclear technology, materials and equipment. He did not speak about the danger which would arise if this technology were to fall into irresponsible hands.

An hon. Member: Sheer rubbish.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, an hon. member opposite says, "Sheer rubbish." He is ridiculing the views of responsible scientists who know the possibilities of misuse.

An hon. Member: What responsible scientists?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Surely hon. members opposite cannot ignore the views of increasing numbers of responsible people who have been involved in nuclear development. Surely hon. members will not fly in the face of established facts. Increasingly, we face the situation in which the spread of nuclear technology increases the likelihood of nuclear terrorism and blackmail.

An hon. Member: Come off it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): The October, 1975, conference sponsored by the Stanley Foundation listed five consequences of proliferation. First, there is the possibility of theft of nuclear weapons. I did not hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs give assurances to alleviate our fears about the possibility of nuclear theft. If hon. members opposite think this is not a danger, I hope they can provide better assurances than were provided by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his officials to set at rest the concern of many countries about these matters. In recent years we have become only too familiar with acts of terrorism. In years to come, nuclear materials will become more plentiful. Stockpile depots will become more abundant. If there is no effective control with respect to security, the likelihood of these materials falling into irresponsible hands is obviously that much greater. I would have thought that, in addition to the possible use of nuclear technology and materials for terrorist activities, the prospect of the theft of plutonium for contamination purposes would in itself be serious. In addition, I do not think any attention has been paid to the possible sabotage of nuclear powered plants or to waste storage facilities being properly established to prevent the release of radio activity, or to the growing threat of pollution problems which have been a matter of concern even in this country, one which has taken the lead in developing this whole technology.

● (1730)

It strikes me as ludicrous, if it were not so tragic, that on the one hand the minister can argue that we have in a sense led the field in the development of nuclear technology, while on the other we are apparently not really concerned about adequate standards in the long term for the safe disposal of waste products in countries which have little sophistication in the nuclear field.

Some three or four weeks ago I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question with respect to one specific safeguard which might, on an interim basis at least, offer some protection. I understood from the answer I received that either the government was unaware of the suggestion or that it was not under active consideration. I was referring to the suggestion by U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger that regionally controlled nuclear fuel centres might be established, to include centres for fuel classification, plutonium reprocessing, waste management and storage.

In the comments the Secretary of State for External Affairs made with respect to safeguards it was obvious he avoided dealing with the most basic element in any effective safeguard system, which is the question of enforcement. He did not tell us what, if any, sanctions or penalties existed for non-compliance with the safeguards. He did not refer to any sanctions or to any penalties, or to any means

whereby the safeguards might be enforced. He seemed prepared to rely on assurances, verbal or otherwise, that he might receive from the countries involved. In the case of India, for example, I find it strange that the hon. gentleman would be prepared to accept an assurance from a country which at the present time, if one examines the domestic situation there, appears in no way to be able to offer the kind of long term assurance which is obviously desirable if the time period involved is to make any sense.

The suggestion of Mr. Kissinger with respect to the establishment of regional fuel centres seems to me to offer an interim means of assuring the kind of workable safeguards which very much concern members of this party and which should very much concern the government. Such a system would remove control from the hands of any single nation state with respect to reprocessing of the spent fuels, a question of great importance when it comes to the development of a weapons device. In addition it would reduce our dependence on individual assurances, assurances which in some cases would in no way be satisfactory. It would also mean the involvement of all states; it would remove the tension related to the intentions of individual states.

Another matter which was hardly touched upon by the Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon was the kind of regional dispute in which we seem all too ready to involve ourselves, for example, that between India and Pakistan.

One does not have to know a great deal about international politics to realize there is a long-standing dispute between India and Pakistan. One has to reflect that by resuming nuclear assistance to India we are encouraging the government of Pakistan to think that either with our assistance, or with the assistance of another supplier, it will be obliged to compete in similar terms with Indian technology which is also capable of producing some kind of explosive device. Has the Secretary of State taken this into account when considering whether he will offer the same kind of package to Pakistan? The establishment of regional centres would at least offer an interim solution in terms of controlling the number of sites, the movement of nuclear materials and possible proliferation.

With respect to the position of India, I should like to remind the Secretary of State for External Affairs that it was his predecessor, the present President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), who said in a release following the Indian detonation:

> We cannot be expected to assist and subsidize directly or indirectly a nuclear program which in a key respect undermines the position which Canada has, for a long time, been firmly convinced is best for world peace and security.

I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs: what happened to that perception of responsibility? Does he intend to wait for a similar event to take place, after which he will tell us, wringing his hands, that he did not expect to be let down by the government of India? I might say at this point that I am not more critical of the government of India than I am of other countries which are attracted toward developing a nuclear device. I do not think India is any more wrong than some other countries which have the same end in mind.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

It is interesting that a year ago an organization known as the Gandhi Peace Organization insisted that only the most gullible would believe that the detonation which was effected with those devices was done for a peaceful purpose. When the minister says we have a moral responsibility I am not sure where he has been taking his moral training. It seems that what he is saying to a number of countries, both those which are recipients of nuclear technology and those which are suppliers, can be construed as a green light. Bearing this in mind, the present position of the Canadian government, as reflected in the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs is one not of moral responsibility but of moral irresponsibility.

The minister was specific in chastising previous speakers in the debate for neglecting to say that one of the moral issues at stake here was our responsibility to provide alternate sources of energy to the developing nations. He suggested we must be very concerned that they have alternate energy sources apart from those of a petroleum nature. Indeed, in this respect he quoted the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

● (1740)

With the situation in the world today, I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs is it understandable, or even commendable, if our government is so concerned with guaranteeing lower priced and dependable energy sources for these countries that are hoping to develop domestic industry, that we should saddle these nations with such expensive and often difficult to control power sources? I do not think the Secretary of State for External Affairs has made the case at all with respect to the economies to be gained by this kind of alternate energy technology.

Surely a much more logical approach would be to assist those nations with research into forms of renewable energy which are already available, and there are a number that have not been mentioned. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the actual power that will be supplied to these countries by nuclear reactors, with respect to RAPP 1 which is now operating, it provides in the order of .1 per cent of India's total energy needs. RAPP 2, which the minister has been talking about this afternoon, will provide together with RAPP 1 .25 per cent of the needs of India for energy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member as the time allotted to him has now expired. Unless there is unanimous consent for him to continue I will have to recognize the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I will conclude very quickly, Mr. Speaker, because I know there are other members who wish to speak. Let me just quote the other figures so they are on the record and we will not be at cross purposes in our mathematics. As far as India is concerned, both RAPP 1 and RAPP 2 supply one-quarter of one per cent of India's energy needs. With respect to the KANUPP reactor in Pakistan, .6 per cent; with respect to the one contemplated in Argentina, nine-tenths of one per cent; and with respect to the South Korean reactor, about 1.1 per cent.

Therefore when the minister talks of alternate energy and the development of nuclear power, he is not talking about solving the great energy crisis with which these developing nations are faced. In this regard the minister has introduced a very large red herring. It would have been much better for him to talk frankly and seriously about the lack of research in this country. I have a number of figures, which I will not bore the minister with today, with respect to this matter. These figures indicate the kind of low level of priority that the government is giving the matter. It is really locked into a kind of archaic kind of technology at the moment.

I feel sorry for the minister who has had to defend a very weak case. Sometimes he does it very well, but I felt particularly sorry for him this afternoon. It will only be a brief matter of time before he or his successor comes back to this House and reverses himself. There is no question in my mind that history is not on the side of the minister, and I think he knows that. History is on the side of the angels, on the side of those who increasingly realize that the kind of major sales plan we have got ourselves locked into with our nuclear bag of tricks is now an anachronism, a point of sorry history for us.

The sooner the government comes to its senses and realizes that it is only endangering hundreds of thousands, indeed millions of people by this kind of foolhardy program, and the sooner it presents a policy that promotes sensible and sane alternate energy development, the sooner it will receive the support of all members of the House. At the present time, with respect to its nuclear assistance to India and the other countries mentioned, it is in a most foolhardy position.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before recognizing the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), it is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for London West (Mr. Buchanan), Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon), Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas), Kitchener (Mr. Flynn), London East (Mr. Turner), Lincoln (Mr. Andres), Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Raines), Niagara Falls (Mr. Young), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) and Halton (Mr. Philbrook) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

If the House agrees, I would suggest we follow past practice and print the text of the objection as an appendix to this day's *Votes and Proceedings*. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED GOVERNMENT PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY RESUMING ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

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

That this House condemns the government for increasing the threat posed to mankind by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and in particular by its present negotiations to resume nuclear assistance to India.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we in this party have made it clear that we warmly approve of the opposition motion that condemns the government for increasing the threat of proliferation of nuclear weapons. The motion refers to nuclear assistance to India, but it should not be forgotten that other countries with which Canada has either entered into agreements for sale of nuclear weapons and materials or is discussing such sales include, in addition to India, Pakistan, Korea and the Argentine. Of these countries, three out of four have not subscribed to the non-proliferation treaty which by many is thought to be a highly important part of the whole attempt to secure safeguards.

I want to make my protest, as others have, against the degree and measure of secrecy that we have had in this highly important matter. The minister made a lot out of the fact that he issued the text of the agreements between the Government of Canada and the Government of Korea, and between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Argentine. In addition we have had made available to us extracts from "Safeguards", a document published by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Furthermore, we have had a background paper on nuclear safeguards and Canadian safeguard policy prepared by the Department of External Affairs. But these documents are extremely vague. They fail to reveal the details of the agreements in question; they fail to reveal the real nature of these safeguards. Certainly they do not constitute an adequate disclosure.

There may be some things in this field that cannot be disclosed, but the government has fallen far short of anything in the nature of full disclosure. Indeed, though the minister seems not to understand this, a careful examination of these documents which he has produced and which he has accused us of not reading clearly reveals the dubious efficacy of these safeguards systems in which he apparently puts his reliance.

In addition, the recent conference of states which export nuclear equipment made an attempt to tighten the safeguards so as to prevent the potential diversion of nuclear materials, but the details have been kept effectively secret. We do not know what was discussed. I do not understand why the peoples of the world, in this day and age, are not allowed to know clearly what efforts are being made to prevent the disaster that faces them. The government has failed to refer these agreements to parliament for ratification, notwithstanding the fact that it used to be the policy that when any serious, important international engage-

ment was entered into the ratification of parliament was sought. A mere debate like this is not equivalent to the ratification of parliament.

● (1750)

Even more than that, the government has failed to refer these documents to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence where we could have heard witnesses such as General Burns, a distinguished Canadian expert on disarmament, and David Lilienthal, first chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Committee. Both these men have warned against the sale of nuclear devices. They could have explained to the Canadian people what is involved in the sale of nuclear reactors. No such explanation has been given. We have not had one single distinguished scientist quoted to us to justify the statement that these safeguards are in any way adequate. I dare say there are some who could do that, and if they could do so it might be very reassuring to the Canadian people. But that we should be left without an opportunity for a proper scientific investigation into what is involved here is, in my opinion, a shameful dereliction of democratic duty.

It somehow seems that the Canadian government is more interested in the financial aspects of these nuclear sales than the frightening potential that they may lead to disaster. David Lilienthal, to whom I have already referred, one of the best known scientists of my generation, and I think of the present generation, spoke of the "impending disaster" in the international proliferation of nuclear bombs. He is a careful scientist and not the sort of man who uses loose rhetorical phrases. He talks about the impending disaster. I got no feeling whatsoever that the minister, or the government for which he speaks, had appreciated the impending disaster, and I notice even now that he prefers to engage in a private conversation with his colleagues rather than listening to the debate.

Mr. David Lilienthal went on to say:

I am glad I am not a young man and I am sorry for my grandchildren.

The government keeps repeating that it has worked out within various agreements the best safeguards available, but we are given no details of what these safeguards are. The question obviously arises at the present time as to whether these safeguards are sufficient. Maybe they are the best, but the real question is, are they sufficient to give reasonable assurances that our nuclear material and the reactors we sell and make available to others will not be diverted to weapons material? The strongest opinion seems to be that the effectiveness of the so-called safeguards depends upon the reliability of the governments entering into or administering the agreements.

The minister said just a few months or weeks ago that there is no safeguard where there is a will to disregard these safeguards. Mr. Kenneth Fasick, who is the director of the International Division Accounting Office of the United States, in the New York *Times*, on January 31 of this year, said that the U.S. and international experts had "generally confided that the country could circumvent safeguards if it was willing to assume the risk of detection, incur the expense and take the trouble to do so". He says that the IAEA has 40 inspectors who keep track of nuclear materials and 400 nuclear facilities.

[Mr. Brewin.]

The Canadian background paper on safeguards, recently prepared by the Department of External Affairs, states that within the IAEA, the division of safeguards and inspection, there is a total staff of 186 people, 74 of whom are professional staff members. It is perfectly clear if you read the IAEA paper that it recognizes the limitations of policy in the enforcement of safeguards. In the extract from this publication at page 7 it says there is no single solution to the problem of nuclear weapons. Technological control, in the absence of genuine political commitment, is inadequate, and political willpower is likewise insufficient without an effort at the technological level. "The avoidance of nuclear war depends on the ability of nations to act co-operatively—and by adopting measures that limit and reduce the availability of such conflict. Neither effort is entirely feasible or credible without the other."

What the energy agency, the people who are expert in this field, is telling us is that we cannot depend on technological safeguards; we must also be able to depend on political willpower. Where the political circumstances are not stable any political commitment creates a situation where feasibility and credibility of safeguards are in doubt. I am not suggesting that all of the countries involved and that have been under discussion are of the same degree of political reliability. Frankly I do not think they are. However, in the choice we have made we certainly seem to have included two questionable countries. I was reading of a military coup anticipated in Argentina even today, and anybody who does not know the situation in South Korea should look into it if he thinks there is any stability in that country.

The IAEA goes on to say at page 10 that the risks of detection by the verification process are substantial. They may be substantial, but how substantial? They have to be substantial enough to be effective; if not 100 per cent in all cases, at least in a very high percentage. Yet even the IAEA says that the risks of detection are substantial. I suggest this is a very guarded way of saying that the safeguards system will not necessarily work.

Again at page 36 the IAEA states:

Cooperation between the agency and national personnel is the crucial intangible in safeguards application.

I invite somebody to look seriously into "the national personnel" in such a country as South Korea and tell us whether they find that crucial intangible satisfactory for the safeguards applied or accepted by that country.

Precisely the same message emerges in the Canadian background paper with which we have been furnished. It was prepared quite recently by the Department of External Affairs. It refers to the IAEA safeguards as an "open-ended" system whose intention is not to lay down rigid rules for safeguards implementation. On page 15 it says:

In this way the Agency endeavours to ensure the maximum effectiveness of safeguards—

I like the choice of the word "endeavours". It does not say it succeeds or there is a reasonable prospect of success, but it endeavours to do so.

On the same page it is stated that the agency's safeguards system or the NPT safeguards system "cannot prevent clandestine diversion of safeguarded nuclear material to military or explosive purposes, they can inhibit a state

from such action by posing a high risk of detection". I ask why we should put our faith in a safeguards system which we are told by the Canadian government, or by the department the minister is in charge of, cannot prevent clandestine diversion of nuclear material to military purposes? This is a clear indication that the whole case the minister has built up in this matter is a house of cards that falls over immediately you look at his own documents.

In the same paper it goes on to state:

In the event of such unauthorized diversion of nuclear materials or facilities to proscribed purposes by a state, international sanctions may be applied to that state.

● (1800)

Let us look again at the dubious language "may be applied". Some of us have made a study of international sanctions and know very well that seldom in history have they been adequately applied.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member requires only a few minutes, perhaps the House would allow him to complete his speech so that the Chair might recognize the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Maine) after dinner. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Brewin: The House will be pleased to know I am approaching the end of what I have to say. I said "approaching". I am not right at it. Again, on page 15 we find:

... the recipient member may be asked to return the materials and equipment made available to them.

I have forgotten my grammar, but I can say that I believe the phrase "may be" means remote and unlikely. That is precisely the situation.

Finally, page 17 refers to Canada's new policies requiring a binding assurance that Canada-supplied nuclear material and technology will not be used to produce a nuclear explosion. A state cannot develop a nuclear explosion devised for peaceful purposes without acquiring a capability to produce nuclear weapons. The minister made that very clear. I ask, what is left of the binding assurance if it is given by a militaristic undemocratic, unstable state? What is the deduction to be made from this material? It is surely that at least a temporary embargo should be put on the export of all nuclear material as suggested by Dr. Lilienthal.

We understand as well as the minister the dilemma involved. We have seen the problems in respect of technological development and the transfer of technological resources, but we urge that the common sense answer, until we have greater assurance than we have today about safeguards, is that we adopt Dr. Lilienthal's advice. I urge the government to have a full inquiry into this and other fields in the production of nuclear energy so that this generation and this country shall not have laid upon them the guilt of enhancing the prospect of world-wide destruction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being after six o'clock I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At 6.06 p.m. the House took recess.

Nuclear Proliferation

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House today reads:

That this House condemns the government for increasing the threat posed to mankind by the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and in particular by its present negotiations to resume nuclear assistance to India.

This motion has two parts to it and I would like to deal with each part separately. First of all I wish to deal with the part which refers to increasing the threat posed to mankind by the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

I should like to differentiate between nuclear weapons and power reactors. They are not the same, they are not interchangeable. Let us go into that a little further. There are technical reasons why the CANDU does not contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The CANDU is a system that uses natural uranium which is made up of .71 per cent of the uranium isotope U-235, the balance being the uranium isotope U-238. This is very important because it is a unique system in the world. It is different from the U.S. system which uses enriched uranium, and it is also very different from the environmental aspect and the hazard it presents. When one is talking about the importance of the CANDU system one should be aware of the fact that one cannot generalize about power reactors as do many people, especially members of the opposition.

Why is it important that we use natural uranium with a high content of uranium 238? Uranium 238 under irradiation in a power reactor, where it gets 6,000 megawatt-days per tonne irradiation converts a lot of that uranium 238 into plutonium 239 and plutonium 240. These two isotopes of plutonium are very different. The importance of plutonium 239 is that it is used primarily to make the bomb, but not plutonium 240. As a matter of fact it is plutonium 240 from which they do not want to make material that can be made into a bomb. The longer you leave fuel in the reactor, the more plutonium 240 you make.

Therefore if one wants to make fissionable material for a bomb one would not leave it in the nuclear reactor for 6,000 megawatt days per tonne, one would irradiate it for 600 megawatt days per tonne, which is a factor of one tenth. This is quite a different situation, from a practical and economical point of view, when you are considering the making of electricity. The CANDU system is a total design. It is designed to be fed the fuel continuously, and the fuel feeding of the reactor is such that the uranium will be irradiated to the 6,000 megawatt days per tonne level. If you change it by a factor of ten, either you have to redesign your system completely—and since Canada has designed the CANDU system it would mean a foreign buyer having to ask us to redesign the system—or else you will have to shut the system down to take out the fuel.

The CANDU system is designed to make electricity. If you happen to shut the electricity down more than you use it, the system will not be generating electricity. For these very practical reasons, if you want to generate electricity you use the CANDU system, but if you want to make bombs you do not use the CANDU system.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Somebody is going to learn something tonight.

Mr. Stanfield: I hope so.

● (2010)

Mr. Maine: If you want to make plutonium 239 for a bomb, you use an NRX type of reactor, which the Indians already have in the CIRUS reactor and which already makes 80 pounds of plutonium per year. I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) mislead the House when he used plutonium in a generic sense and said we were contributing to the over-all massive increase in the production of plutonium, as if all plutonium were the same and as if there is no difference in the types which are generated and the uses to which they can be put.

CANDU is not an efficient or useful way to make effective weapons. An air-cooled graphite-moderated reactor should be used, which is much simpler and easier to run than the power reactor, or another approach could be used such as the approach of the Chinese. They used a centrifuge to concentrate uranium 235 for their weapons programs to produce bombs. This would be smaller, much easier to conceal, and is one tenth of the cost, approximately $50 million as opposed to $500 million.

I agree that it is not impossible to produce bombs with CANDU plutonium, but it is not practical. The value of electricity to the Indian economy is much higher than that of producing bombs, and we should weigh our foreign aid as to the possible abuse of it in weapons versus the aid we should be giving to the poor, starving nations of the world. We are not giving them new technology, just the capability to produce nuclear electric power, and even without the safeguards we would not be helping them one iota with any ideas they may have about a weapons program. Indeed, we had an international obligation when we signed the non proliferation treaty not only not to pursue a weapons program ourselves, but to help undeveloped and underdeveloped nations with peaceful developments of nuclear energy.

Why is there this interest and concern about energy? In this world today there are three major problems; over population, lack of food, and shortage of energy, and they are interrelated. We face an energy problem in this country as all countries around the world do. As the poorer and less developed nations of the world ask for a new international economic order, they are also asking for a higher standard of living which is derived from the utilization of energy. Where can we get that energy today? In the short term there are only two possible solutions where technology is already available, and they are using coal to generate electricity, and nuclear fission to generate electricity. The technology is here. It is a matter of economics and transportation. Those are the key problems to be resolved.

Our product mix of energy of the past is changing, and will change in the future. We have come from an era where wood and coal were primary sources. We are presently in an era where petroleum, both oil and natural gas, are significant contributors to our sources of energy, and in the short term future, coal and nuclear fission are great hopes because of increasing demands for energy.

[Mr. Maine.]

By the middle of 1980's there will be contributions from the Alberta tar sands followed by contributions from Arctic and Atlantic offshore areas of oil and natural gas, and by the year 2000 we should be getting our energy from solar and possibly nuclear fusion. There will be no significant contributions before that time from new technologies such as the wind, geothermal, tidal and other such novel techniques which are presently being investigated. For this reason research is being done in the nuclear fission area, but several things are needed.

What is the future program and the ongoing program for deriving electricity from fission after the present CANDU system with its pressurized heavy water reaction? The next generation will see plutonium used as a fuel in a boiling light water reactor. After that, as it becomes more expensive, we will see plutonium used to transform thorium into uranium 233, which is fissionable. It is more expensive to do, and we will not be doing this until our present supplies of uranium and more expensive uranium in the lower concentrations in ore are exhausted, but there is more thorium around than uranium, and this certainly will see us off into the future.

When those two technologies have been developed and utilized, we see the possibilities of nuclear fusion. India has the CIRUS research reactor it got from Canada. It got its heavy water from the United States and its reprocessing plant from France, which is needed to separate the plutonium and which will be used for the fuel cycle, which uses plutonium, as well as for the generation after that which will use the plutonium thorium cycle which makes uranium 233. Unfortunately some of the plutonium was sidetracked from their research reactor for a detonation. This is regrettable and should be safeguarded against, and as the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) mentioned this afternoon, these safeguards should ensure against that in the future.

In addition, with India signing these new safeguards, which have been and are being signed by such countries as South Korea and Argentina, it is certainly not acceptable internationally to have one standard for South Korea and Argentina and another standard for countries such as India. They should all be following the same rules and getting the same help.

I should like to make a few comments in reply to some of the remarks made by hon. members of the opposition.

[*Editor's Note: A power failure extinguished the lights in the Chamber for 15 seconds.*]

Some hon. Members: What happened to the lights?

An hon. Member: You are ruined, Frank.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Maine: Hon. members should really appreciate how important energy is to us today. We just cannot get along without it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maine: If we do not do something about it, we will not have it in the future. We will have blackouts and

brownouts, and we will not be able to carry on our business.

The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) made several points this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Maine) has the floor.

Mr. Stanfield: I thought he was better in the dark.

Mr. Maine: Hon. members of the opposition get very excited about a blackout. The hon. member for Egmont was not happy that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) did not deal with several questions he raised. One of the reasons I think these were not dealt with was that they did not deal with this motion at all. However, let me respond to some of the questions the hon. member raised. He raised the question of terrorists, which has nothing directly to do with the problem of nuclear proliferation in the lesser developed countries of the world. Certainly it is a very unrealistic comment to make that a terrorist is going to come into possession of a nuclear weapon. Let us think about this for a moment.

Is a terrorist going to rush into Pickering and grab a fuel bundle which is radioactive? He would not get out of the plant before he would be killed, so if we were going to get any nuclear weapon at all, he certainly would not steal the material from a power plant and reprocess it. There is only one possible way he could get the material, and that would be to steal a weapon which is already made, and Canada does not make nuclear weapons. If he wants to steal a weapon, he would not steal it from this country or from the countries with which we are dealing.

Mr. Stanfield: Famous last words.

Mr. Maine: He would steal them from a country like the United States. If he was to steal them, there would not only be the possibility of a nuclear explosion, but also of a delivery system to go along with it.

An hon. Member: There go the lights again.

Mr. Maine: There is a lot of power in my remarks.

Mr. Epp: Give us more light and less heat.

Mr. Maine: It is unrealistic to think of a terrorist stealing a nuclear weapon just to blow it up in his own backyard. He would want to deliver the system, and by stealing a nuclear weapon from a country like the United States he would have the capability of both exploding the device and of delivering it. So the problem is not one of a terrorist in our country at all. It is a problem of a terrorist in the United States, which the Americans have to deal with, and it has already been conceded that it would be very difficult to stop the most determined efforts of terrorists to obtain a nuclear device in this manner. However, I am quite confident that several steps have been taken to try to ensure against this possibility.

Another comment made by the hon. member for Egmont was that plutonium contamination would be terrible if anyone were to come into the possession of some plutonium and just spread it around. Plutonium is a chemical and there are many chemicals equally as toxic or much more toxic which are in everyday use right now. You have heard of some of the problems we have when we do have accidents—when a chlorine tanker is derailed or when a tanker of sulphuric acid is derailed and it is spilled, or when we have an ammonia leak. These chemicals, certainly in high concentrations, are just as toxic as plutonium. We live with these problems of chemical contamination. We have contingency plans to try to nullify any disaster that may result from an accidental contamination. Plutonium contamination is certainly no worse than some of the problems we deal with in everyday life in the chemical industry.

● (2020)

A comment was made about sabotage and what a terrible threat it is. This is again extremely unrealistic, Mr. Speaker. There was Dr. Morton Shulman with his crazy idea of dropping three sticks of dynamite in at Pickering. That would do absolutely nothing. If you were able to get the dynamite to the actual fuel bundle itself the most you could hope to do is rupture the fuel bundle and thereby expose an increased surface of nuclear contaminant. The increased contamination in that area would be minimal and would not extend any further than the immediate environment of the fuel rod. The only way to create a serious problem of sabotage is to use an atomic bomb to explode these expended fuel rods. There would be more problems with the atomic bomb than there would be with the result of the sabotage. This is another red herring that the opposition has dragged out to confuse the issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maine: There was another comment about the great stockpile of plutonium—

Mr. Epp: Do you understand it, Joe?

Mr. Maine: —and how we are producing more plutonium. The problem gets worse and worse every day, they say, because we have tons and tons of plutonium. But as I mentioned earlier, plutonium is the fuel of the future; our future energy. We need to store it now and use it when we have the technology to harness it. We are developing that now. Plutonium 239 has a half life of 24,000 years; plutonium 240 has a half life of 6,000 years, so by stockpiling it and protecting it, as we are doing, we will have the fuel to meet our future energy needs and any programs to harness energy in the future. Not only is it not a shame but it is very necessary that we produce and store this plutonium for our future energy needs.

The hon. member for Egmont made a comment about alternate energy forms available. Mr. Speaker, they are not available to be utilized right now. In the short term we are depending on electricity generated from coal and electricity generated from nuclear fission. This will satisfy our immediate increase in energy requirements. There are no other options. The sooner the people of Ontario and of this country wake up to that fact, the sooner we will come to grips with the whole energy conservation problem in order to satisfy the increased needs of the future.

The hon. member also commented that India only derives a quarter of one per cent of its energy from nuclear fission. Well, Mr. Speaker, only 1 per cent of Canada's energy is derived from nuclear produced electricity. By the year 2,000 that will be in the order of 25 per cent. There is no reason for us to stop our nuclear program now and say it is not an important amount.

Another comment was to the effect that energy research and development are not being carried out in this country as they should be. This is erroneous, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) only a month ago in this House announced an extra $10.6 million to be expended on energy research and development with respect to our needs for the next decade or two. The kind of energy options we are talking about, geothermal, tidal, solar and so on, are being worked on now but we will not see the benefits for ten, 20 or 30 years.

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) also made some comments which I believe were misleading and incorrect. He talked of a prominent scientist saying that we have an impending disaster. Any impending disaster in the nuclear weapon area is not going to be from Canada supplying the less developed countries with CANDUs.

An hon. Member: The disaster is over there.

Mr. Maine: Mr. Speaker, the disaster is on the opposite side of the House—with the New Democratic Party.

The hon. member also raised the question of the conditional statement that governments may be asked to return expended fuel, and asked why this was a conditional statement, and the reason for it. There is no reason to force ourselves into the possibly uneconomic proposal of having to repatriate any expended fuel. It may not be necessary, it may not be essential or economic—it may not even be possible. Why force ourselves into a commitment whereby we have to bring every ounce of expended fuel back?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to summarize by saying that I think the opposition in some of its generalities has misled this House by contending that the course we are taking is the wrong course; it is not the wrong course, it is the right course, and I fully support it.

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Maine) gave us the viewpoint of the scientist. I am sure he would not have us believe it is the only scientific point of view. I shall be quoting a few other scientists whose views are diametrically opposed to his, some of whom have given us the following scenario to consider.

I ask you to consider a band of terrorists in a developing country who steal some plutonium—which is not hard to do—from a newly constructed reactor, and build a nuclear device which, while amateurish, is effective. They load the device in a plane and fly it over London or New York city, any major city, and demand an astronomical sum of money. Not only the New Yorkers or Londoners, but the whole world knows that the dreaded moment of annihilation has come—and no one, anywhere, is safe.

I used to think this scenario was a bit too alarming but events are moving so fast in the specialized world of nuclear technology that I now believe people must be

shocked into waking up to the grave dangers mounting throughout the world.

Canada is very much involved. We have become one of the leading exporters of nuclear material—primarily uranium, nuclear equipment, specifically CANDU reactors, as the motion before us brings to the forefront, and nuclear technology.

At the end of this year there will be 650 nuclear reactors operating in 38 countries. In addition to the principal nuclear powers such as the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France, and China, about a dozen more are on the threshold of nuclear strike capacity. Some countries have not ratified the non-proliferation treaty; of course this is a larger problem than Canada's involvement, but this country is obviously and admittedly in the race to export nuclear technology.

The former minister of energy, mines and resources who is now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) said in this House on December 20, 1974, when unveiling the nuclear policy of the present government, that Canada is in the race to enjoy the economic gains from sales abroad of major high technology components and services. I wish that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) had quoted from that speech this afternoon as justification for Canada's policy. I regret that he laid so much of the motivation for the pursuit of Canada's nuclear export policy on what he advances as a moral argument, the argument it would be helping developing nations. If he were going to lay such emphasis upon our responsibility to help developing nations I wish he had thought at the same time about realistic ways in which Canada can further that responsibility.

I waited for the minister to couple his arguments with, for example, the conference on the Law of the Sea being held in New York at the United Nations. Surely that would be a much more realistic way of helping developing nations—through the exploitation of mineral resources at the bottom of the sea including those on the continental shelf extending beyond Canada's 200 mile economic zone. The utilization of those mineral resources under an international authority or a concrete plan of revenue sharing would be a genuine move toward helping the developing nations. That would be a much more realistic way for us to take our responsibility, and a much safer way.

I could not believe my ears when I heard the minister lay such emphasis on our responsibility to help the developing nations through exporting technology. I hold in my hands Canada's official policy for helping developing nations, called "Strategy for International Development Co-operation 1975 to 1980" as outlined by the minister at the seventh special session of the United Nations General Assembly which reconfirmed the new economic order to which Canada gave its support. As I go through all 21 points I cannot find one item that deals with the export of nuclear technology.

When the government presents to us the rationale for the export of nuclear technology under the guise of helping developing nations I say that is a cover-up for the real motivation unveiled by the former minister of energy, mines and resources on December 20, 1974 when he said that we want to sell CANDU reactors. I wish the government would get its story straight. We are doing this either

because we want to help developing nations, or because we want to recover our substantial investment in CANDU.

● (2030)

If the government were to raise the sales argument in the House and allow us to discuss sales of nuclear technology in terms of the revenue we will gain from the sale of CANDU reactors, its approach would be more forthright than it presently is. Now it argues that it is doing this to help developing nations. Why does the government say this when our official policy makes no mention of it? I hope hon. members on the government side will respond to this point. Hon. members opposite answered questions raised by opposition members earlier today. I believe the point I just made very much needs answering.

I wish the Secretary of State for External Affairs had explained how we can help developing nations through vigorous participation in the commodities policies to be raised at UNCTAD IV, to be held in Nairobi in May of this year. What will Canada's policy be to help developing nations stabilize the prices of 18 primary commodities, prices which are controlled by the developed nations, Canada included? They have been the subject of rhetorical negotiation at United Nations special sessions, and will be the subject of hard negotiation at UNCTAD IV, in May.

I wish the minister had referred to his commendably valuable work as co-chairman of the conference on International Economic Opportunities, commonly called the North-South Conference, operating out of Paris. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has been co-chairman of that conference on behalf of the developed world. He knows how important Canada's role is in helping developed nations become involved in our international commerce and trade, and in the work of the North-South Conference.

So far we have not heard discussed the work of UNCTAD IV, the North-South Conference, or the Law of the Sea. We have not heard about the views of those organizations regarding the export of nuclear technology. So I say, Mr. Speaker, with respect, that the government's argument is a red herring, presented to us as justification and rationale.

I recognize that we face a terrible moral dilemma. We can overcome the dilemma only with honest talk in this House. On the one hand the Third World is undoubtedly pressing for access to nuclear technology available to developed nations. On the other hand sales of uranium and nuclear reactors raise the danger and probability of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Thus we are asked to weigh the goal of achieving equity with regard to energy sources against the spectre of nuclear holocaust. And, make no mistake: as we have seen in the case of India, any country which has available to it a supply of uranium and reprocessing technology can construct a nuclear bomb with plutonium derived from a CANDU reactor.

We have considered the expansion of our sales, sales undertaken despite the experience in India, to which my colleagues alluded earlier and which I will not repeat. Now we come to the case of South Korea, Argentina, and Pakistan.

Let me say a word about South Korea. Several times in the House, and in committee, I have protested against the sale of a CANDU reactor to Korea. I protested on two grounds; first, the international safeguards are not there; second, the current South Korean régime is not stable. This afternoon the minister chided us for not knowing the policies he had tabled in the House. Well, I have copies before me, have read them, and wish to ask some questions concerning the agreement he tabled on January 30, 1976, following the signing of the agreement with South Korea, an agreement which, in my judgment, leaves three main areas open to question. They are the root of the present debate. There is still time for the government to act before it reaffirms its nuclear arrangements with India. There is still time to put some hard questions to the government. That, of course, is the purpose of the motion we are debating.

I am now concerned about South Korea. The agreement has been signed and the documentation tabled. I suggest to the minister that, apart from suspending nuclear assistance and supplies, Canada has no effective sanction against Korean abuse of nuclear technology. Second, spent fuel rods are not to be returned to Canada. Thus over a period of time South Korea will acquire a large inventory of unprocessed plutonium. All who have studied this subject know how little plutonium you need—it can be leaked or stolen—to make a nuclear device.

Third, the South Korean agreement was signed one day before the seven supplier countries, referred to as the London Conference, implemented a new agreement. I ask, is the South Korean agreement in accord with the safeguards agreement of the London Conference? These are important questions which the minister ought to answer.

As I said, the government completed its sale to South Korea. I regret this. If any country in the world is politically unstable, it is South Korea. I pleaded with the minister in committee to consider carefully with what sort of government in Korea we are dealing. It is one of the most repressive régimes in the world today. The Park administration is accused by international observers of economic injustice, corruption, and increasing violation of human rights.

An Amnesty International mission to South Korea said this:

> The mission found torture is frequently used by law enforcement agencies both in an attempt to extract false confessions and as a means of intimidation.

Other secular human rights groups have criticized the régime, including the International Commission of Jurists and the International League for the Rights of Man. The World Conference of Religion for Peace has publicly expressed its deep concern about the political repression in South Korea, especially for those who, out of their religious conscience, have expressed their stand against the violation of human rights by the Park government and who are now in jail. This is the administration the Canadian government says it will trust.

I am unwilling to trust the South Korean government. Unfortunately the agreement is now a *fait accompli*. There is not much you can do. We were not able to debate the South Korean agreement before it was signed because the government had some spurious notion that we do not

debate international agreements in the House before they are signed. What legal precedent is there for that position, since the contrary has been our experience time and again? For instance, former Prime Minister Mackenzie King said that before international agreements are ratified, they ought to be debated in this House.

Why was this House deprived of the right of debating and voting on such an international agreement before it was entered into? We ought to consider that question as we consider circumstances relating to India. The opposition to the government's stand of members of this House, of the media, and even of distinguished experts, some of whom I shall mention, has been fruitless. The government was determined to sell the $500 million CANDU reactor to South Korea even though that régime was unstable and international safeguards inadequate.

Anybody who knows anything about IAEA knows how inadequate is the staff of the organization. Indeed, IAEA in large part is devoted to the promotion of nuclear energy, not to inspection where treaties are in force and not to the preservation of safety. I conclude that again money has triumphed over morality. It happened in the case of South Korea, and the case of India brings into sharp focus exactly what has happened.

We now find that the rapid escalation in the number of nuclear reactors is resulting in the production of more plutonium than can be effectively monitored. Even when reactors are being used for the peaceful production of energy, the danger grows that plutonium will be diverted for the creation of nuclear bombs. That is why this evening I must raise a question of concern to many scientists. What would happen if plutonium were stolen? As India proved, you need merely a small laboratory staffed with experts in order to make a bomb. No wonder scientists themselves are worried. As British physicist Dr. Amroy Lovins said, "Any country with a power reactor can make atomic bombs if it wishes."

Three high level engineers recently resigned from the General Electric Company protesting that "Nuclear power has become a technological monster, and it is not clear who, if anyone, is in control." David Lilienthal, chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, sees "impending disaster" from the international proliferation of nuclear bombs.

Lilienthal calls for a moratorium on nuclear sales, something the government has laughed at every time we have proposed it in the last several months. I well recall the hon. member for Halifax last June proposing a moratorium on nuclear sales. The government paid no heed. That is the very approach taken by General E.L.M. Burns, respected head of Canadian disarmament teams for many years. General Burns insists that it is the Canadian government's duty to do nothing which may lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and that this obligation, which is explicit in article III of the non-proliferation treaty, takes precedence over Canada's desire to assist, through nuclear technology, the underdeveloped nations of the world.

There is a ray of hope. In his concluding comments this afternoon the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that he was not sure in his own mind if the export of nuclear technology and materials to India ought to be resumed. There were some questions he was still asking himself and he posed the dilemma in these terms: would it be better for us to suspend completely the nuclear negotiations with India, as we have done on a temporary basis, or should we go on to complete the present deal applying to it the strictest sanctions we could? Which would be the better choice? If we are to adopt a moral approach to this question I think the answer is to be found in the advice General Burns has given us—Canada ought to do nothing which might lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And this takes precedence over Canada's desire to assist developing nations.

● (2040)

The minister told the House that the new agreements represent juridical assurances of high order. All we can do is pray that he is right because we have not seen the proof, and the questions I have posed indicate there is every reason to think that the safeguards are anything but adequate. What we are left with are documents which the receiving country can ignore if it wishes to do so. This calls into question the trustworthiness of South Korea, it calls into question the intentions of India, it calls into question the intentions of any state with which we conclude an agreement.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. He can only continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to carry on?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Roche: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know there are many who wish to take part in the debate so I shall not abuse the courtesy of the House.

I shall conclude by returning to the principal argument advanced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon in favour of the policy he is pursuing. He says this is the way in which we should be helping the developing nations. I say again that this is a serious argument. If we are to advance an argument based on moral grounds in favour of exporting nuclear technology I believe Canada should stand up in favour of action based on a sounder moral premise, that is to say, a much more vigorous expansion of trade economic co-operation with the developing nations, such as those nations are now demanding so urgently, and which they need far more than they need nuclear technology.

Mr. Peter Stollery (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult for most of us average Canadians who do not pretend to be experts in the field of nuclear technology to address ourselves to such complicated questions as, for example, whether or not we should sell nuclear power stations to the third world nations.

I do not pretend to be an expert on nuclear technology, and when I read some of the names which are used in the manuals to describe these pieces of machinery I find the subject even more difficult. They talk about CANDU, about advanced gas-cooled reactors, steam-generating heavy water reactors, breeder reactors, and that sort of thing. I certainly am no expert—

Mr. Epp: You have said that three times now, so you must believe it.

Mr. Stollery: Nevertheless, there are a few points which I understand as well as most Canadians. I think it is fair to say that today in the Canadian House of Commons the Conservative Party has launched anti-India day.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Stollery: It says right in the motion—

Mr. Paproski: Shame on you!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Right on!

Mr. Stollery: I don't want to appear to be on the side of the people who ignore the fact that there is a world energy crisis, that the cost of energy in the undeveloped world has increased by a factor of eight since 1970. I would certainly not want to associate myself with the concept that we in Canada are so comfortable that we shall decide who shall get energy and who shall not.

I find it offensive that the hon. member in whose name the motion stands should have bullied the undeveloped countries, bullied the emerging world in his motion, and, in his bullying manner, told us he is going to make sure the people in our constituencies know how we vote on this issue. That is what he said. I am happy to inform him that the people in my constituency will be pleased to know that I shall not take up his stick to beat people, many of whom live outside a cash economy, because the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) feels that Indians and others in the undeveloped world do not have the right to energy at reasonable prices.

I must say the former leader of the opposition adopted a more reasonable attitude inasmuch as he expressed a genuine concern about this business. I notice that much of it seems to have been lifted from an editioral which appeared in the *Economist* on November 3, 1974. I would say to members on the other side that I too read the *Economist* from time to time and I hope hon. members opposite will continue the habit of trying to make themselves a little knowledgeable about world events.

Earlier today we heard talk about whether we ought to sell nuclear technology to unstable countries. Anyone who can read a newspaper knows that what members opposite are really saying is that from a comfortable Canadian point of view we should not sell nuclear technology in circumstances which might cause us the slightest embarrassment.

● (2050)

Where are all these tremendously stable regimes for which hon. members are looking? We all know that much of the world is in turmoil as a result of colonialism. There was an article in the *The Economist* about Africa, and I detect an anti-black, anti-African sentiment in this motion. How unstable is Africa!

An hon. Member: What about Algeria?

Mr. Stollery: We do not sell Algeria anything. They have had two heads of government and one unsuccessful coup in the last 13 years. We sell nothing to Nigeria because in 16 years they have had five heads of state, three successful coups, one unsuccessful coup, and one civil war. Since the average Nigerian has an annual income of a couple of hundred dollars we do not want to sell them any of our technology or give them the opportunity to compete industrially. It might mean they would be able to produce power at a reasonable price and possibly avoid the eight times energy cost factor facing most countries in the world today. So we cannot deal with the Nigerians, Mr. Speaker. As for dealing with Uganda, no way. Somaliland has had three governments and one coup. The same can be said of Ethiopia, Sudan, Chad and the Upper Volta Republic.

The only African countries to which we might sell nuclear technology which would satisfy the opposition would be the Republic of South Africa and perhaps Rhodesia, because they have a stable background. Therefore it would be perfectly all right for the Government of Canada to enter into some form of agreement with the Rhodesians!

Many Canadians are concerned about the problems created by nuclear power. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) made a couple of points that had no reference at all to the motion but rather referred to the problems caused by nuclear power. What the motion asks, in effect, is: do we sell technology to the third world, India being the example used? The hon. member also made mention of American scientists who had a problem coming to terms with the ecological consequences of nuclear power. It seems to me these two points are utterly different and in no way go together.

I think it is unfortunate that the motion reads the way it does. It is blatantly aimed at one country, at one sector of the world. I think the real question that we should be discussing is: is nuclear power in fact a practical and safe kind of power? Unfortunately the motion does not address itself to this.

As I recall some of the speeches of hon. members opposite, their concern centres around Indians, Pakistanis, South Koreans, Iranians, all of them people who live life a little differently from us. Most of their comments had to do with how we know what is better for these people than they do themselves. They could not possibly know what is best for them because they are not advanced enough! This is the point the opposition is making, and I think it should be made clear that that is the point.

Mr. Paproski: That is Liberal philosophy.

Mr. Stollery: I acknowledge that I am a Liberal and I am not ashamed of it. Members of the opposition have been very careful not to mention the American undergraduate in Boston who explained on educational television how to build a nuclear weapon. Boston is all right; it is a little different from India. India is a long way away. Hon. members opposite also very conveniently did not discuss some of the problems with European nuclear technology.

I would ask them, what would happen if you built a nuclear power station in California where there is an earthquake fault and the whole bloody thing could blow up? We heard nothing about that. All we heard were hon. members standing up and telling other people who live in the Third World that they know better what is good for

them than they know themselves. I shall certainly be voting against this motion tonight, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This can only be done with consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Beatty: The hon. member made reference to anti-black sentiment in the motion today. I wonder whether he would clarify his remarks and indicate to the House whether he is imputing racism to hon. members on this side of the House?

Mr. Stollery: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not imputing racism. I was just taking note of the fact that the motion mentions India and that all the debate today has centred on the Third World. That is not racism.

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate as a concerned Canadian and a concerned parliamentarian. It truly appalls me to think that there has been so little continuing discussion, analysis, and concrete information about the government's nuclear policy given not only to parliamentarians but to the public generally. If I may say so, I am even more appalled to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery), who lowered a debate on a question of such magnitude and importance to this country and the world to the level of racism. His remarks were both stupid and offensive.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: Why is it that we in the opposition have raised this matter today, Mr. Speaker? The reason is that there has been secrecy about this issue. There has been secrecy about nuclear development in this country for the past 30 years. Such secrecy may have been justified during the second world war, but I submit that now, with the escalation of this country's investment in nuclear power, both domestically and internationally, there should be wide open debate on this matter with the people of Canada so as to let the people of Canada decide whether to accept a commitment that has implicit health and environmental hazards and the danger of nuclear holocaust—an open, honest debate with all the relevant information put straighforwardly to the country. By not doing so the government is shirking its responsibility in this nuclear age, an age unlike any other in the history of mankind.

● (2100)

Many governments in other countries have recognized their responsibility to present the necessary information to their people. I think in particular of Sweden where an intense public debate on nuclear energy has resulted in a pronounced reduction in plans to expand Sweden's nuclear capability. I think of the United States where a Senate committee holds continuous hearings on all aspects of nuclear development, and it has the right to call upon witnesses to appear before it, witnesses who have detailed information to provide to the public through that committee.

Furthermore, in the United States before any nuclear deal is completed abroad the government must present the terms to Congress where members have a chance to discuss it, to raise objections, and to have their questions answered. Such a thing never happens in this House. No minister feels he has to come before the House and present the terms of agreements before they are signed. They just hide it in a blanket of secrecy. That is the practice here in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss MacDonald: There is a constant refusal to provide legitimate information when requested, and you only have to look back over the records of this House to see that day after day, question after question, we get the same kind of answers from the minister. The minister says "I will consider tabling the information after it has been agreed to," or "I do not consider this proper parliamentary procedure," or a number of other excuses. Does the minister think in giving this kind of answer that Canadian people are not concerned about this issue? Does he think they are not capable of understanding it?

The government lightly signs agreements that could lead to a nuclear holocaust without consultation with parliament or with the people of Canada. What excuse does the government give? What excuses do the ministers give when questions are put to them? The only excuse I have heard so far is that it is up to the opposition to raise this matter for debate. Today the opposition has raised the matter for debate and the government still is not prepared to provide information. I would say to the minister that this is not a matter for a one-day debate initiated by the opposition. This is a matter of such importance that it should be a continuing national debate with the government shouldering the responsibility to sustain it. I feel this way because of the terrifying situation we are in and in which we are placing the world. Just think back over our nuclear development for a number of years.

The nuclear reactor which marked Canada's entry into the atomic age is now 30 years old. It was on September 5, 1945, that the country's first reactor, a very small one and part of a wartime weapons development program, went into operation.

There was no hint of ultimate destructive purpose in Canada's coming of atomic age. As early as June, 1946, the federal government in a deliberate policy action made the decision that it would not develop nuclear weapons although it was in a favourable position to do so. That decision made Canada one of a special breed of nations—a major nuclear power which is not a nuclear weapons state.

As a country we pledged our nuclear technology to peaceful purposes. Canadian scientists have made major contributions to the world's knowledge of how atomic energy can be used to the benefit of mankind, and Canadian statesmen over these 30 years have established reputations for themselves and for this country through their work to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war.

They have made contributions in other fields. Radioactivity through their efforts has proved important in cancer therapy, in the use of isotopes as tracers in medicine, in metallurgy and agriculture, and in the treatment of food for long-term storage.

Considered in this way, Canada's commitment to the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes reads like a success story. Yet there is a flaw in the narrative, an ugly twist in that line stretching over the past 30 years. Its source can be traced to the ominous smoke which rose over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August, 1945. It is now generally accepted that material for these first atomic bombs came from the Eldorado Mine at Great Bear Lake in the Northwest Territories.

Implicit in its beginnings, 30 years ago, we have Canada's nuclear dilemma of the 1970's, and it is this: can we as a nuclear power disclaim responsibility for its application? Can we export resources and technology with no concern for their ultimate uses? Can we implicate ourselves in the processes which threaten destruction of society without ourselves being destroyers?

One of the earliest Canadian post-war research projects was to examine the possibility of using nuclear energy to generate electricity. With rich supplies of uranium available, Canada developed the CANDU reactor which uses natural uranium as its fuel. Then the federal government through its Crown corporation, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, began to seek markets for these reactors in countries throughout the world. But as Robert Reford pointed out in an article published last May by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, there is one fly in the ointment, and it is this:

> One of the by-products of all nuclear reactors is plutonium . . . which can also be used to make an atomic weapon. Thus a purchaser of a CANDU reactor inevitably becomes a potential nuclear weapon state. It is a step on the road to proliferation.

We know that nuclear weapons are relatively easy to make if the right materials are available.

David M. Krieger, a political scientist and former director of the International Relations Centre at San Francisco State University, has said of the whole question of terrorists and nuclear technology:

> The danger is great; the question is not whether the worst will happen, but where and how.

The memory of the 1974 so-called peaceful nuclear explosion in India can only constantly remind us of what David Krieger said:

> The danger is great; the question is not whether the worst will happen, but where and how.

The bomb that was exploded in the Rajasthan Desert was the same size as those which destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was developed with the aid of plutonuim obtained as a by-product from a nuclear research reactor purchased from Canada. The CANDU reactor as well, is ideally suited to the production of weapons-grade plutonium. Thus with each CANDU reactor it exports, Canada exports extension of the nuclear hazard.

The government has stated that its new safeguards introduced in 1974 are the toughest in the world, requiring the promise of the buyer not to use the materials or the technology to manufacture weapons, and to allow inspection to ensure that the agreement is followed. While these safeguards are, according to the minister, more stringent than those which we required India to sign as a condition of its purchase of nuclear materials, nevertheless they are far from fool-proof. It is strange that the government's faith in such safeguards hardly seems to have been jarred by that blast which opened a crater in the Rajasthan desert in India. I would remind the minister of the words I used recently when I said, "Acceptance of a country's word that it will not use our technology to create weapons is a show of confidence which conditions in today's society do not warrant.

● (2110)

"Faith in a country's avowals of its peaceful purposes, avowals which can be withdrawn at any time, for any reason, amounts to naive gullibility. Trust that any country will prevent materials and knowledge from falling into the hands of criminals and lunatics is suicidal stupidity." The time to set policy, to draw up new safeguards and conditions, is not while a sale is in progress. In fact there should be no sales, no further exports until the international community has developed the most stringent measures possible to prevent use of reactor fuel in the manufacture of weapons.

Even the London group has not been able to bring about that kind of safeguard. The strongest safeguards in the world are no good when experience has proved them not strong enough. One wonders really if, in the final analysis, any safeguards can be guaranteed to work. Let me quote William Epstein, for many years director of the Disarmament Division of the UN Secretariat, on the subject in particular as it concerns Canada:

> In the field of safeguards, while they . . .

The nuclear powers

> . . . were interested in tightening international controls and improving the IAEA safeguards system, the nuclear powers and other supplier states such as Canada would not undertake to supply nuclear material and equipment only to non-nuclear states that agreed to place all of their nuclear material and nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. By refusing to go that far, they preserved the absurd situation whereby non-parties to the NPT are in a more advantageous position than are parties . . . unless safeguards apply to the entire fuel cycle they leave a loop-hole large enough through which to drive a nuclear bomb. This extraordinarily shortsighted position is due almost entirely to commercial rivalry and the competition for markets. It is likely to facilitate rather than curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional countries.

That was Mr. Epstein's analysis and I contend that that has been Canada's approach.

It is argued that with the depletion of international oil preserves we must explore alternate forms of supplying our energy needs. I agree. But we must not solve one problem by creating another and possibly a worse one. I consider the nuclear dilemma one of the most vitally important issues before the Canadian people today. But it is one which I believe has not been presented to us honestly by our leaders, in all its naked ugliness and destructive potential. Some would say, as the hon. member for Spadina has said, that this is too complex for ordinary people to understand, that it is fraught with implications and counter-implications.

Surely there is no difficulty in understanding the basic issue which underlies the nuclear question and it is this: we cannot, as a country, pretend to stand above and apart from those conflicts and terrors which we ourselves have permitted, even helped to grow and spread in the world. We are, in the end, responsible, however we may attempt to rationalize away the knowledge. The government, by its current policy on export of nuclear technology, is leading the country in a dangerous and self-destructive charade.

When it suits his convenience the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talks of sharing, of making do with less so that more disadvantaged parts of the world may have more. We have heard him state that over and over again. But what a reversal takes place when his Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) attempts to defend our indefensible policy on the sale of nuclear reactors. Here the talk of sharing or self-denial is replaced by the promotion of hot deals and cold cash. Here the pose of humanism is swept away and we see a different philosophy, one of cynicism, hypocrisy, and criminal short-sightedness.

It is unthinkable that the government should be permitted to do what no government before it has dared to do, to offer the integrity of Canada for sale on the open market. It is insupportable that the government should be listened to seriously when it talks pious cant about safeguards and assurances while knowing that the higher the price offered, the fewer the demands for safeguards our negotiators feel they need to make.

A conspiracy of silence promoted and sustained by government is keeping Canadians ignorant of exactly where we are being led in this matter. The government must level with the people. It must honestly state exactly what it has been doing in negotiating the sale of nuclear reactors to countries which have refused to give assurance that they will use them only for peaceful purposes or which have shown by their past behaviour that their word of assurance is not to be trusted. Above all the government must stop talking of safeguards when it knows full well that no foolproof safeguards exist at present and that any safeguard which is not demonstrably 100 per cent effective is worse than useless.

It is absurd to practise secrecy in the delicate negotiations which precede nuclear sales abroad. There is no delicacy about an exploded nuclear device. There is no secrecy about the method of making such a device once the necessary materials, the materials which we are spreading in the world through our sales policy, have been obtained. There is only a great finality. If we are to avoid rushing toward that fate ourselves, dragging hundreds of thousands of others with us, the government should immediately place a ban on all nuclear sales until adequate, universally accepted safeguards have been established.

We have nothing to lose. Our resources and technology will not disappear because of the delay. The demand for them will not disappear. Only the fatal cloud which the government, by its nuclear policy, has placed over Canada and over the world community of nations will disappear. And that cannot happen soon enough.

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, "we have nothing to lose". That is what I have just heard from my préopinant, the person who spoke before me. "We have nothing to lose", of course, because the ban or the moratorium will apply to others and not to us. That is exactly the point I would like to develop. Once more today we have discussed transfer of nuclear technology by way of sales or by way of aid to development.

[Miss MacDonald.]

Once again the minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Dr. MacEachen, has been explaining with great care—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Right on.

● (2120)

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I have heard so much about Dr. Kissinger in this Chamber this afternoon that I thought if hon. members have not read the biography of our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) then that is too bad.

He has been explaining with great care and deep concern Canada's attitudes and active role in upgrading security measures and safety standards for any form of nuclear development—not only with fellow nations of the Third World but, what is far more difficult and far more significant, with business partners, the other industrialized supplier countries.

Once again the opposition parties through their major spokesmen—that means women—applied the credibility their seniority and personal reputation have given them to exploit the natural and understandable fear of Canadians regarding nuclear proliferation. I am sorry to say that I think the speech of the speaker who has just preceded me was a perfect illustration of that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: This, in my view, is totally irresponsible and badly misleading.

Starting with the former leader of the official opposition, who indicated recently that he would apply himself to the field of foreign policy, which all of us welcomed, he abused this afternoon the stature he had gained with many, many Canadians by quoting from older magazine articles on nuclear technology, which is probably the fastest developing technology in the entire world. He then went on to challenge the Secretary of State for External Affairs to tell us about the so called London Club consensus, although the minister had just stated very clearly the seven points emerging from the nuclear suppliers' meetings. He then asked what Canada intended to do!

Let me say that it is Canada who had initiated these meetings which led to a consensus as a result of which the situation improved all over the world. Canada had given her competitors the very text on the safeguards we require bilaterally in addition to the international standards required to ensure maximum peace and security in the world. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) concluded by calling all that "a sales pitch". Bad salesmen we are, very bad indeed, when we state to our competitors the tough terms and conditions under which we make our sales or transfers, thus making us the "highest bidders" in that market!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: I ask, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. member for Halifax or the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), who is also a former premier, or the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), who was once a cabinet member in a provincial legislature, or the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) really believe what they say—in which case they have not done their homework—or do they play very dangerous partisan politics—in which case I would be justified, in the name of my constituents, in accusing them at least of "impropriety"?

Mr. Stanfield: Keep the judges affairs out of this.

Miss Bégin: What sense of responsibility is that in a person of the high standard of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), who spoke of "criminals and lunatics" when speaking about the Indian government in the context of our current negotiations to honour our commitment to continue nuclear aid for that nation? Am I to conclude that such language is fine because that particular debate on March 8 took place at 10.31 p.m. when there was just a handful of members in the House?

Miss MacDonald: What has that got to do with it?

Miss Bégin: Double standards all the way through, that is what I suggest, Mr. Speaker. The more I listen to the debate, the more I think it might not even be a double standard, it might be that hon. members opposite do not know the procedures of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: I am tempted to explain—going back to my former role as a teacher—that when the minister tables some document in the House it means that every member has the duty, if he has any sense of priority, to obtain a copy of that document and acquaint himself with the Canadian policy on nuclear safeguards. The document in this case was tabled on January 30, not yesterday. Several bilateral agreements have also been tabled, but nobody seems to even know of their existence. I know why. It is difficult to read and it takes time to read, but let me tell you it is worth it if we want to be responsible.

Is it fair to talk about Dr. Kissinger and what he told a U.S. Congressional committee when every member in the House—but not every Canadian we have the responsibility to represent—knows that U.S. cabinet ministers are not elected and therefore are not accountable to the electorate the way we are, and the way the Secretary of State for External Affairs is, and demonstrates it every day?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: Again, is it fair that we should hear so much about Dr. Kissinger's proposal when all members of this Chamber know it to be an unquestionable fact that Canadian safeguards are the highest and the toughest in the whole world?

Pseudo-scientific facts are stated today—because very few of us are scientists—let us face it and say the truth at least once. Hon. members pick these pseudo-scientific facts here and there, and state them out of context. They hide behind that smokescreen and try to frighten fellow Canadians whom we are supposed to represent and for whom we are responsible. To me that is absolutely unacceptable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: There are Canadians who are very concerned about world peace and security, and no matter from what platform they speak or what voice they raise to express these preoccupations, these are very well taken because the government knows how strongly the vast majority of Canadians feel about nuclear dangers of different sorts. The majority of Canadians know how well our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is aware of these dangers—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss Bégin: —but they feel secure with him and they return him to office. They know that he, and in particular the Secretary of State for External Affairs, have an understanding of people here and abroad. They do not accept double standards. What is good technology for us here in Canada, which is converted to around 25,000 jobs here with an annual turnover of around $1 billion for the construction of the CANDU program, must also be good for others, those anonymous faces of people in Asia or elsewhere who live on less than $200 a year per person.

Canadians know that their government is a responsible one which will not sell or give nuclear technology to, for example, a country blessed with a good water system since their natural energy technology should be in hydro electricity, not in the nuclear business.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss Bégin: Study your dossiers and we will talk after that. I did not hear any facts from over there, only demagoguery. When you understand facts, we will talk of particular cases.

● (2130)

Canadians know that in our country of great natural resources we are lucky and have been able to research and develop in every one of the energy industries. In each of the energy industries we have specialists for industrial and personal needs. We can assist other countries because we have a particularly wide experience. This puts us in a unique position and gives us a unique responsibility. We are assuming both to the fullest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is important—

Mr. Lavoie: Hear, hear!

Miss Bégin: Thank you. At least, there is one Quebecer opposite who understood something!

Mr. Speaker, it is important to consider a matter concerning the peace and stability of the world. It is important to consider an issue representing for Canadians a domestic industrial program, and I refer to the CANDU program that could easily reach, according to experts, $5 billion

before 1983. If Canadians reject this they must tell it frankly and directly. I did not hear it yet today.

We always have one law for the rich and another for the poor. We are good, we are clever, we are developed and the others must shift for themselves. We are not going to lose our reputation, we are not going to take that risk! However, I think it is the responsibility of governments and of hon. members from all sides of this House, on such an explosive issue—I say it without playing on words—to provide their constituents with objective information.

It is also the responsibility of mass media to explain clearly and readily what is done and what happens. It is not difficult, the papers are constantly tabled. There are also many questions put in this House. Maybe hon. members opposite do not know there exits something called the "late show" in which they would find thousands of concrete data. To go back to media, I find very interesting, for instance, the special issue of March 75 of *Le Monde*, No. 19 on nuclear power. This is the type of non-partisan contribution, the only one which is valuable in such an important and dangerous debate as this one.

This is what the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) did today as well as my colleagues on this side. I think it is also what the Prime Minister did when he raised the issue of a "New Society". And I conclude on this, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is true that the happiness of Canadians and the less privileged people, even if we do not like it or if it disgusts some overly candid minds in this House, their happiness is measured in kilowatts.

[*English*]

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, from time to time in this House it seems we are preoccupied with many relatively unimportant matters. Seldom, however, are we in this House faced with an issue of the magnitude of the issue before us today. This is one of Canada's first real opportunities to play a significant role in shaping the future for the inhabitants of this planet.

Five months ago I had the privilege of serving as a delegate to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference held in New Delhi, India. While there I came to realize the deep-seated historical animosity felt by that nation toward China and the widespread and real fear of the nuclear capacities of China. Likewise, the mutual hostility between India and Pakistan was clearly evident, as was the distrust felt in each country about the intentions of the other in rushing ahead in the development of nuclear energy and potential nuclear armaments.

I suggest to this House that given the context, both historical and current, of the Indian nation, it is inevitable that that country will seek and successfully develop a nuclear weapons capacity. I think the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery) sunk to a new low in a recent speech. The Third World is fed up with this kind of perverse paternalism displayed by the hon. member for Spadina.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wenman: India has too often been portrayed as a poor, helpless, downtrodden nation. India is a strong, proud nation which has practised and has strong historical and traditional diplomacy, the kind of diplomacy Canada would do well to match. I am sure the Indians must have been laughing quietly at our fledgling attempts as our new minister stepped into the international arena trying his new wings. I am concerned about the feathers of this new minister. I am concerned that they are being plucked. The new minister's naivete seems to be greatly evident, and as he makes these international thrusts I have great concern because of the understanding I have gained about India and its intention.

While I do not condemn India for seeking this power, I condemn Canada for giving it the means to attain this power. Even with the possibility that non proliferation could be guaranteed, there exist other and perhaps ultimately more significant reasons to declare an immediate moratorium on such exports. I refer particularly to the potentially devastating environmental consequences of nuclear proliferation as a result either of accident in nuclear facilities or of inadequate safeguards attendant upon the storage and disposal of nuclear radioactive waste products.

A recent book called the "The Nuke Book", which was presented by Pollution Probe of Ottawa, states a few rather frightening facts. The United States Atomic Energy Commission sponsored Brookhaven Report was assigned to show the risk or lack thereof in the operation of a nuclear power plant. It outlined the damage which could be caused by a major accident in a 200 megawatt plant located 30 miles from a major city. It is interesting to note that the Pickering plant is a 2,000 megawatt station—ten times that size—and is located not 30 miles, but 20 miles, from the core of Toronto.

An accident in the smaller plant could kill up to 3,400 people, injure 43,000, and create up to $7 billion in property damage. Radioactivity might contaminate up to 150,000 square miles. What is the chance of this kind of thing happening? The study shows that there is a chance of an accident factor which could actually be as high as one in 25. Plutonium 239 can cause cancer of the skin, bones, lungs, and thyroid, and is one of the most lethal poisons known to man. Genetic damage by radiation for generations yet to come can be a result of radiation. The Brookhaven Report asks all foreseeable generations of human beings to guard this element from accident, sabotage, or act of God not for a generation but for 240,000 years for one expedient term of atomic energy.

Then we ask, what is the reaction of the government to this? As I consider the reaction of the government, I am appalled. I am appalled by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand). The Minister of the Environment, given the authority, given the responsibility to protect the environment of Canada and to show responsibility and leadership as a developed country in environmental matters, is not very helpful. On a previous occasion I asked the minister if he would agree that with the export of nuclear material comes the moral responsibility to provide technological information on environmental protection. What was his answer, Mr. Speaker? Is he going to provide environmental protection along with that kind of energy technology? Not at all. He replied that if we do not have it we cannot export it. Mr. Speaker, why do we not have environmental technology that is equivalent to the energy technology we are exporting from Canada?

● (2140)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wenman: Not only do we not have it but we have the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) taking an irresponsible stand—we will export it, it does not matter about the environmental effect, that is up to the country we are exporting to, let them look after it—that is his attitude. Not only do we export that kind of technology and tell them to look after it themselves but we do not even tell them how. We are one of the most developed countries in the world and we do not have the environmental technology to match our energy technology. That is a shame, Mr. Speaker; it is a damning indictment of the efforts of the government.

There are so many things we could talk about, but there is only one minute left so I must conclude. It is clear from what has been said here today that nuclear technology, and specifically the byproducts thereof, pose a tremendous threat to the well-being of our environment. It is equally clear that the government and the Minister of the Environment have not formulated or implemented adequate safeguards in this area. Given this situation we have an indication of the moral bankruptcy of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wenman: It continues to export nuclear capability to countries even less equipped than ourselves to handle these potentially disastrous problems.

As the leader of my party has stated on many occasions, it is not enough simply to point out the mistakes and omissions in government policy. I would therefore add my voice to those of my colleagues in demanding four points: first, a moratorium on the export of nuclear material, at least until such time as adequate safety and environmental standards are in effect; second, House of Commons ratification of all future sales; third, the repatriation to Canada of spent fuels from our exported reactors, and fourth, as a prerequisite to future sales the signing by the recipient country of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wenman: In the name of the morality of this country, before the government commits us and commits Canada to its first and greatest international misdirection, I urge the minister to reconsider.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being 9.45 p.m. it is my duty, pursuant to section 9(a) of Standing Order 58, to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion before the House.

The question is on the motion in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Lawrence) which was negatived on the following division:

● (2150)

(*Division No. 122*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Benjamin
Brewin
Brisco
Broadbent
Cadieu
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crouse
Dick
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gilbert
Gillies
Grafftey
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Horner
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
MacLean
Malone
Masniuk
Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Muir
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Neil
Nielsen
Nystrom
Oberle
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Rynard
Saltsman
Schellenberger
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Symes
Towers
Wagner
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—98

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
De Bane
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet

Messrs.

Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)

Messrs.

O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stollery
Tessier
Trudeau
Turner
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—125

● (2210)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion lost.

It being after 10 o'clock this House stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow.

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 24, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE STUDY OF AIR-SEA RESCUE FACILITIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity regarding the air-sea rescue facilities in British Columbia. I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That the Standing Committee on Transport be empowered to investigate the air-sea rescue facilities in British Columbia and that it report to the House its recommendations as soon as reasonable after a thorough inquiry.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSAL THAT KGB AGENTS POSING AS PART OF SOVIET DIPLOMATIC STAFF BE NO LONGER ACCREDITED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity affecting the security of Canada and its North American air defence partner and ally, the United States of America. At least half of the so-called diplomats accredited to the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa are agents of the KGB, the Soviet spy service, some of whom are known to have taken part in illegal and clandestine operations. The assistant air attaché, for example, was expelled from Lebanon in 1969 for plotting to steal Mirage airplanes from the Lebanese airforce. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence):

That the Minister of External Affairs be instructed to advise the Soviet Embassy immediately that KGB agents posing as part of their diplomatic staff can no longer be accredited to Canada as members of the diplomatic corps and that they be forthwith recalled.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO ACTIVITIES OF REISMAN AND GRANDY IN CONNECTION WITH LOCKHEED CONTRACT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to present a motion under Standing Order 43 on a very serious matter. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

That this House calls for a public inquiry into all of the activities of the firm of Reisman and Grandy Limited in relation to the negotiations between the government of Canada and Lockheed Aircraft Corporation over the proposed purchase of Orion aircraft.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion can only be presented to the House with its unanimous consent? Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSSIBILITY MR. GRANDY HAD CONSULTING CONTRACT WITH PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE OR OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Acting Prime Minister said he would look into the question as to whether Mr. J. F. Grandy personally has had a consulting contract with the Prime Minister's office or any other central agency of the government since his firm of Reisman and Grandy Limited went to work for Lookheed Limited and, if that is the case, when any such contract with that individual was completed or terminated. I wonder if the Prime Minister is now in a position to satisfy the House on this matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received the question from the Acting Prime Minister and I have had it looked into. I can answer that no such contract has been entered into by the Prime Minister's office or by the Privy Council office. There have

previously been several departments to which they were under very short-term contract essentially in order to wind up the transition period, that is a get files in order and so on. I think there is no difficulty with that. There was one contract with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in an advisory capacity. I am looking at the nature of that contract. I am afraid I cannot reply to the House today on that. I see the minister is not in the House, but this is a matter we are considering very seriously with a view to finding out the facts.

* * *

● (1410)

PUBLIC SERVICE

NEED FOR GUIDELINES ON RIGHT OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES TO WORK FOR CORPORATIONS DEALING IN AREAS IN WHICH EMPLOYEES HAD GOVERNMENT EXPERIENCE

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, sir. I appreciate the answer of the Prime Minister. I wonder whether the Prime Minister will review the question of the guidelines in respect of what I see now as virtually an untrammelled right of senior public servants to work for corporations in those areas where they have government experience.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot talk about reviewing guidelines because I do not think such guidelines have existed in the past. Indeed, I do not think the practice was prevalent and probably that is why there were no guidelines. I can say, however, unequivocally that it is a practice which leaves me somewhat uneasy. I am not sure of the extent of the facts. As I indicated in my first answer I am having them looked into, but certainly I am concerned about the possibility of former high level civil servants lobbying or approaching people, who until very recently were under their jurisdiction and authority, in order to make representations. I am concerned with the practice insofar as it may exist and I would want to see that guidelines are promulgated.

I cannot for the time being see how the practice could be made illegal. We do not want to attempt to direct the conduct of people who are no longer with the government, but it might be possible to have some contractual arrangement, perhaps under their pension arrangement or somewhere else, under which at least a period of time would elapse before any type of lobbying would be permitted. I take it this would apply to the senior level and not necessarily to all levels of employees who might have been in the public service. I think it would apply to the policy-making levels essentially. I confess I do not have a complete report on the facts. I am looking at them with a view to establishing policy.

Mr. Clark: Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister and commend him for his willingness to look into this matter fully. I suggest that, in looking at the question of guidelines, he might look at the practice of the British government which has found a way to deal with this problem and also consider the precedents in our own public service dealing with employees at a very much lower level, namely, to the customs officers. Would the Prime Minister give us an undertaking to move quite quickly in respect of the promulgation of guidelines and make those available to the House of Commons for review at a quite early date?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the British practice to which the hon. member has referred. But he is probably aware also that, in fact, it is rather customary for former civil servants in the British public service to go to the private sector. What their relations then are is something we will need to look into, but it is not an unknown practice any more than it is in other European countries. As to the urgency, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we must have some guidelines for practice in these areas very soon.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF REPRESENTATIONS BY REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday the minister told the House that to his knowledge no representations had been received from the consulting firm of Reisman and Grandy by himself, the Minister of Supply and Services or any member of those departments or departmental agencies. Would the minister now inform the House whether he has taken any steps to investigate the possibility of such representations and if so what has been the result of such investigations?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have made inquiries. I have discussed this matter with my deputy minister and others in the Department of National Defence. I did not discuss the matter with officials or ministers in other departments. To the best of my knowledge no representations have been made on behalf of the Lockheed company. I believe there have been some conversations concerning the contract, but there have not been representations made on behalf of the company to any official in my department.

Mr. McKinnon: Then, Mr. Speaker, perhaps in answer to this question the minister could clarify his own position in respect of these conversations and whether he indeed had conversations with Mr. Reisman. Mr. Grandy said: "We have tried to help the company find financing for their shortfall." Last night the Minister of National Defence certainly indicated in committee that he was seeking financing aid for the same company to the extent that DND was willing to pay the interest. Are we now to assume that these two seekers of financial support for Lockheed did so without ever talking to each other about it?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen Mr. Reisman or Mr. Grandy even to say good morning or good afternoon to them for several months.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Richardson: I have had no conversations of any kind with either of these gentlemen for many months. There have been conversations by telephone on the subject mentioned by the hon. member with my deputy minister. I do not believe there have been any other representations to any other personnel involved with the Lockheed company.

Mr. McKinnon: I hope that the minister and Mr. Grandy are not both lucky on the same day and borrow twice as much money as we need.

* * *

FINANCE

CONSULTING CONTRACTS HELD BY MR. REISMAN AND HIS ACCESS TO DEPARTMENTAL FILES

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Finance. He stated yesterday that he would take notice and report to the House on either the contracts held by Mr. Reisman or his access to the Department of Finance files. Is the minister in a position to report to the House on the second part of that promise, that is Mr. Reisman's access to the Department of Finance files?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I say in answer to the second part of the question that I have made the inquiry and been advised that Mr. Reisman, as former deputy minister, would have no right of access to departmental files, either in relation to matters now on hand or in relation to his former responsibility.

With regard to contracts, I am advised that there was a contract outstanding with Mr. Reisman for the period from April 1 to April 30, 1975 for the purpose of winding up some of the items that he had under particular consideration in the department before he left, and that indeed Mr. Reisman occupied, on a part time basis, some space in the department until June 27 of last year.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR OBLIGATION TO PAY $111 MILLION IN INTEREST

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Since the minister indicated in the House on March 2 that the reason for the cost escalation of the Orion purchase by some $111 million over a two month period was due to the cost of interest on interim financing payments, I should like to ask the minister if he is telling the House that the government did not know in advance that it was obligated to pay this additional $111 million, in which case it is incompetent, or is he saying that the government was not obligated previously to pay this amount and, if so, why has it decided to do so?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have explained this point to the House before on earlier occasions. The cabinet decision which was reached in November included a decision to purchase the Lockheed Orion at a cost of $950 million, and also allowed for the interest charges for financing the payments over the production phase of the contract. This was in my statement which I made in the House in November. The exact dollar amounts for interest were not stated because we did now know them at that time, but the statement indicated very clearly that there would be additional financing charges over and above the $950 million.

Mr. Broadbent: Is the minister saying that that reference to interest charges pertains specifically to front-end financing of the project and, more specifically still, did it pertain to the $111 million for just a two or three month period? Was that clearly understood by the cabinet last November?

Mr. Richardson: It was not related to very short-term financing in the sense that we are talking about three years. Full payment is provided for by my department at the end of the life of the contract and on delivery of the aircraft. But the need for financing over the production phase, which is about three years, was always contemplated by the government. The interest payments were authorized and were so stated in my statement, and are in fact in the estimates which are now before the House.

● (1420)

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF OBTAINING INFORMATION ABOUT PAY-OFFS FROM UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): On Monday of this week the minister indicated that the government was accepting Lockheed's response to the question about the possibility of bribes being offered by that company to anyone in Canada with regard to purchases of aircraft from that corporation. I should like now to ask the minister if the government thinks it appropriate to follow the examples of the governments of Holland and Japan, and specifically to request the United States government—not Lockheed—to provide the government of Canada with its confidential information concerning pay-off payments which have been made by the Lockheed Corporation to various government officials around the world.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): We have had conversations with senior officials in the United States government, and there has never been any indication whatsoever that there were any improper payments made to Canadians by Lockheed. In addition, in the Senate hearings which were held and in which the other revelations were made concerning Japan and other countries, there was no mention at any time of payments to Canada. There has been no evidence anywhere that there have been improper payments in this country, and a few months ago I read into the record a statement by the chairman of Lockheed confirming that in writing.

[*Translation*]

LAW REFORM COMMISSION

REQUEST FOR NAME OF NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Justice.

I would like to ask him if he intends to appoint the new chairman of the Law Reform Commission in the near future. And, if so, who will be the appointee?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I appointed a new chairman some time ago, Mr. Justice Antonio Lamer of the Superior Court of Quebec, who is the present vice-chairman of the commission and will become chairman at the expiration of the present chairman's term of office.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CONTENTS OF JUDGE LAMER'S EVIDENCE BEFORE CRIME COMMISSION—KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary question.

I would like to ask the minister—to protect the integrity of the Bench, whether he is aware that Justice Lamer has appeared in camera before Justice Réal Brunet of the Commission of Inquiry on Organized Crime and whether he knows the contents of the evidence given by Justice Lamer?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron. Basford (Minister of Justice): I am not aware of the giving of the evidence, and obviously if it was in camera I would not be aware of it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a final supplementary.

Can the minister explain how it is that he is not aware of such an important matter? If someone is appointed chairman and this person will be called upon to direct the new legislation relating to the law, can the minister tell the House whether he will investigate this matter to know the content of Justice Lamer's testimony to the commission of inquiry on organized crime?

[*English*]

Mr. Basford: The chairman designate was appointed vice-chairman some four years ago, and apparently the matter was examined at that time by my predecessor.

* * *

COMBINES

ALLEGED CHARGES AGAINST THOMCOR HOLDINGS LIMITED

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, whoever he may be today. Can the acting minister confirm for this House that, as a result of the diligent work of the hon. member for Central Nova and members of the caucus research staff, his department has seen fit to lay charges in the provincial court at Montreal relating to Combines Investigation Act violations committed by Thomcor Holdings Limited, the operator of duty free shops at both Dorval and Mirabel?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is the same person today as yesterday, will be the same gentleman tomorrow, and will be until someone is appointed on a permanent basis.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Are you tired of the Post Office?

Mr. Mackasey: In the meantime, he has inherited a very capable parliamentary secretary who can answer these questions.

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I think he well knows that it is not the policy of the department to comment on whether investigations are being undertaken by the director of the anti-combines branch.

Some hon. Members: Charges.

An hon. Member: What are you hiding?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, for the information of both the acting minister and the parliamentary secretary, there was in fact such a charge laid in the provincial court on March 17. I give that information to those gentlemen gratuitously.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Solicitor General. Now that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has led the way, so to speak, when it comes to investigating and then acting on information placed before it by the hon. member for Central Nova, I wonder if the minister can tell us when we are likely to see the results of the work of his department?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned many times before, the RCMP were investigating this matter long before the hon. member for Central Nova raised it in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Allmand: Almost one year before, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Come off it.

Mr. Allmand: The investigation is continuing, and when there is enough evidence we will present it to the attorney general of Quebec.

* * *

RESEARCH

MEETING WITH MEDICAL RESEARCH REPRESENTATIVES—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Did the minister meet yesterday with members of the Canadian medical research community and if so, what was the nature of their representations and the minister's response to them?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in Kingston at a funeral and did not meet with the members.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of National Health and Welfare—because of the noise from the other side I did not hear the reply of the hon. Minister for Public Works.

● (1430)

Mr. Speaker: The reply of the hon. minister was that he was at a funeral in Kingston yesterday and did not attend any such meeting.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare or the President of the Treasury Board. Did either minister meet yesterday or this week with members of the Canadian medical research community and, if so, what was the nature of the representations and the minister's response to them?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I met these persons yesterday. We discussed the situation and I informed them that I agree with the opposition party in trying to restrain government expenditures.

[*English*]

SUGGESTED RECONSIDERATION OF FUNDING OF MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the government should change its priorities in this regard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Grafftey: Because the quality of medical research in Canada directly affects the costs and quality of medical and health care services, and because as a result of current government funding policies many research scientists are ready to leave this country and many projects have been cancelled, will the hon. Minister reconsider government funding policy and give the Canadian research community new and deserved hope?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we had granted a very substantial increase to the Medical Research Council the previous year. Unfortunately, in view of the government restraint policies, we have not been able to do the same this year. However, the doctors who made representations to me yesterday did not describe the situation as being as bad as the hon. member is doing today in the House.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

BUDGET OF ADMINISTRATOR—EXCESS ALLOWED TO LAPSE

Mr. John Roberts (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the statement by the administrator of the Anti-Inflation Board that he requires no more than $100,000 to meet his budgetary commitment to the end of March and in view of the impossibility of procedurally amending the recommendations of the House of Commons for a sum much larger than that, will the minister assure the House that the sum in excess of $100,000 will be impounded, allowed to lapse and not spent?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that the money which has been or will be voted will not be allowed to be spent and will be turned over to the government's Consolidated Revenue Fund, as is the case with every budget. In any given fiscal year, we tell the House that about 2 per cent of the credits have not been spent at the end of the year and are turned over to the Consolidated Revenue Fund; this principle will hold true for the administrator and for other departments.

* * *

[*English*]

POST OFFICE

REQUEST FOR CONSULTATION WITH PUBLISHERS BEFORE DOMESTIC RATES INCREASED

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General—if he still is Postmaster General. It arises from the 400 per cent increase in postal rates imposed on January 1 on Canadian periodicals mailed to points outside Canada, an increase which violates the guidelines of the government's anti-inflation program and which was imposed without prior consultation with Canadian publishers. Will the Postmaster General comment briefly on criticism contained in the brief submitted to him by the Canadian Periodical Publishers Association and the Canadian Community Newspaper Association and give assurance that there will be consultation with the industry before the government imposes increases in domestic postal rates on Canadian publications?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making statements which are not factually correct. As far back as in 1971, in order to protect the Canadian industry, we prevailed upon the United States government to raise their postal rates for publications coming from the United States to Canada. We did this to protect the Canadian industry and, in response, we had an obligation to raise the rates in this country. I have on file correspondence from both associations to which the hon. member alluded, dating as far back as 1974, plus the notification in October, 1975, that the rates were to go up. I suggest, when they go to the Anti-Inflation Board to check the new rates, they should also submit to that board their new advertising rates which went up on January 1 of this year.

SUGGESTED REDUCTION OF RATE INCREASES ON PUBLICATIONS GOING TO UNITED STATES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Postmaster General referred to 1971, a time known as the bad old days in the Post Office service—I recall the Prime Minister saying in those days that everybody knows the postal service is lousy—would he, in view of the decision of the associations I mentioned to refer the recent increases to the Anti-Inflation Board for adjudication, consider rolling back increases already imposed, so that they will meet the government's anti-inflation guidelines?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. gentleman questioned the service of 1971. I said that in 1971 we made representation in order to protect the Canadian publishing industry. Obviously, he feels we should not have done that. By asking the United States to raise postal rates, since for every 100 publications coming into Canada from the United States one Canadian publication only goes to the United States, we protected in a tangible way the Canadian publishing industry against the influx of United States periodicals. We did that, as I say, by raising domestic rates in the United States. I thought the hon. gentleman would be pleased about that. The associations are perfectly free to take the new postal rates to the Anti-Inflation Board, just as I am free to take to the Anti-Inflation Board their new advertising rates which went into effect on January 1 and which also exceed certain guidelines.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGATION SOME MEMBERS OF KGB ARE ATTACHED TO SOVIET DIPLOMATIC STAFF—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Is the minister aware that a great number of personnel at the Soviet embassy in Ottawa, listed falsely as part of the Soviet Union's diplomatic corps, are actually Soviet spies and members of the KGB? If so, what steps, if any, is the minister taking to expel these individuals?

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the RCMP are aware that certain members of the Soviet Union embassy staff, in Ottawa, are with the KGB. They have known it for some time. I cannot say more about what they are doing. That would be counter-productive.

Mr. Paproski: But you are doing nothing.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION SOME MEMBERS OF KGB ATTACHED TO SOVIET DIPLOMATIC STAFF—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is it government policy to allow known KGB spies to be active under the noses of the government? Further, as it was the minister's position, in the answer to my leader's order paper question No. 3,336, that the government has no information that any accredited diplomat in Canada has been expelled from another country, and as Major Vladimir Vassiliev, presently serving—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member put a clear question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Perhaps he ought to answer that clear question.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the clear question, if the activities of any members of the embassy staff are inconsistent with their diplomatic status, they would be asked to leave the country.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, ask them to leave.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. As salaries for 200 Saskatchewan Indian guidance counsellors, language teachers and associate teachers in Saskatchewan have been frozen for three years, in some cases at levels below the minimum wage, will the minister amend the guidelines controlling those salaries, to permit those workers to get cost of living increases retroactive to 1972-73?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if this group was included in the recent negotiations we conducted with teachers and allied groups. I understand an increase was negotiated which is acceptable and going before the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Nystrom: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. According to what members of the group said yesterday, when I met them, what the minister suggested does not appear to be the case. Will the minister look into the

matter? How can he justify guidelines which allow salaries in programs administered by his department, both provincially and federally, to be below the minimum wage? How can he justify such guidelines?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that that is the case. I do not think the hon. member is correct. The settlement negotiated was in excess of the guidelines. That is why it has been referred to the Anti-Inflation Board.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH QUEBEC CONCERNING GRANTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs about the Housing Action Program?

Considering that under the provisions of Quebec chapter 15, municipalities are not allowed to negotiate directly with the government of Canada or its organizations, considering that this delay of the Quebec government in finalizing an agreement with the government of Canada deprives Quebec municipalities of important amounts in capital and interest and in view of the fact that by February 29 the city of Longueuil had already qualified for $814,000, could the minister report progress of the negotiations with the provincial government and tell us whether he thinks an agreement will be reached very soon with the Quebec government?

[*English*]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is to be an exchange of letters. It is not covered in a formal agreement. There is an understanding between Dr. Goldbloom in Quebec and our regional director in Montreal, Mr. Guilbault, that all building permits which fall within the criteria passed by this House since November 1, 1975, I believe, will be honoured. The applications will pass through the Quebec Housing Corporation. The funds will be paid directly to the municipality by CMHC, retroactive to November 1, 1975.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

REPORTS OF ALLEGED INCIDENTS RESULTING FROM BILINGUAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—REQUEST MINISTER MEET WITH PILOTS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In a release of February 25 to do with bilingual air traffic services the minister stated that allegations of problems concerning bilingual air communications were without foundation and that not one alleged incident had been validated. We now find that The Canadian Air Line Pilots Association has submitted evidence of 20 incidents of close calls in Quebec to the director general of Civil Aeronautics. Were those incidents reported to the minister?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received a report on them. The officials would, in the ordinary course, determine whether there was any foundation to them, as in the past such reports have proved to be without foundation.

Mr. McKenzie: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister this: Why was not the report of these close calls from CALPA acknowledged? Will the minister make the details of these incidents public and meet personally with CALPA officials, to clear up the matter?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there is not much point in acknowledging something like this until one has checked, to see whether there is substance to the allegations.

* * *

● (1440)

AGRICULTURE

PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF TRANSPORT SUBSIDY ON FLOUR TO EAST COAST PORTS—ALLEGED CONFLICT IN MINISTER'S STATEMENTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is the first ever to a Minister of Agriculture. I hope he will be kind to this city fellow. Since the Minister of Transport has told me that the subsidies on flour and grain movements through east coast ports will go shortly, and since the Minister of Agriculture replied very kindly to the hon. member for Vegreville that studies are underway into this sensitive matter, may I ask which represents government policy, ruination by Transport or rumination by Agriculture?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, that all depends on what my studies show.

* * *

TRANSPORT

REPORT ON LOSS OF LIFE AND FISHING BOATS ON WEST COAST—REASON FOR FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, two more fishermen were lost at sea the night before last in Queen-Charlotte Sound. I wish to ask the Minister of Transport whether he was able to ensure that the recommendations of last year's report on life and fishing boat losses on the west coast were implemented before the herring fleet set out to sea this season.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a number of steps were taken to try to minimize the danger. Some further regulations have been put forward for discussion. It was our intention to implement them, requiring fairly major changes in the nature of construction and other safety matters relating to vessels. There was general concern that any very abrupt implementation of those regulations would cost fishermen the use of their vessels completely for a period of time. Therefore, those

discussions as to how we can best bring about those standards are still going on.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, since the failure to implement the regulations has cost lives and not just ships, will the Minister of Justice inform the House about the correspondence he has had with the British Columbia authorities in relations to this report and, in particular, to the conflict between federal and provincial jurisdication over the fishing fleet as those conflicting jurisdictions affect provincial regulations relating to workmen's compensation.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, that, of course, is another question which concerns the fishermen. They are concerned if they are faced with two sets of regulations and each one imposing different standards upon them. As a result, discussions have commenced with the appropriate provincial minister. It will be our endeavour to seek to coordinate the regulations so there is no duplication, quite apart from the jurisdictional issue.

* * *

FISHERIES

INQUIRY AS TO REPLACEMENT OF "CAPE FRIELS" PATROL VESSEL

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of State (Fisheries). As a result of the loss of the *Cape Friels* patrol vessel, which was so important with regard to patrolling the fisheries zones and air-sea rescue surveillance, has the minister been in touch with his colleagues in the Department of Transport to ensure that the *Cape Friels* will be replaced as soon as possible? What action is being taken in this regard?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, there is a vessel replacing the *Cape Friels* at the moment. We are looking into a permanent replacement for the vessel which was lost. While I am on my feet, I should like to pay homage to the men of the armed forces. It was their plane which found the survivors and which, at their own risk, stayed very close to the lifeboat until the survivors were safe.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PROPOSED EXPANSION OF LIFEBOAT STATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the fact that the air-sea rescue tracker plane in St. John's was the first to assist in the incident. Will the minister indicate what plans there are with regard to expanding air-sea rescue surveillance, particularly with regard to lifeboat vessels and stations which apparently do not have the capability to apprehend or intercede?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, the different departments involved—Transport, Defence, Environment in terms of atmospheric service, Fisheries and others—are working together. We are pulling together the coordination that is required. It is really a question of getting people in the regional offices to pull together and we are working on this question now.

* * *

TRANSPORT

ALLEGED CLOSING OF CERTAIN SHIP REGISTRY OFFICES ON WEST COAST—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In the Vancouver *Province* of March 18 an article stated the Vancouver registry office for ships was to remain open but the Prince Rupert and other customs offices were expected to be closed for ship registration. Can the minister advise the House whether there has been any change of policy under Bill C-61 as was discussed in committee where custom offices such as Port Alberni and Prince Rupert would continue registering ships?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no such change in policy. There may have been a misunderstanding because certain offices will be designated as deputy-registry offices along with the registry office at the central registry. It will still be the intention to receive documents and offer such services at a variety of customs offices.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HARBOURS

PROPOSED REPAIR OF CERTAIN FACILITIES ON ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—SUGGESTED AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Public Works.

As an agency has been delegated to negotiate with the Quebec government the abandonment by the federal government of wharves located along the St. Lawrence River, can the minister tell the House whether those negotiations are progressing or whether they are at a standstill? If there is no progress, can he tell the House when he will finally decide to spend the required public moneys on the maintenance of those wharves which, all in all, are still useful to the public?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I must tell the hon. member that his question should be addressed to my colleague the Minister of Transport. The wharves in question are used for passenger ferries, and they fall under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Transport.

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

As the Minister of Transport is a colleague of his, may I ask him to get in touch with the Minister of Transport so that an agreement can be signed as soon as possible with the province of Quebec, so that those wharves can be kept

in good shape and that the Quebec government, if it takes over the wharves, can accept that responsibility at the earliest possible date, and to avoid their becoming useless within the next few months?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of an agreement and I shall take up the matter with my colleague at the first opportunity.

* * *

● (1450)

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SAMSON COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT—REPORTED CANCELLATION OF CONTRACT OF COMPUTING DEVICES

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence and has to do with the reported cancellation of the Computing Devices contract for the Samson communications project. Can the minister confirm whether or not that cancellation has taken place?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that Computing Devices were not able to complete their work under the contract. The contract is handled by the Department of Supply and Services and I do not know if in fact it has been cancelled.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the interest of the minister in obtaining Canadian input into this kind of defence project, and in view of the statement made yesterday by the president of the company to the effect that Computing Devices had offered to start delivering the terminals in May, 1976 and that Supply and Services had refused to accept that offer, before any action is taken by the government or before the government permits any action to be taken can I have an undertaking from the Minister of National Defence that he will intercede with his colleague the Minister of Supply and Services to see whether there is any way in which the contract can be restored? Because it is important, Mr. Speaker, not only to the people employed at Computing Devices, but also to the whole commitment of the Canadian electronics industry to supply our own Canadian forces.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, we have, of course, wanted to see the maximum amount of Canadian content in the Samson project. I think it is true to say that the government has been very long suffering with this particular contractor. We have been delayed many months but we have made every possible attempt to have the contract completed by them. However, at some point we are going to have to go to another contractor to supply the essential parts for the Samson project.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CAMBODIA—INQUIRY AS TO CANADIAN PROTEST AGAINST VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In regard to the previous questions put to the minister concerning the cruel tragedies and tortures that are taking place in Cambodia, documented in the Toronto *Star* of March 10 in an on-the-spot report by Jack Cahal, can the minister add to what he said before and tell the House in what way Canada is protesting this massive violation of human rights, and specifically whether Canada has yet launched a protest with the United Nations commission on human rights?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be aware, as I am, that it is very difficult to get information out of Cambodia at the present time. There is an almost total lack of information on the situation in Cambodia at the present time, but we are following up the question of violations with the UN commission on human rights.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF LAND

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister. It has to do with foreign ownership of land in Canada. Can the Prime Minister advise the House what progress is being made with the provinces with respect to the establishment of measures to deal with the ownership of land by foreigners in Canada? I realize the government has introduced an enabling amendment to the Canadian Citizenship Act which will assist in this regard, but I understand that there are other matters that require resolution, such as the application of the Foreign Investment Review Act, particularly as it applies to agricultural land. Can the Prime Minister bring the House up to date on negotiations in this regard with the provinces?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would have to check whether there has been any new development since I last reported to the House on this. There was a study by the federal and provincial governments on this very subject and certain conclusions were reached which I believe were tabled in the House. I believe I tabled at the time the letter that I wrote to the various premiers getting their reaction to the report.

The amendment to the Citizenship Act is one of the recommendations that is within federal jurisdiction and on which we can act. There have been objections to the federal authority acting in that area under the Foreign Investment Review Agency. The position that I have taken is that this agency was set up by federal law and that it will continue to operate.

I will see whether there is some occasion on which to table further correspondence. I believe I have brought the House up to date on the matter as it stands. The provinces

have taken the view, which we understand, that much of this is within their jurisdiction. The Citizenship Act amendment was an exception and we are prepared to amend that act in co-operation. I think the matter rests where it is now, and the provinces and the federal government will each have to act within their own jurisdiction to make sure that ownership and zoning of land in Canada is properly dealt with.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT NATIVES GET JOBS ON MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in connection with his promise of jobs for northerners on the proposed Mackenzie valley pipeline. In view of the fact that a master labour contract now exists between almost all pipeline contractors and four trade unions giving the unions control of hiring for pipeline construction, and in view of the fact that these unions will allocate jobs on the basis of seniority to unemployed members, including 2,000 members fresh from the Syncrude project, what steps will the minister take to ensure that northerners get the jobs he and the industry have promised us?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): First of all, Mr. Speaker, a conclusion has not been reached vis-à-vis the pipeline. Secondly, in the granting of the right of way application which will come to me this will be one of the conditions upon which I intend to insist, that it guarantees employment for native people.

Mr. Firth: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that similar government promises were changed by union action on the Alyeska pipeline in Alaska?

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of that but I will happy to do my best to see that the same does not happen here.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS—POSSIBLE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERMINISTERIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and relates to the call yesterday by Ambassador Thomas Enders with respect to new forms of co-operation between Canada and the United States. In view of the considerable disquiet raised by his predecessor Ambassador Porter in December and the comments in January of the Senate committee studying Canada-U.S. relations regarding the need for the re-establishment of the Canada-U.S. interministerial committee, what action is being taken by our government to head off being in a reactive position with respect to new U.S. initiatives?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the speech made yesterday by the United States ambassador to the Canadian Club, and I must say that his approach to the management of Canadian-U.S. affairs is commendable and obviously will be constructive in the months and years ahead.

With respect to the suggestion of the hon. member that the interministerial committee be revived, it is not one of the forms of co-operation that we presently find useful in view of the very frequent bilateral conversations that take place between United States and Canadian ministers and the difficulty of bringing together all the players who are required for a successful interministerial meeting.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR NAMES OF PEOPLE MR. DRURY CONSULTED ABOUT APPROACHING JUDGE HUGESSEN

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. On March 18 the minister admitted that he "consulted a number of other people" on the question of confrontation which he raised with Mr. Justice Hugessen. Would the minister tell the House whether any of the "number of other people", with the exception, of course, of the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs, are members of the cabinet?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have no very clear recollection but I thought I probably did mention this to some of my other colleagues in cabinet.

Mr. Fraser: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of that I would ask the minister to examine his memory carefully and to tell the House with how many and which members of the cabinet this matter was discussed. I do not have to remind the hon. minister that without an answer in this regard he leaves a very grave suspicion of conspiracy to commit an impropriety, namely, to touch a judge.

● (1500)

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member wants to be threatening. I have replied that I have no particular recollection of discussion concerning an event which I myself felt to be a baseless rumour. I will try to see if I can get some precise recollection.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. minister that the baseless rumour was the ganging up, and not the confrontation. I would invite the hon. minister to clarify his memory and advise this House just what went on.

Mr. Roche: I have had occasion before, Sir, to draw to the attention of the Chair the lack of clarity about who can ask supplementary questions and who cannot. I wish

respectfully to draw to the attention of the Chair today the continuing lack of clarity, for again today I was denied the opportunity of asking a very important supplementary question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I raised in my first question the matter of what Canada would do to protest the terrible tragedies that have taken place in Cambodia with regard to the violation of human rights. That, Sir, was the preparation for the question I then intended to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs concerning what Canada would do about the long awaited ratification on the part of Canada of the UN declaration on human rights.

Some of us will be representing our country at the forthcoming meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union where the question of human rights is going to be foremost on the agenda. We are going to be asked at that time what Canada is doing in respect of ratifying the UN declaration on human rights which was approved in principle between Ottawa and the provinces last December 11. I believe I should have been given the opportunity of following up my question to the minister in this regard, especially since some of my colleagues did have the opportunity of asking supplementaries following my denial. I only want to respectfully—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the hon. member does not seriously contend that, in order to prepare himself for participation in an international conference on behalf of our country, the only avenue of information for a proper preparation for that event is the question period.

There are members I can name here who for two days now have been attempting to get the floor. The Chair has always found this difficulty. Indeed, there are seven or eight members who tried to get the floor yesterday and still could not get the floor again today. Surely there must be a judgment left to the Chair when a question relates to a very general subject, such as the one put by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, and in turn by the hon. member for Egmont, anticipating his point of order, in which the Chair must exercise some discretion, not related necessarily to the importance of the question put by the hon. member, but really to the importance of the questions that fail to get put each time a question of that sort is followed by one or two supplementaries. This is a balancing act that the Chair has to do every day, and it is such that really gives me no pleasure.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat some of the arguments that were put by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona in respect of the same question, but I do think you put members in a somewhat difficult position, Sir, in terms of the question period. I am one of the members you referred to who stood all day yesterday and today in order to catch Your Honour's eye. It is somewhat difficult for this hon. member, who has been in the House for a few years, to determine the basis on which the decision is taken.

If indeed there is to be a rule in respect of the asking of second and third supplementaries I think it should be clear to all hon. members in this House in order to avoid the very situation which has arisen, on this and on previous days, of a number of members not being recognized and getting a suitable opportunity to do so. Otherwise it may fall to some members to consider that Your Honour is making decisions which are really not based on anything other than a very subjective judgment.

Mr. Speaker: I welcome that intervention because that, indeed, is in fact the case. If there is a way the hon. member or other hon. members could suggest that would cause it to be otherwise, the Chair would welcome such comments.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), Rimouski (Mr. Allard), Champlain (Mr. Matte), Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne), Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), Manicouagan (Mr. Blouin), Mercier (Mr. Boulanger), Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Béchard) and Joliette (Mr. LaSalle), has been filed with me pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Chapter E-2, R.S.C. 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec.

It is also my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Matane (Mr. De Bané), Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Fox), Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe), Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance), Drummond (Mr. Pinard), Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal), Compton (Mr. Tessier), Saint-Jean (Mr. Smith) and Richelieu (Mr. Côté), has been filed with me pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Chapter E-2, r.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

TABLING OF TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT OF THE CLERK OF PETITIONS ON PETITION RESPECTING OLD AGE PENSION

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the table the twenty-sixth report of the Clerk of Petitions, stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and finds that it meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

Supply

SUPPLY

PROCEDURE TO DEAL WITH SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES AND INTERIM SUPPLY

On the Order: Government notice of motion:

March 22, 1976—The President of the Privy Council:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order, on the penultimate allotted day in the present supply period, at fifteen minutes before the ordinary time of adjournment, proceedings then in progress shall be interrupted and every question as may be required by section (9) of Standing Order 58 shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate;

That, immediately thereafter, any other question or questions as may be necessary to dispose of any item of supplementary estimates, the restoration or reinstatement of any item in the supplementary estimates, or any opposed item in the supplementary estimates, and for the passage of any bill based thereon shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate;

That, immediately thereafter, the questions on a motion to grant interim supply and for first reading of a bill based thereon shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate; and

That, on the final allotted day in the present supply period, the business taken up shall be the second reading, consideration in committee of the whole, report stage and third reading of the bill based upon the motion for interim supply and that, at fifteen minutes before the ordinary hour of adjournment on the said day, proceedings then in progress shall be interrupted and every question necessary for the disposal of the said bill shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate;

Provided that, on both the aforementioned days, the House shall not adjourn until all business referred to in this Order is disposed of.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, since this motion for a special order is couched in rather arcane language, perhaps the House would appreciate a brief explanation in what might be called lay terms. This special order has, of course, been discussed among the House leaders of the various parties, who I understand have recommended its support by the members of their various groups.

The purpose of this motion is to facilitate debate on the bill authorising interim supply for the first quarter of fiscal 1976-77. Interim supply is the last item of the business of supply taken up during the winter portion of allotted days and, consequently, it has not in recent years been reached in time for debate. Under this proposed special order a full day's debate would be provided.

Under this proposed special order the business for the next two days will be as follows. Today we will debate the opposition motion in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). At the conclusion of that debate we will take up the motion relating to Supplementary Estimates (B) and will then proceed to pass at all stages the required bill. The motion for concurrence in interim supply will then be reached and the required bill will be introduced. The proceedings relating to estimates and interim supply must be taken up not later than 5.45 this afternoon. When orders of the day are reached tomorrow, the interim supply bill will be taken up at second reading. After receiving second reading the bill will be considered in committee of the whole. The bill must be disposed of not later than 9.45 tomorrow evening.

In our continuing efforts to iron out procedure relating to supply there have been suggestions from several quarters that it would be helpful if provision were made for debate on supply bills. Our experience tomorrow will help us assess this proposal.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I welcome this proposal as a niche in the heretofore closed door. I hope the door will be flung open much wider to let the rays of the sun shine on a proper and real examination of government expenditure by the representatives of the people. I am very pleased to have participated in the discussions with the House leader and to say that the measure has our support as a beginning.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is correct, as the government House leader pointed out, that the terms of this motion have been discussed among the House leaders and that we have recommended to the members of our parties that it be supported.

● (1510)

Under normal conditions if members of the opposition were to put down motions for debate for both today and tomorrow we would end up at 9.45 tomorrow night having to put through two bills, the supplementary estimates and interim supply, without debate, in an atmosphere that sometimes is not exactly pleasant. Under the terms of this motion, as we understand it, we will pass the supplementary estimates bill tonight without any debate, and that may not be exactly pleasant, but we will have all day tomorrow for second reading, consideration in committee of the whole and third reading of the interim supply bill. We hope, as some members have said, that tomorrows' debate on the interim supply bill may result in a desire for more such days.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion is in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. Sharp moved:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order, on the penultimate allotted day in the present supply period, at fifteen minutes before the ordinary time of adjournment, proceedings then in progress shall be interrupted and every question as may be required by section (9) of Standing Order 58 shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate;

That, immediately thereafter, any other question or questions as may be necessary to dispose of any item of supplementary estimates, the restoration or reinstatement of any item in the supplementary estimates, or any opposed item in the supplementary estimates, and for the passage of any bill based thereon shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate;

That, immediately thereafter, the questions on a motion to grant interim supply and for first reading of a bill based thereon shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate; and

That, on the final allotted day in the present supply period, the business taken up shall be the second reading, consideration in committee of the whole, report stage and third reading of the bill based upon the motion for interim supply and that, at fifteen minutes before the ordinary hour of adjournment on the said day, proceedings then in progress shall be interrupted and every question necessary for the disposal of the said bill shall be put forthwith successively, without amendment or debate;

Provided that, on both the aforementioned days, the House shall not adjourn until all business referred to in this Order is disposed of.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the followimg questions will be answered today: 3,946, 4,017 to 4,019 inclusive, 4,023 to 4,029 inclusive, 4,108, 4,587, 4,602, 4,604, 4,609 and 4,916.

[*Text*]

SMALL FARM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Question No. 3,946—Mr. Mazankowski:

1. How many (a) Rural Development Officers, (b) Farm Management Consultants are employed by the Department of Agriculture to administer the Small Farm Development Programme and, in each case (i) where are they located (ii) how many are in each location?

2. What are the specific duties of the (a) Rural Development Officers, (b) Farm Management Consultants and, in each case, to whom are they directly responsible?

3. Are their activities monitored to ensure their duties are properly being conducted and fulfilled and, if so, in what manner?

4. What is the aggregate amount spent on an annual basis to cover the costs of the (a) Rural Development Officers, (b) Farm Management Consultants?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1.

(a) and (b)(i)	(a)(ii)	(b)(ii)
British Columbia	—	5
Alberta	6	10
New Brunswick	—	1
Prince Edward Island	—	5

2. (a) Under the direction of the Provincial Regional Director, Alberta Department of Agriculture, participates in the planning of and guides and supports the implementation of Rural Development Service activities in the region by: participating in the preparation and co-ordination of overall plans for rural economic development at the regional level; guiding and supporting the activities of the Rural Development Counsellors within the region; providing counselling services to rural people directly and on referral or request from Rural Development Counsellors; conducting liaison activities with regional officials of government agencies and other organizations involved in the solution of rural development problems; performs other related duties. (b) Under the general supervision of the Regional Farm Management Specialist* studies, analyzes, and advises individual farmers requiring farm management consulting services on how to develop viable farms and thereby increase income opportunities and equity; provides a continuing follow-up consulting service for the progressive review and adjustment of the farm operation; provides management assistance to farmers on a wide range of business activities; and performs other related duties.

3. Yes. In accordance with the Federal-Provincial agreements covering the Small Farm Development Program, functional supervision is provided by the Provincial Supervisor on the day to day activities of the employees. Monthly reports are submitted to the Department outlining activities and the number of farmers served.

4. (a) $128,925. (b) $388,935.

---

*Farm Management Consultants are responsible in the respective Provinces, as follows:

British Columbia, Director of Extension, British Columbia Department of Agriculture.

Alberta, Regional Director, Extension Branch, Alberta Department of Agriculture.

New Brunswick, to the District Agriculturalist in the office in which they work.

Prince Edward Island, to the Agricultural Representative in the office in which they work.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO GEORGES LÉTOURNEAU

Question No. 4,017—Mr. Cossitt:

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council which lists a grant in the amount of $6,600 to Georges Létourneau of Montreal "to investigate uses of the translation of human bio-electrical signals into musical sound" (a) what are human bio-electrical signals, (b) what were the conclusions of the investigation, (c) what are the names and addresses of all those (i) appearing on the application for the grant (ii) who recommended the grant to the Canada Council, (d) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) Human bio-electrical signals are electrical impulses of the brain which can be recorded by an encephalograph. (b) Conclusions are not yet available as the investigation is still under way. (c) (i) The only name appearing on the application form is that of Georges Létourneau. (ii) See Appendix I of the Council's 18th Annual Report for the names of members of the Regional Selection Committees for the Explorations Program. To protect the privacy of candidates and Committee members, the Council does not release their addresses. (d) The Selection Committee judged the application worthy of a grant after assessing the merit of the proposed project and the applicant's ability to carry it out, and taking into account all other applications entered in the competition.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO JO-ANNE FRASER, KATHLEEN MURCH AND ERNA VAN DAELE

Question No. 4,018—Mr. Cossitt:

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council which lists a grant in the amount of $2,760 to Jo-Anne Fraser, Kathleen Murch and Erna Van Daele of London "for a multi-media review on the theme of sexual stereotyping" (a) was the review made and, if so, on what date, (b) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved, (c) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended the grant to the Canada Council?

Order Paper Questions

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) The review, entitled Straightjackets, was presented in the Talbot Theatre, London, Ontario, from April 15 to 19, 1975. (b) See 4,017 (d). (c) See 4,017 (c)(ii).

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO KEVIN GILLIS

Question No. 4,019—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council which lists a grant in the amount of $5,000 to Kevin Gillis of Chesterville "to study the role of the harmonica in the social culture of each region in Canada" (a) was the study made and, if so, on what date was it completed, (b) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended the grant to the Canada Council, (c) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) This study has not yet been completed. (b) See 4,017 (c)(ii). (c) See 4,017 (d).

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO JACQUES HENRIPIN

Question No. 4,023—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council which lists a grant in the amount of $48,160 to Jacques Henripin of the University of Montreal to study "fertility of families in Quebec" (a) was the study made and, if so, on what date did it report, (b) what was the purpose of the study, (c) for what reason was the grant awarded, (d) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended such a grant to the Canada Council?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) The study is still under way and will be completed in March 1977. (b) Purpose of the study is to analyse certain factors related to the drop in Quebec's birthrate. (c) and (d) The Council bases its decisions on the recommendations of assessors chosen for their expertise in the particular subject or research area and on the advice of the Advisory Academic Panel, whose role is to review the applications, taking into consideration the opinions of the assessors and the policies of the Council. The names of Panel members are listed on page 5 of the Council's 18th Annual Report. The addresses of members of the Advisory Panel and the names and private addresses of assessors are regarded as confidential.

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO LINDA DIANE RUBIN

Question No. 4,024—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council showing a grant of $3,500 to Linda Diane Rubin of Vancouver to hold workshops "for the general public on expression through body movement" (a) were such workshops held, (b) what type of body movement was involved, (c) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended the grant to the Canada Council, (d) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) The workshops were held on weekends between September and December, 1975. (b) Dance movements. (c) See 4,017 (c)(ii). (d) See 4,017 (d).

[Mr. Cossitt.]

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO STEPHEN L. ENDICOTT

Question No. 4,025—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council which lists a grant in the amount of $10,233 to Stephen L. Endicott for a "biography of China missionary and political activist James G. Endicott" (a) is the Canada Council aware as to whether this is the same James G. Endicott that was at one time associated with the Labour Progressive Party (communist) and other left-wing causes, (b) is the Canada Council aware as to whether Stephen L. Endicott was at any time a member of the Labour Progressive Party (communist), (c) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved, (d) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended the grant to the Canada Council?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) Yes. (b) No. (c) and (d) See 4,023 (c) and (d).

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO O HANDMADE PAPER OF BEAVERTON

Question No. 4,026—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council showing two grants totalling $10,000 to O Handmade Paper of Beaverton for "experimental work in the production of hand-made paper as a visual art form" (a) what are the names and addresses of all those (i) appearing on the application (ii) recommending the grant to the Canada Council, (b) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a)(i) Andrew James Smith. To protect the privacy of grant recipients, the Council does not release their addresses. (ii) See 4,017 (c)(ii). (b) See 4,017 (d).

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO JOHN MUSGRAVE

Question No. 4,027—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council showing a grant in the amount of $6,000 to John Musgrave of Edmonton "to collect, organize and interpret data on reported sightings of UFO's across Canada" (a) has this data been collected and has it appeared in printed form, (b) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved, (c) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended the grant to the Canada Council?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) The research is still under way. (b) See 4,017 (d). (c) See 4,017 (c)(ii).

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO OCEAN LIFE SYSTEMS SOCIETY OF VICTORIA

Question No. 4,028—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council showing a grant in the amount of $5,000 to Ocean Life Systems Society of Victoria "for a film based on research and attempts of communication with whales" (a) has this film been made and, if so, on what date, (b) what are the names and addresses of all those (i) who recommended the grant to the Canada Council (ii) appearing on the application for the grant, (c) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council

as follows: (a) Research is still under way. Because the initial submission was modified, the results will be set forth in a book instead of a film. (b)(i) See 4,017 (c)(ii). (ii) Bruce J. Bott, James A. O'Donnell, Christine Swierbut, Paul Mockler, Nick Orton, Peter Vatcher, Patricia Sowerby. To protect the privacy of the grant recipients, the Council does not release their addresses. (c) See 4,017 (d).

CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO GOLDIE JOSEPHY

Question No. 4,029—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the 1974-75 Annual Report of the Canada Council showing a grant of $5,300 to Goldie Josephy of Ottawa "to write a book on her experiences with the Canadian Peace Movement during the last fifteen years" (a) has the book been written, (b) has it been published and, if so, on what date, (c) what is a description of the Canadian Peace Movement as it was represented to the Canada Council, (d) what are the names and addresses of all those who recommended the grant to the Canada Council, (e) what are the reasons that the application for the grant was approved?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: (a) Writing of the book has not yet been completed. (b) See (a). (c) The author refers to her involvement with the Canadian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the program for U.S. draft resisters arriving in Canada, the Committee Against the War in Vietnam, and Amnesty International. (d) See 4,017 (c)(ii). (e) See 4,017 (d).

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION STAFF MEMBERS

Question No. 4,108—**Mr. Matte:**

1. What are the (a) names, (b) jobs, (c) duties, (d) salaries of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission staff members?

2. How many are (a) French speaking, (b) English speaking, (c) bilingual?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): The Canadian Radio-Television Commission (CRTC) submits the following information: 1.

Name	Title	Duties	Within Salary Range of
J. M. Shoemaker	Executive Director of the Commission	Responsibility for the supervision of the operations, policy development and staff of the Commission	SX-3
G. R. Lefebvre	Secretary General to the Commission	Responsibility for the supervision of the licensing, the public hearing function of the Commission, the Chairman's Office and for the Administration of the proceedings of the Executive Committee and of the Commission.	SX-2
J. Baby	Director General	Responsibility for developing, establishing and supervising a telecommunications bureau to assist the Commission in carrying out its new responsibilities for regulating telecommunications carriers under federal jurisdiction.	SX-2
E. E. Boyd	Director General of Administration	Responsibility for administrative matters in the Commission including corporate and resource planning, personnel, finance and program planning, management services, operational review and audit, administrative services and information services.	SX-1
P. McDonald	Director General, Broadcasting Programmes	Responsibility for advising the Commission on station and network programming matters in television, cable television and AM and FM radio.	SX-1
D. Loftus	Director General, Broadcasting Operations	Responsibility for providing information, recommendations and advice to the Commission on policy, regulations and decisions which lead to strengthening and extending of the Canadian broadcasting system.	SX-1
C. C. Johnston	General Counsel to the Commission	Responsibility for the provision of legal advice to the Commission, for the development and enforcement of Commission regulations and for representing the Commission in all judicial proceedings.	LA-3

Order Paper Questions

CANADIAN AND FOREIGN WORKERS IN THE FILM INDUSTRY

Question No. 4,587—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. For films designated as Canadian, is it permissible for production companies to employ workers and, in particular, actors without furnishing prior proof that there are no Canadians suitable for and capable of filling such positions?

2. Have any negotiations been held with the responsible authorities in the United States with a view to permitting reciprocity of employment between the two countries for workers in the film industry and, if so (a) between whom, (b) on what dates, (c) what were the specific points raised by Canadian representatives, (d) with what results?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Such an arrangement would normally only apply to actors, except in the case of coproduction agreements.

2. No.

COMPANY TAKEOVERS

Question No. 4,602—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. In the takeover of Cornwall, Ontario welding apparatus assembly facility of Liquid Carbonic Canada Ltd/Ltée of Montreal by Victor Equipment Company of San Francisco what percentage of control will Victor Equipment Company of San Francisco, California which is wholly owned by the Pacific Lumber Company of San Francisco acquire?

2. What is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

3. Who were the principal shareholders of Liquid Carbonic Canada Ltd/Ltée of Montreal and what control, if any, will they retain in the company?

4. Who are the principal shareholders of Pacific Lumber Company of San Francisco and what are their holdings in the company?

5. Does Pacific Lumber Company of San Francisco control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by per cent of control and value?

6. What will be the effect of the takeover on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada, (b) resource processing in Canada, (c) utilization of parts components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada, (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada, (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada, (g) employment within Cornwall, Ontario welding apparatus assembly facility of Liquid Carbonic Canada Ltd. and within the industry?

7. (a) How many persons did Cornwall, Ontario welding apparatus assembly employ before the takeover, (b) how many are presently employed?

8. (a) What are the unions, if any, who represented the employees, (b) did they approve or disapprove of the takeover, (c) was their opinion sought?

9. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

10. How is the takeover (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the takeover?

11. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the takeover?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 3,954 answered on March 2, 1976.

[Mr. Fleming.]

COMPANY TAKEOVERS

Question No. 4,604—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. In the takeover of Ingersoll turkey processing facility of Checkerboard Foods Limited of Rexdale, Ontario controlled by Ralston Purina Ltd. of Canada which in turn is a wholly owned subsidiary of Ralston Purina Company of St. Louis, Missouri by Swift Canadian Co. Limited, of Etobicoke, Ontario, wholly owned by Swift & Co. of Chicago, Illinois, which is owned by Esmark Corp., what percentage of control will Swift Canadian Co. Limited acquire?

2. What is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

3. Who were the principal shareholders of Ralston Purina Company of St. Louis, Missouri and what control, if any, will they retain in the company?

4. Who are the principal shareholders of Esmark Corporation and what are their holdings in the company?

5. Do Esmark Corporation, of Chicago or Ralston Purina of St. Louis control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by per cent of control and value?

6. What will be the effect of the takeover on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada, (b) resource processing in Canada, (c) utilization of parts components, materials and services produced in Canada, (d) exports from Canada, (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada, (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada, (g) employment within Ingersoll turkey processing of Checkerboard Foods Limited and within the industry?

7. (a) How many persons did Ingersoll turkey processing of Checkerboard employ before the takeover, (b) how many are presently employed?

8. (a) What are the unions, if any, who represented the employees, (b) did they approve or disapprove of the takeover, (c) was their opinion sought?

9. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

10. How is the takeover (a) compatible, (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the takeover?

11. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the takeover?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 3,954 answered on March 2, 1976.

OFFER FROM JAMAICA TO SELL SUGAR TO CANADA

Question No. 4,609—**Mr. Herbert:**

Has an offer been received from Jamaica to sell sugar to Canada and, if so (a) from whom was it received, (b) what was the response?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Industry, Trade and Commerce has not received any communication from Jamaica offering to sell sugar to Canada. Of course, Canadian sugar refiners consider Jamaica as a source from which raw sugar can be purchased for refining in Canada. In 1974, imports of raw sugar from Jamaica were valued at $4.5 million. There were no imports of raw sugar from Jamaica in 1975.

LRC TRAIN SYSTEM

Question No. 4,916—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

How much has the government spent for the production of a LRC train system?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: The Government has contributed approximately $2.75 million toward the design, construction and testing of the LRC train system.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 3,685 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

CIDA—GRANTS TO FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES

Question No. 3,685—**Mr. Jones:**

1. How much has been loaned by CIDA to (a) francophone countries, (b) colonies of France in each year 1971 to 1975 (i) for what purpose (ii) at what interest rate (iii) to which countries?

2. How much has been granted by CIDA to (a) francophone countries, (b) colonies of France in each year 1971 to 1975 (i) for what purpose (ii) to which countries?

3. What was the basis and criterion followed for each loan and grant in Parts 1 and 2?

4. How much money has been loaned by CIDA to (a) anglophone countries, (b) countries which are not anglophone or francophone in each year 1971 to 1975 (i) for what purpose (ii) at what interest rate (iii) to which countries?

5. How much money has been granted by CIDA to (a) anglophone countries, (b) countries which are not anglophone or francophone in each year 1971 to 1975 (i) for what purpose (ii) to which countries?

6. (a) Is the President of CIDA anglophone or francophone, (b) what is his (i) ethnic background (ii) mother tongue?

7. What is the (a) ethnic background, (b) mother tongue, (c) salary for each person in the executive and management positions of CIDA?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the notice of motion for the production of papers No. 96 is acceptable to the government.

Economic Policy

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that notice of motion No. 96 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

LETTER OF RESIGNATION TENDERED BY MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS

Motion No. 96—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the resignation from the Cabinet tendered on or about March 12, 1976, by the Minister of Public Works, and a copy of the reply of the Prime Minister thereto.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notice of motion for the production of papers No. 79?

[*Text*]

COPIES OF ALL DOCUMENTS RELATING TO FEDERAL COST SHARING FOR MARINE SERVICE CENTRES

Motion No. 79—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all minutes of meetings, letters, telegrams between the government and the Province of Newfoundland as it relates to federal cost sharing on the current construction programme for marine service centres.

[*English*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, almost every activity the Department of the Environment and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion are involved in includes some sort of discussion with one or more of the provinces during the course of development or implementation of policies and programs. The release of documents exchanged during the preliminary discussion phase related to policies and programs would very probably be detrimental to the future conduct of federal-provincial relations. I would therefore request that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Marshall: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED CONTRADICTORY ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) moved:

That this House deplores the contradictory economic policies of the present administration, which have failed to enhance the growth and stability of Canadian employment and industrial production, which have not encouraged investment in industry and which have permitted a serious decline in our competitive position in international markets.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is a growing lack of confidence in the country. Under the present administration confrontation rather than co-operation has become the custom. Labour is uncertain; it is bewildered. Why else would some 15,000 union people come to Ottawa in protest, the largest demonstration in history? Businessmen have tried to maintain hope, but they hesitate to make the necessary capital commitments needed to ensure prosperity in the country.

Consumers have learned to spend today, and even to borrow in order to spend today as they have little confidence in what tomorrow may bring. Can such consumers, such businessmen and such labour be blamed for this attitude when in a very basic sense the administration has done little to defend our currency?

During the last eight years the value of the dollar as measured by the Consumer Price Index has fallen by 40 per cent in Canada, a direct result of the most prolonged period of inflation in our peacetime history. To maintain a strong dollar we must assure a vibrant inflation-free economy. The value of our dollar at any particular time is based on the condition of our domestic economy. Yet in the past eight years the administration has followed fiscal and monetary policies which have built strong inflationary forces into the structure of the economy itself. They have discouraged savings and capital investment in the private sector. Consequently, capital investment in Canada during this period has been one of the lowest of any major industrialized nation.

Rationalizations for administration failures have become more and more commonplace. It is only appearance which seems to count, not reality. Gestures are the order of the day rather than effective action. Policy in respect of the making of decisions is preferred to decision.

We are now told that as a result of the administration's approach to the economy, including controls, inflation may drop to 8 per cent this year. Why only 8 per cent? Certainly the Americans are doing better. Why can our target not be 5 per cent or, certainly, 6 per cent? With responsible economic planning at the federal level we could have significantly less than 8 per cent inflation in Canada this year. In fact until recently it was widely forecast that we would do much better than the administration now predicts.

In the summer of 1975, prior to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) taking office, prior to the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) control program, prior to the Liberal leader's musings at Christmastime, concerning a new society, and certainly prior to the so-called tight money policy, independent forecasts by eight of our most reputable financial institutions, including the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Nova Scotia, and Woods, Gordon and Company, predicted that inflation would be down to the 6 per cent range this year. And now the government is saying that 8 per cent is the target.

● (1520)

On that point I think it is interesting to review what the winter forecasts are of the institutions which were optimistic about a 6 per cent range of inflation for the current year. The Conference Board is now predicting that for 1976 our inflation might be as high as 10.5 per cent. The Bank of Montreal, instead of its summer prediction of 6 per cent inflation in 1976, is now stating it may be 9 per cent to 9.5 per cent. The Bank of Nova Scotia is now predicting an 8.8 per cent inflation, Woods Gundy are predicting 9.3 per cent inflation, Woods, Gordon and Company are predicting 8.1 per cent.

What went wrong? Why should we be faced, after so-called government action with an 8 per cent inflation when nine months ago such reputable institutions anticipated a 6 per cent level? Why should we be tolerating the administration's vague hope of less inflation when William Simon, the counterpart to our Minister of Finance, who is Secretary of the Treasury in the U.S. is confidently predicting a 2 per cent inflation in that country within the relatively near future?

The administration has consistently fallen short of its real growth projections. In November of 1974 we were told there would be a real growth of 4 per cent in the economy in 1975. It turned out to be barely zero. That 4 per cent loss represents $5.3 billion of a loss for the Canadian public, or $220 for every man, woman and child in this country. Last summer the Conference Board in Canada and the Bank of Montreal, for example, were confidently predicting that our growth this year would be 6.3 per cent. Already the government is conditioning us to less, stating it hopes we will reach 5 per cent this year. In this context our motion today deals with five deficiencies in the administration's approach to the economy.

First, its economic policies have been contradictory. I cite three examples. While we have been subjected to the wage and price control program designed to contain inflation, the administration has followed a counter productive fiscal and monetary approach.

The present administration preaches restraint, yet its own spending will increase this year by 20 per cent when main estimates are compared with main estimates annually. The money supply increased by 16.5 per cent in the 12 months ended January 1976, and the Minister of Finance now tells us it will be difficult to hold this year's increase to 13 per cent. The minister's approach seems to be to anticipate inflation and thus adjust the money supply to accommodate it rather then to contain inflation. With such an approach how could any control program work effectively?

Again, while the Foreign Investment Review Agency attempts to regulate foreign investment, we have found out that more than $4 billion in foreign capital was encouraged to enter the country in 1975 to finance our trade deficit. This capital was attracted by Canadian high interest rates and as a result of a change in the government's attitude to such borrowing. While debt is preferable to equity, the extent of Canada's obligations to foreign lenders is alarming. On this point governor Bouey of the Bank of Canada stated in the bank's annual report that such borrowing "could at some point prejudice a healthy expansion of the Canadian economy".

Not only do these borrowings run contrary to the spirit of the foreign investment review legislation, but we find that these heavy borrowings abroad have driven the Canadian dollar above parity with the U.S. dollar. If the exchange rate remains at this level serious damage could be done to our economy through the overpricing of our exports and the underpricing of our imports. With a trade

deficit of $5 billion it is time the administration stopped aggravating the situation.

Second, in our motion today we deal with the administration's failure to ensure meaningful employment growth. This is especially so in the manufacturing field. On average there were 65,000 less jobs in goods-producing industries in 1975 than in 1974. This decline came about because of a massive 73,000 jobs lost in manufacturing industries over the same period. On a 1974 to December 1975 basis there were 99,000 fewer jobs in manufacturing. The 1,905,000 employed in manufacturing industries in December, 1975, means there has been lower employment than in any month since March, 1973, and the year average employment has not been lower than this level since 1972.

Industrial production in Canada is the third disappointment. Canada's performance in industrial production is significantly worse than in most other industrialized nations. In a comparitive table found at page 67 in the March 19 issue of the *Economist*, Canada is listed with a sad 6 per cent decline in production last year, the worst record of the ten industrialized nations shown. More than that, our record was even worse than the record of the beleaguered United Kingdom which had a 2.5 per cent decline, and much worse than the United States increase of 4 per cent and Germany's jump of 5 per cent in the same period.

Our fourth point is that investment has been weak over the past several years, reducing Canada's employment generation capabilities and productivity. Investment capital has been difficult to raise, in part because of federal government actions in the area of the capital gains tax and the federal cash requirement of over $11 billion between 1975 and 1976, but it is mainly due to the government's inaction in not giving direction and leadership to the country.

As a result of such indecision, investment as a per cent of the gross national expenditure is now lower than in 1966. This confusion in government was highlighted last night when officials from Dome Petroleum told us of their nine year delay in receiving approval to start drilling for oil in the Beaufort sea, an area they were encouraged to develop almost a decade ago. This case is unfortunately typical of government frustration of business. Can we be surprised if many businessmen choose to go elsewhere than remain in Canada? The government should streamline its decision-making process.

In the case of Dome Petroleum, in spite of the fact that over $150 million of invested funds is at stake, that company has been required to deal with three ministers of the environment, each one requiring himself an education as to what the project is all about.

I would suggest that the administration should also review the effectiveness of the capital gains tax which the government is not even willing to estimate so far as its revenue production is concerned. Dealing with that I think it is important to note that an unofficial estimate of the total revenue in the last full year with respect to the total capital gains tax was only $70 million. Think of the red tape and the frustration to which the business community is being subjected for that type of revenue, for $70 million.

I believe the government should also consider measures to encourage the private sector to raise capital domestically. Employee stock ownership plans may be part of the answer. The administration should review this approach, which is really a democratization of our capital ownership system. It could well be that our income tax system should be changed to facilitate the development of such plans.

● (1530)

The government must take steps to reduce its impact on our capital markets. Speaking on this subject, Andrew G. Kniewasser, president of the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada, said this month in Guelph, and I quote:

> Last year, savings were channelled through our capital market in the following ways—debt financing for governments $13.8 billion, debt financing for corporations $4.3 billion, preferred equity with call features $300 million, new permanent capital (equity) $700 million.
>
> In other words, of the $19.1 billion of savings flowing into the Canadian capital market last year, governments absorbed 72 per cent, leaving 28 per cent for the private sector. The pattern of financing is remarkably unbalanced in that debt financing accounted for 96 per cent leaving only 4 per cent available for permanent capital to launch new businesses or to strengthen the financial base of existing firms.

Obviously governments should take less, and less should be channelled off in the form of bonds and debentures. New incentives should be offered to equity financing and existing disincentives removed.

The impact of the federal invasion of our capital markets is reflected by the staggering interest cost now carried by all Canadians. In 1977 it is estimated that this cost will be $4.7 billion, or $202 for every man, woman and child. The cost has jumped in the past two years more than the entire interest cost on federal debt when the Prime Minister first assumed his post. At that time the cost was $1.3 billion, a $63 load for every Canadian. As we just stand still, the cost of debt for previous spending sprees at the federal level is now 50 per cent of the total federal budget 10 years ago.

But what is $4.7 billion? None of us really can comprehend such a sum. I am reminded of a story which I believe appeared in *Reader's Digest* in which a man with $1 million gave his wife the money and told her to spend $1,000 per day. He found her back on his doorstep in less than three years. It was then pointed out that, if he gave her $1 billion, she would not be back for almost 3,000 years.

Mr. McCleave: That's what he had in mind.

Mr. Stevens: The fifth point in our motion deals with the serious decline in our position in international markets. We are fundamentally lacking in price competition in the manufacturing sector. In 1968 our merchandise trade had a surplus of $1.2 billion. Last year we were $1.7 billion in deficit. Most alarmingly, our manufactured goods were $6.5 billion in deficit compared with $900 million in 1968. In 1975 it was mainly our primary products which helped minimize our manufacturing deficit.

Wage inflation has undoubtedly played a key role in the deterioration of our manufacturing export trade. Canadian earnings as a percentage of the United States were 79 per cent in 1968 when the present administration took power. The percentage rose to 95 per cent in 1973, and last year it went over the American level and now stands at 105 per cent, based on last year's figures.

With this background, as I have outlined, it is discouraging that the response of the government is one of justifica-

tion, not one of rectifying the problems. Worse still, judging from the utterances of the leader of the Liberal Party, it is we who should conform to a lagging economy, not that the economy should be made more vibrant and prosperous to serve the people better. We Canadians are being conditioned to accept a standard of living less than our capability. It is a subtle conditioning, but it is there.

With no real growth in the economy, a per capita income now eighth in the world compared with second six years ago, and with the highest combined inflation and unemployment levels since Confederation, those in power would like to talk of other things. The new approach is: if you cannot reach your goals, then change your goals.

We are now told there is a limit to growth in Canada. The Prime Minister's control program is designed to whip us into line. Our Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) advises that we should use more powdered milk, for example, to offset the rising price of the fresh stuff. Our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) adds that we are eating too much meat and should shift to cheaper spaghetti and macaroni. Our expectations are said to be too high, and our natural resources are now found to be finite.

But to live is to grow, and as we lower our expectations so will we lower our achievements. Certain resources may be finite, but man's ingenuity is infinite. Canada, with its relatively small population and vast area, is unique in the world. We have the potential to be the wealthiest people on earth if we allow our resources to be harnessed through individual initiative.

To prosper, a nation needs fresh water, food, resources, energy and an educated population. We have them all. Canada has more lakes than the rest of the world combined, and about one third of the world's fresh water supply. In relation to our population we have more arable farm land, natural resources, and energy reserves than any other country. We certainly have a highly talented people. So why have we slipped? In my opinion we have slipped as we have subjected ourselves to undue bureaucratic control. Our growth in employment has been more in the unproductive sectors of the economy than the productive.

Most bureaucrats are quick to regulate, but slow to innovate. Left to government, our oilfields, our gas reserves and our potash industry would never have been developed to their present levels. Yet governments, in the name of progress, now stifle further advances through heavy taxation and regulation, and there are even plans to nationalize certain of our industries.

The greatest thing government could do is to stop expanding and to be explicit as to the future for those who wish to innovate and create. The people of Canada can create a vibrant economy once again, but government cannot do it for them. Such an economy would create jobs for Canadians in productive sectors. What a relief that approach would be compared with the present drift. But the worst may be yet to come.

Recently I was shown a paper which is now being reviewed by the Liberal caucus. It contemplates the substitution of a new, and I quote, "gross social product" index for the present gross national product figures. In future it is suggested that we calculate the contribution of the unemployed in our society, not just the employed. When we visit our neighbour it is suggested that that should be recorded in the new scale as a contribution to Canada. And of course, when we take a holiday, that in turn should be duly recorded as a plus for the nation. It is strange what some academic, bureaucratic and so-called liberal minds will turn to. It is even stranger that they are paid for their efforts out of our taxes. Canada was not built with such thinking, nor will such thinking help in the building of our future.

● (1540)

The nation has now reached a crossroads where we must decide between a more competitive, more open society or accept, perhaps irrevocably, a society in which the large decisions about our economic and personal welfare are made by a central government.

The past demonstrates that a system of free enterprise, despite its many flaws, is the most compatible with the protection of rights and liberties, as well as the most productive of material goods. Equally so, recent history shows that government, despite its splendid intentions, is incapable of matching the vitality, the wisdom, and the ingenuity of free men. Let us hope the present administration learns this simple truth soon. If it does confidence will return and we will have significantly less inflation and unemployment, with a higher real growth for all to share.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are not having a vote on this particular motion. While I agree with the content of the motion to the effect that the government does not know what it is doing, etc., the remarks I have just heard do not persuade me that the alternative is any better.

I think I have heard that speech before. It seems to me it was given in the late sixties or early seventies when the Liberal rump sat on this side of the House. This is the sort of criticism the Conservatives were making of the then government whose dollar had gone away up, a government that was in the grip of a high interest rate policy from the Bank of Canada, and was following a contradictory policy in that the monetary expansion was coupled with an easy fiscal policy. "Everything changes and yet nothing changes."

The subject matter of the motion is a very important and serious one, however, and should command our attention. This party has been formally committed to the idea of planning. I wish I had the same kind of faith that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) has in the free enterprise system and its ability to do all the right things to get our economy going.

We do not very often get examples of the problems with the free enterprise system because newspapers and critics generally, certainly the financial writers, love to point out that the waste that takes place in our society is almost entirely government waste. Their annual horror story is the Auditor General's report. More copy comes out of that when writers point out with glee all the errors committed by the government.

It is not very often that we read about the things that happen in the private sector and learn how costly they can

be. Recently, however, there has been quite a spate of stories about the kind of waste that takes place in the private sector, and about what happens when you have the kind of economy where people are allowed to pursue their own ends. If, as Adam Smith thought, the pursuit of those ends leads to some kind of intelligence and while the methods might not be desirable the objectives might be worth while, one would have some sympathy. But you find that people who are engaged in building shopping centres, for instance, are sighing with relief because money has dried up. They have had to build and yet have so many empty spaces in their shopping centres that it is hard for them to stay alive.

A headline in the *Globe and Mail* of March 19 reads: "Industrial leasing vacancies greatly exceed demand". All kinds of facilities have been built that are not being used, and all kinds of capital has been put into these things and it has now gone down the drain. Of course we will use them in the future. As the country grows I am sure these facilities will be required. In the meantime, and while the hon. member for York-Simcoe is complaining about the great inrush of capital and the resultant high interest rates that need to be maintained in order to get this capital, it is being wasted.

Another horror story appeared in the Toronto *Star* of March 23 relating to empty hotels. Under the heading "Empty hotels: a look at the biggest losers", the article says that in the city of Toronto in recent years three major hotels have been completed—Plaza II, The Prince, and Harbour Castle. The Harbour Castle is described thus, "Is the site a plus or a minus?", The Prince "The trial balloon didn't soar", and the Plaza II as "The hotel that hardly anyone knows about".

I do not have the exact figures on the other hotels but apparently The Prince cost $23 million. The city of Toronto does not need the hotels. The occupancy rate is something like 20 per cent or 30 per cent in these new hotels. Those are just a few reports that have appeared in the newspapers. Here we are talking about $50 million or $60 million when we cannot get enough money for housing, enough money for the manufacturing industries if we require to expand them, yet we are putting up these kinds of hotels.

I should like someone to explain how the private sector with all that comes to it through investors, is increasing the productivity of this country, or how putting up hotels that stand with empty rooms is increasing productivity. You might call it private waste and say it is their money and they can spend it as they will, but today it is everybody's money, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that when one group of people in our society use capital they are taking it away from some other use; to the extent it is important to the country when it has an effect on the exchange rate. These people are not islands, and what they do affects others.

If waste takes place it is not just the individuals involved who suffer or lose on their investments. Governments are deprived of revenue, and very often a loss of one commercial enterprise is written off against the profits of another. In fact the taxpayer becomes a partner to these losses and waste just as surely as he is to some of the things the Auditor General discusses in his reports. Waste is waste, Mr. Speaker, and it is one of the problems we run into today. I do not see how any modern society can proceed on the basis that the individual entrepreneur can handle the situation if he is left alone.

In the case of the Beaufort Sea the hon. member for York-Simcoe deplores the fact that environmentalists are entering the picture. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to take the environmentalists into account; they have to be heard. People are entitled to make representations. I should like to see these things expedited, but there was a time when we used to do things the way they were done in regard to the pipeline—a minister made up his mind, rammed legislation through parliament, and did not care about the consequences for the economy or the people affected by it. We know a little better today; it takes a little more time to get things done.

When it comes to the question of planning in the field of energy, private enterprise has demonstrated how totally bankrupt it is to meet the needs of the country. Then we talk about over investment. One of the reasons that interest rates are so high and ruinous to small businessmen is that we are talking about billions of dollars needed to provide energy in the future. This is a fine argument—we are running out of energy, and therefore the industry needs more profit in order to provide energy in the future.

A few years ago we were being told that we would never have to worry about energy supplies in our lifetime; we had so much that it was a sin to keep it in Canada. The total effort of people in the energy industry was directed toward persuading the government to allow them to increase their exports of gas and oil. They said we had so much energy to spare that it was an embarrassment to us. The government bought the idea. We exported fuel we ought not to have exported. We permitted overdevelopment in the industry. That should not have happened.

● (1550)

Let me remind the House of what happened in the early days of oil development and why we exported vast quantities of our oil. It was not enough that oil had been discovered in western Canada. We were not satisfied with letting one or two companies rationally service the Canadian economy. No, that was not good enough. People thought money could be made, and they rushed into the industry. The result was tremendous over capitalization in the oil industry, particularly in Alberta. The government of Alberta was forced to prorate production; at one time it prorated production at 35 per cent of well capacity, to restrict the amount of oil an individual operator could take out. You can see what caused the tremendous pressure for exports.

People had invested huge sums in our oil and gas industries. They had over invested. The capital was sitting there, not bringing the return people thought it should bring. They wanted to sell our oil and gas as quickly as possible, just to recover the excessive capital which should never have been invested in the industry in the first place. It was over developed.

To hear people talk, you would think this country suffers from a shortage of capital. This country does not suffer from a shortage of capital. In this country there is not enough rational use of capital. From that we suffer. The people of this country are known to save more money than

the citizens of any other country, except Japan. We have a reputation as savers of money. Surely we cannot carry on in future as we carried on in the past. If, in future, our people are allowed to invest huge sums of money in any industry haphazardly, without heeding the needs of other sectors of society, our goals will not be reached. There just is not enough money in the world for doing what we want if we take that kind of haphazard approach to energy development.

Energy is being developed in this country. At the moment Quebec is embarked on a multi-billion dollar hydroelectric project in northern Quebec. Manitoba has embarked on a somewhat smaller hydroelectric development. One hears talk of pipelines being built for oil and gas. Every time you turn round pipeline costs increase by millions of dollars. If we are spending all this money in these areas, how then can we expect to find enough capital to meet all our other requirements? We need to plan for the future. At present there is no such planning.

Let me show hon. members how capital is wasted in this country. This country is not short of capital. It misuses capital most criminally. If we are to meet future needs we shall require the government to plan the use of capital. Why do I say that? Some years ago we began a government enterprise known as Trans-Canada Air Lines. The government went into the air transport business because private entrepreneurs felt it was too risky, or would bring small returns. That government airline grew until it became Air Canada, one of the finest airlines in the world.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: That was too much for the government. Here was a government enterprise operating successfully. It was more than the federal government of the day could stand. It looked for some way to correct the situation, for some way of killing the airline. Well, a previous Conservative government found a way of killing it. It allowed a competitor to compete with Air Canada, the government-owned airline which was doing a fine job, returning money on investment and providing suitable service across this country. A competitor was allowed. What was the result? Air Canada did not make as much money. Aircraft were used inefficiently. Now, both Air Canada and CP Air have an overcapacity of seats.

The situation has degenerated; now CP Air magnanimously says, "We do not mind embarking on joint efforts with Air Canada so that we can rationalize our purchasing, flights, and use of capital." But capital was used rationally when only Air Canada was the large operator in Canada. Introducing a competitor in the air served no useful purpose. Probably in the end we shall need to take over both airlines and operate them as one airline.

We did much the same with our railroads. One railroad was not good enough. We needed two, one to compete with the other, in order to preserve the myth that one is privately, the other publicly owned. The publicly owned railroad has to bear the costs of passenger service, whereas the CPR is not under that obligation to the same extent. It is free to carry more profitable cargoes. The CNR, being saddled with higher costs, is forced to apply for government loans. The CPR, which does not carry as many passengers, is said to be more profitable. People should remember that.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

The point is that Canada is a large country, and transportation is important in holding it together. That has always been true. Therefore why do we need competition in our modes of transport? Or why should one mode be forced to compete with another? Why do we need two airlines, one competing with the other? When we disembarked from one mode, say at a station, why must we travel to another part of town to embark on another mode? Arrangements of this kind destroy confidence in the utility of transportation.

People talk of our great capital requirements in the future. We do not want to import large quantities of capital. Surely, therefore, we ought to co-ordinate our transport systems, to make sure that one system does not duplicate the efforts of another. We do not need two modes of transport doing the same thing, carrying the same goods. These things ought to be done by co-ordination and co-operation, not by competition. Really, competition in transportation brings few benefits.

I know that businessmen like to think that competition in transport is good. Some of them think that any government-run operation is not worth a damn; therefore when they travel by private carrier they please their ego, their own philosophy. Such attitudes are not based on fact. Some businessmen insist on travelling by private carrier. But the majority of our people are quite satisfied with Air Canada service. The vast majority must pay the shot so that a few in this country can choose to satisfy their vanity or ideology. That is madness.

The United States has concluded that competition between similar modes of transport is not beneficial. It was harder for the people of that country to reach that conclusion. Now they know that, no matter if people travel by train or air, the transport system must be planned rationally. They are moving in the direction of the planned transport system and away from the private enterprise pattern advocated by the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

I do not disagree with much that the hon. member said. In many areas of society private enterprise can perform a most valuable service. In many areas of society private enterprise is useful and should be encouraged. My argument does not constitute a blanket condemnation of the private sector. I say to the hon. member for York-Simcoe that we shall not meet the challenge of the future if we permit the anarchy of the market place. Many things benefit from competition, but many things are destroyed by competition. That is the kind of choice we have to make. I was hoping that in his well prepared and sincerely delivered address he would have shown a recognition of that fact, that what we need today is planning.

● (1600)

Planning does not mean that you do every little thing in the economy, that you plan everything to the last detail. The mind of man and the computers at his disposal are not of such accuracy that all these things can, should or need to be done. One of the jobs of planning is to know which things are important and of such magnitude to the economy that they should be part of government and public responsibility, and which things can be safely and more efficiently left to competition in the market place. That is the first job of planning, to say which things are which,

and not to undertake everything. You can then get the benefits of both systems. You can have competition where competition has some merit and provides some benefits, but you also get the benefit of planning public ownership and coordination, where that is obviously the way in which we have to go.

I guess I should have not been surprised. I should have anticipated that my colleagues on my right feel that our tax system has been too onerous for businessmen, that we should get rid of the capital gains tax and that the whole Carter report was a mistake, even as little of it as the government implemented. In fact it was most unkind of the hon. member for York-Simcoe to degrade the government over its lack of response to businessmen. I cannot think of any government that has been more generous to businessmen or has given more away than this government in the last number of years.

Because it said we had to make our business in Canada more competitive, the government brought in two main tax measures. It reduced the corporation tax to one of the lowest in the western world. It gave valuable concessions in the way of depletion and depreciation allowances. Those were very, very generous concessions. When successive ministers of finance answered why they were giving these great benefits to business in Canada, they said it was in order to be competitive, to provide jobs, to provide the investment and capital that are needed to create employment.

We have now gone through two or three years of this corporate bum era. Where is the great prosperity that was promised this country as a result of these tax concessions to business? Where is the employment the government said would be created if we would only let business hang on to its profits, and be generous with depreciation allowances? Where is it? We do not have the employment and we do not have the investment. It is not that they have not made the money, it is that they have not used the money.

We argued that if you want to stimulate the economy you should give the money to the people who want to buy things and let business respond to that, instead of giving the money or concessions to business. There are times when in fact concessions to business may be valuable, but not in the period of time we have gone through when most businesses have idle plant capacity. The idle plant capacity in Canada is something around 20 per cent. There is hardly a factory in this country that could not increase its production by 20 per cent if there were the demand or market for its products. That demand or market only comes from people making the purchases they want to make.

The government promised there would be a survey of the consequences of those tax concessions. It did a survey. It asked something like, "Would you like to have these concessions continued?" One would have expected unanimous agreement from the people involved saying "Of course, we want these continued", giving a story about how great the benefits have been from these tax concessions. Instead, the results of the survey that came back were unfavourable. Of 1,014 companies surveyed, only 67 bothered to respond. A follow-up survey indicated the companies which failed to respond had a zero impact on their operations as a result of these tax measures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may only continue with consent. Does the House agree that the hon. member may continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much time of the House. I know there are other members who wish to speak. I will conclude my remarks by summing up the point I was trying to make.

I agree with what the hon. member for York-Simcoe said about the chaotic state of our economy, the absence of planning, and how everything is going off in different directions. However, I also disagree with the hon. member. I call upon this House to recognize that we cannot go back to the kind of situation that got us into the present mess.

The fault of the government is that it has in fact listened to the kind of advice that the hon. member for York-Simcoe has been giving, namely, "keep your cotton picking hands off the economy and leave it to those of us who know more about running it than you". That has been happening, and it has made a mess of things.

The government has interfered in the economy to some extent. I do not think its efforts have been all that great. Ministers really do not have that much confidence in government interference. That is probably the reason why none of these things have worked. It is as though the government had a death wish about its own creature, not wanting it to work.

I do not think we can go back to the simple model of an eighteenth or nineteenth century economy. Our resources are much too scarce for that. The challenges facing the country are much too great. Therefore if the government is to be condemned, and I think it should be condemned, it is because it has been derelict in its duty, not using its brains to anticipate the problems, and not doing intelligent planning to make the best use of our resources.

● (1610)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, again I have the great pleasure to intervene in this debate and congratulate the sponsor of this motion who denounces anew a reality that is unfortunately very obvious. In fact there are so obvious inconsistencies in government policies that we really wonder how such policies can be seriously established.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we study the matter in depth to find out for what actual motives or reasons this government formulates such policies we realize that those inconsistencies are created by the obstination of the government to maintain a totally inadequate system as a basis for those policies. So is it not surprising that we wish to fight inflation and that we accept higher unemployment as a consequence of this fight against inflation.

Of course, we do so without mentioning it as it would not be politically profitable. But facts are facts. We also accepted escalating prices developing into real inflation because a few years ago the problem had nothing to do with our production capacity or the quantity of products

we could have at our disposal. The problem was rather the disposal of our products but, systematically, through inconsistent economic policies we artificially created inflation and it became a fact.

Recently the Bank of Canada anounced a rise in interest rates which, of course, will be reflected in all chartered banks in the country. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, production should be increased but we design a policy that will systematically prevent industry from producing; we notice the same inconsistencies in all areas because the government's economic experts never even dreamed of getting off the beaten track to find out why the system did not work. How is it that we have to face inflation every two or three decades? How did this come about? Is it because the country has less potential? Is it because Canada has run out of natural resources? No, I do not think that there is a single hon. member in the House who would question Canada's potential, its productive capability, the availability of its natural and human ressources which are plentiful.

In fact we have 800,000 unemployed persons. Are not those 800,000 jobless workers prepared to participate in the production which we require? No, they are not, because, once again, governmental measures are conflicting with one another. We import goods that we could manufacture here. My hon. friends opposite ought to check on their shirt collars if their garments were made in Japan, Korea or China. Mr. Speaker, is not Canada capable of producing clothes for Canadians?

An hon. Member: Where does your necktie come from?

Mr. Matte: Clearly this is contradictory. Instead of enquiring about the origin of my necktie, the hon. member opposite should address himself to my objection. How in this country larger than the United States with their 250 million people, how in a country larger than the whole of Europe but with only 24 million people, how can we have 800,000 unemployed? This is a scandal. A government that accepts such a situation dwells in contradiction.

Let us reform the system, let us produce neckties when we need them. It is as simple as that. And let us simply ask the questions that are pertinent: First, do we have what is needed to produce food? This evidently is the first question. The second question is: What do we need for clothing? The third question is: What do we need for housing. If we have the materials, the manpower, the know-how to compute, plan and coordinate the whole thing, it is stupid to say we have no money. No engineer will ever say that bridges are built with money. They are built with steel, with concrete, with cement, with stone. You build a bridge with all that and with labour, but not with money.

We therefore say that a system must face bankruptcy if it gives money some other value than the one it has or should have. Because we hold on to the same system, we are regularly confronted with the ups and downs of the vicious circle of inflation, unemployment, high interest rates.

Obviously the more you prevent industry from developing, the more unemployment there is. And the government go on floundering in this, simply because they will not consider changing the system.

Obviously when it is realized this does not work, why not try another way? I therefore feel the motion is up to the point, except maybe for the last suggestion "which have permitted a serious decline in our competitive position in international markets." I have some reservations about that, because we should stop explaining everything through world trends. Everytime there is a problem like inflation, for instance, the government say, it is is a world problem.

At this point, they say: why not do this or that? Oh, the international market, that must be closely watched. In other words, instead of saying: let us produce what we can produce, when that is impossible because we do not have what is necessary to produce, let us call in the international market, but only then. We should not believe those who say that everything must be based on the balance of trade, on international trade, and that we should be willing to sacrifice ourselves for others. To those who think that we should always watch that trade balance I would ask what that thing is made of.

Mr. Speaker, I would like them to answer the following question: why do Communist China and the USSR buy wheat from Canada? Because of the trade balance? It is because they need it; because they have not produced enough cereals in their own countries to feed their people. They do not buy our wheat just to please us. That is certainly not the reason. And why do Americans buy our pulp wood? Because they have newspapers with circulations in the millions, and they need paper to do that. That is all. They do not buy our paper to please us. And when one argues about inflation seen as a world phenomenon, we must protect our international balance of payments. That, we must protect. Let us buy butter from New Zealand while penalizing our own producers in Canada. What a lot of contradictions!

The member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) denounces these contradictions and he is right. But to find a remedy to these problems, which I understand, the government will have to change the system otherwise we will be facing the same problems. We know we can change it and our party leader (Mr. Caouette) has been saying so for 40 years. This reminds me that when I was a teacher—I was a teacher for 13 years—I learned that one had to repeat the same thing over and over but when a pupil still did not understand, we knew we were dealing with a "dummy". It seems that some people are so stupid they cannot understand such elementary things.

I suggest that the economic policy must be developed in such a way as to enable us to ask ourselves: What are the requirements of Canada? What is our physical capacity to meet these requirements? And the third point is self-evident: The problem only lies in financing. Well, we only have to vote the necessary supplementary estimates to meet this financing. It is as simple as that. But the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) answers me that if we grant interest-free loans to foreign countries, there is no such thing as interest-free loans, and in order to make such loans to India, Ceylon, Bangladesh, we must make borrowings that bear interest.

Well, when a prime minister speaks in such a way without being ashamed of himself, I say he is "stuck" in his own contradictions, his own system. This is why he is

being blamed today. It is true, I know, that there is nothing the government can do. Even my friends on my right could not do anything about it if they had the power, unless they recognized it is necessary to start right now reforming and restructing the economic system. Only then shall we logically fight against inflation, otherwise we will continue to flounder in contradictions, like those mentioned in the motion before us today.

● (1620)

[*English*]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in responding to the motion this afternoon I should like to address myself to a number of points; first to a view of recent Canadian economic performance and government policies which have been involved in that; second, to talk about Canada's competitive position; third, to pass under review some of the statements of the official opposition in the same time period that we have set out these various policies; and then, as a fourth element, to talk about the post-controls period and address some remarks in particular to the decision made by leaders of the Canadian Labour Congress yesterday not to participate in the very necessary role of planning that we would have to do for future policy change in the post-controls period.

First, with regard to the Canadian economic performance and government policy I would call, in response to the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), on a number of economic authorities, private and public, Canadian and foreign, who have commented favourably on a comparative basis on the course of economic events in Canada in comparison with the situation in a world which has generally been in economic turmoil.

It has been demonstrated, beyond any shadow of doubt, by countless numbers of independent economic bodies, both at home and abroad—for example the OECD, the Howe Research Institute, the University of Toronto's Institute for Quantative Analysis, the Economic Council of Canada, and most recently in the annual report of the Governor of the Bank of Canada—that in recent years this country has out-performed virtually every other industrial nation in terms of employment, output, and capital investment.

Indeed the most outstanding fact that emerges from developments of the past few years is the extent to which Canada, despite its vulnerability as a major trading nation, has succeeded in maintaining relative economic stability at a time when the rest of the world was plunged into the worst recession of the post-war period.

As the Governor of the Bank of Canada has noted in his annual report for 1975, real gross national product in Canada during this period declined by only 1½ per cent during the course of the recession, a decline which compared to a fall of 5¼ per cent in West Germany and more than 6½ per cent in the United States.

The Governor also noted that:

> Canada and Japan were the only major industrial countries in which the over-all output of goods and services at the end of 1975 appeared to be as high as it was before the recession began.

I would refer the hon. member for York-Simcoe to the charts on pages 24 and 25 of the bank's annual report where he will find a graphic illustration of the extent to which Canada has out performed the United States in terms of maintaining output, employment, and business investment in recent years.

In its 12th annual report the Economic Council pointed out that few countries have escaped the adverse impact of inflation and unemployment in recent years. But as the council pointed out:

> The Canadian economy managed quite well under the circumstances, with better price and growth performance than most other industrial countries.

In its economic outlook last December the OECD forecast that the "path of recovery in Canada is likely to follow that of the United States, but by end-1976 the level of activity, in relation to the previous peak, may be higher for Canada than for other major OECD countries".

As I have had occasion to emphasize on other occasions, the fact that output, employment, and business investment held up better in Canada than in practically any other country, notwithstanding the seriously adverse effect on our economy of a sharp decline in critically important export sales as a result of deep and prolonged recession, is not something that just happened. To a very considerable extent it has been the result of a whole range of government policies and programs aimed at preventing the real personal income of Canadians from being seriously eroded by the impact of rising prices and unemployment. May I just say here I refer to the indexing and cuts in personal income taxes, sales tax cuts and tariff reductions, indexing and increases in old age security and guaranteed income supplements, family allowances, veterans pensions, subsidies on some basic foodstuffs and imported oil, and the automatic stabilizer provided through generous benefits provided under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

These measures were reinforced by changes in corporate taxation policies, and other measures which have been aimed at sustaining business investment and housing construction at a high level.

While I would concede there was virtually no growth in Canada's real GNP in 1975, that was the result almost entirely of the slump in export sales because of recession abroad, a development naturally over which we had little or no control. The impact of the policies initiated by the government to sustain the economy are apparent in the figures relating to final domestic demand here in Canada for goods and services which rose last year by 3.5 per cent.

As the central bank's annual report noted in comparing the Canadian and U.S. performance during 1975:

> The major difference between the two economies was the extent to which final domestic demand was sustained in Canada. Here, the volume of domestic spending on final goods and services continued to advance, whereas in the United States it fell by over 4 per cent.

Despite the slowdown in the economy brought on by recession abroad, the rise in unemployment in this country by comparison with most other nations has been relatively small even though in absolute terms, in the view of the government, it is still at an unacceptably high level.

I think it is important to emphasize at this point that, for reasons of the age and structure of our population, Canada has the fastest growing work force of all industrial nations. There are more young people coming to working

age in this country than in any other industrialized country. Our relatively better performance on this front is due to the fact that employment has continued to grow relatively strongly despite the adverse circumstances confronting the economy. In February, for example, the number of Canadians with jobs was up by nearly 300,000 over the level a year ago, which is an increase of 3.2 per cent, somewhat above the long-term trend of growth we have experienced over the past decade.

Now, I should like to address just a few remarks to the question of Canada's international competitiveness. What about the allegation that our so-called contradictory policies have contributed to a decline in Canada's competitive position? I do not for a moment deny that our international competitive position was in danger of becoming seriously jeopardized. That, of course, is why the government moved last October to launch a major national anti-inflation program with the co-operation of the provinces, to bring under control the domestically generated cost-price spiral that threatened to undermine our competitive position at home and abroad.

The developing problem of a domestically generated cost-price spiral, which by last year was rapidly becoming the primary source of inflationary pressure in Canada, was in no small measure the result of the success of government policies and programs aimed at minimizing the impact on the Canadian economy and the Canadian people of inflation and recession abroad.

● (1630)

Had Canada followed the course of a number of other countries and allowed inflation and recession abroad to erode the real income of Canadians and their real power to purchase goods and services, we in this country would also have suffered a massive recession and a massive increase in unemployment. In those circumstances we undoubtedly would have experienced substantially less upward pressure on costs and prices. But we, for our part, were determined to search for a means which would enable us to bring prices and incomes in this country under control without the imposition of severe hardship on the Canadian people in terms of output, employment, and real incomes.

I hope that during the course of this debate the official opposition will let us know whether the Conservative party believes we should have resorted to severe recession as a means of preventing the build-up of domestic cost-push pressures. As the House is aware, we sought over a period of many months to develop a consensus among the major groups in our economy in support of voluntary restraint of prices and incomes. When that effort proved to no avail, we finally found ourselves with no choice but to impose mandatory restraints on the major groups in the economy in order to bring inflation under control without at the same time jeopardizing our prospects for the revival of healthy economic growth.

I should like to address myself now to one of the phrases in the motion of the hon. member in which he refers to "contradictory economic policies of the present administration." I should like to cite some of the policies he and his colleagues have advocated over the same period of time which I passed under review with regard to the economy to see where the contradiction lies.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Where, for example, does the Conservative party stand on the broad thrust of fiscal and monetary policy? Does it believe it should be more expansionary, or more restrictive? Let us take a few random declarations by various Conservative spokesmen to see if we can how they approach this question.

First, almost exactly a year ago, on March 26, 1975, the hon. member for York-Simcoe, who moved the present motion, was quoted in the Toronto *Star* as complaining that the November, 1974, budget produced by my predecessor did not provide "sufficient stimulus to the economy and a new budget is needed—It's needed now more than ever". Then we find that the same member, speaking in the debate following the budget of June, 1975, a budget incidentally which did add to the net stimulus being injected into the economy, had completely reversed his position. He contended that major cuts should be made in government spending to reduce both the government's budget deficit and its cash deficit, the effect, of course, being to reduce rather than add to the stimulus of the government's economic policy.

On October 25, 1975, the Conservative financial critic was again quoted by the Toronto *Star* on the occasion of his entry into his party's leadership race, and at that time he warned that his fellow Conservatives would vote against the government's price and income restraint program unless it was accompanied by more monetary and fiscal restraint.

What is the position of the Conservative Party? Well, a new note of confusion was injected by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), one of the intellectual leaders of the group on the other side and a privy councillor on the front benches, on December 19, 1975, when he warned that the economy was heading into recession and urged the government to adopt more expansionary policies. But on January 6, 1976, another front bencher, the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies), the former financial critic, appeared to reverse the field when he indicated that he was in favour of more restrictive economic policies, particularly in his advocacy of a balanced federal budget.

On March 1, 1976, the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), now the leader of that party, was quoted in the *Financial Times* as demanding during the course of his own leadership campaign that the government must set a dramatic example of restraint by sharply reducing the rate of growth of the money supply and the growth of government spending.

On the basis of those remarks a reasonable man might reasonably conclude that the Conservative Party now believes, in contrast to the position—and the hon. member for York-Simcoe supports this—of the hon. member for York-Simcoe of a year ago, that the government should have adopted highly restrictive fiscal and monetary policies, reflected in a balanced budget and money supply growth trimmed to the long term growth potential of the economy of around 5 per cent. Were we today following such a policy prescription, the Canadian economy today would still be in the grips of a critically severe recession. Output would have fallen to catastrophic levels, unemployment would likely have risen to the double-digit level, the real incomes of Canadians would be very much lower than

they are today, many more companies would now be in bankruptcy than has been the experience, and the profits of other Canadian firms generally would be very much lower, and business capital investment would be very much lower indeed.

Those are the certain and inevitable consequences of the fiscal and monetary policies—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would permit a question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would be delighted to do so, but since I have only 30 minutes I think I should be entitled to finish my speech and then entertain a question.

I would just remind the House that this policy prescription, which I consider a prescription for disaster, is directly contrary to the course that almost every other industrial nation has adopted over the course of the past several months, namely, that of expanding their fiscal and monetary policies in an effort to pull their economies out of the deep recession into which they plunged.

What of the Conservative position on the question of price and income restraint? I am sure it is not necessary to recount that story of conflict and contradiction at any length. But I might briefly recall the official opposition's advocacy of comprehensive wage and price controls early in 1973 at a time when they clearly would have been totally ineffective in holding back the tidal wave of inflation sweeping around the globe.

Indeed the election campaign waged by the Conservative party in favour of controls in 1974—and incidentally the restrictive monetary, fiscal and consumer credit policies also advocated by the Conservative leader—was at a time when the world was heading into a recession. Then we have the incredible admission in a speech to the Toronto Kiwanis Club on September 3, 1975, by the Conservative architect of controls, the hon. member for Don Valley, that the proposal had lost any validity it might have had when world oil prices were quadrupled, but the party refused to alter its position despite its obvious absurdity.

Finally, we had the spectacle of the official opposition having voted in this House for the bill on second reading and then voting against the third reading of the Anti-Inflation bill because it would have been in effect some months longer than originally proposed by the Conservative party during the 1974 election campaign.

I suggest that this motion condemning the government for failing to follow policies which enhance growth and stability, coming from a party which has urged the adoption of measures that would have had the certain consequence of plunging the economy into severe recession, and coming as it does from a party which has opposed the present national undertaking to restore Canada's competitive position, cannot have been made seriously by the hon. member.

They cannot have it both ways. They cannot stand in this House and on platforms across the country and advocate drastically restrictive fiscal and economic policies which would cripple output, employment, and real incomes in Canada, and at the same time argue with any credibility that the expansionary policies we have pursued have hampered the growth and stability of the Canadian economy. They cannot at one moment stand in this House and demand that the growth of the money supply be sharply curtailed, as is so often heard in this House, and at the next rise to deplore rising interest rates which are the inevitable consequence in the short term of efforts by the central bank to moderate the growth of the money supply. They cannot deplore the current level of unemployment and at the same time advocate restrictive economic policies that would drive it infinitely higher.

The final point I should like to make is with regard to the withdrawal of the Canadian Labour Congress from federal consultative bodies such as the Economic Council and the Canada Labour Relations Council. What this will mean is that the formal leadership of the Canadian labour movement will not participate in the discussion on policy making at the critical point when we are considering what policy changes are appropriate for the post-controls period.

● (1640)

The chairman of the CLC at the meeting 72 hours ago suggested that the labour movement looks forward to further consultations on the question of the post-controls period, and we would welcome further consultations. We suggest to him that he and his colleagues should reconsider the decision to withdraw from the federal consultative bodies, which would facilitate that kind of consultation on the changes to take place. Indeed we found it rather contradictory that just 24 hours after the chairman of the CLC had complained that labour was not being consulted sufficiently, or had complained that the consultations which were taking place were not occurring with the business community there, after those two expressed complaints made 300 feet away in the Railway Committee Room of this House, we found the council as a whole retiring from two important groups, the Economic Council of Canada and the Canada Labour Relations Council.

The French have a very wise maxim that "les absents ont toujours tort", those who are absent are always wrong. In discussions in the coming months leaders of organized labour risk putting themselves in a position of not being able to participate in these discussions and not being able to add their experience to these discussions. That is not to say that organized labour will be without representation in these discussions.

I myself and my colleagues who represent members of organized unions will have a full opportunity to participate, in our weekly contacts with our constituents, with the thousands of members of the labour movement with whom we meet on a regular basis. Indeed it is clear that the leadership of individual unions will be continuing to seek contact with the Government of Canada on these important questions. But I say—and I say it not in anger—that the country and the over-all membership of organized labour stand to benefit from the participation of their leaders, talented leaders in this field, in the kind of decisions that we as a country have to agree upon, and therefore it is important that we should have the opportunity again of being able to consult effectively with them. I hope they will reverse their decision.

I should like to say a final word with regard to the efforts of my colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro), with regard to the Canada Labour Relations Council. He embarked on this endeavour of trying to bring together the two sides of the collective bargaining equation to attempt to reverse the trend which has existed in Canada of a great number of work days being lost in the last several years. There were close to 10 million work days lost in 1975 and a very serious record of work days lost in 1974. I think that anybody involved in these particular discussions would have to acknowledge that neither the working man himself, nor his family, nor those who live in his community and provide him with services, nor the industries for which he works, nor the economy of the country generally will benefit from a continuation in Canada of that kind of collective bargaining environment in which 10 million work days a year are lost. That is not only lost income to the individuals in question, it is a loss to the economy of the productive services of these many Canadians.

We are a well endowed country both in resources and in the talent of our people, but we cannot afford continuing to lose 10 million work days a year. This is too much for any economy to bear. Therefore measures have been taken by the minister of Labour to try to change the environment in which these discussions take place and try to change the structure of these discussions. This can only be for the benefit not just in the broader interest of Canada but of the working man himself, and it is for that reason, I hope, that we may again resume these discussions within the Canada Labour Relations Council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I must, first of all, comment on the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). Basically I was disappointed by the hodge-podge of new and old statistics which he called to his use in defense of the mismanagement of the Canadian economy which we have witnessed in the past year and a half or two years.

I was surprised by his remarks, toward the end of his speech, regarding the collective bargaining process. Perhaps one could gather from these remarks that some time in the future we will be seeing substantial changes in the collective bargaining process in Canada. Were I a union leader or one deeply involved in the trade union movement, I would be very concerned and I would want to know a great deal more about the government's intentions in that regard because the action which the government takes can either lead to further disharmony within our labour force or, perhaps, bring about greater harmony. But certainly if this misunderstanding continues for very long it is apt to lead to a worsening situation rather than an improvement. If we lost 10 million labour days last year, we may well have more days lost in the months ahead, particularly if the impasse continues much longer.

The motion before the House deals with the contradictory economic policies of the government. The minister dealt lightly with that in attempting to embarrass the Conservative party. He asked how one could have low interest rates if there was a tight money policy. That has been the complaint on this side of the House. We have had high

interest rates and a high rate of growth of the money supply, and we have not benefited. If we are going to have a high rate of growth of the money supply, then the country should benefit from low interest rates. But the government has chosen the deliberate policy of having high interest rates, not because of any curtailment of the money supply, and that is the error in the minister's remarks and in the contradictory figures which he used.

Mr. Saltsman: It is not an easy thing to do.

Mr. Horner: It is the deliberate policy of the Bank of Canada to have high interest rates. The hon. member from the NDP made a speech and you would think his party was the mother of planning. If you took the word "planning" out of his speech, not much would be left in it. I am not much of a capitalist but I believe that anyone who has tried hard to earn capital does a little planning about how to spend it.

I look at some of the failures in the government's planning—and here one does not have to look only at Canada, one can take a look at Great Britain where the master planner of all master planners threw his hands up in the air and said "I am quitting". He has left the scene of action completely. We could take a look at some of the socialist provinces in Canada to see how their planning has got them out of trouble, but I do not think that we in this House have to go that far.

We have a master planner in the Department of Transport. Formerly he was in charge of the Wheat Board and he brought in a planning program called operation LIFT, which cost the prairie farmers around $600 million. That was his master planning. We have also seen master planning in CEMA to cut back production in Ontario to 62 per cent of capacity. I suppose that overproduction would be wasteful in the eyes of the minister. We have seen master planning in the dairy industry, and we have seen excessive build ups of wrong products. No, planning alone is not the answer.

● (1650)

In order to control inflation we must recognize the fact that we must increase productivity, manage our money supply with a great deal of care, and cut back on wasteful government expenditures. The Minister of Finance talked about people in the Conservative Party wanting the government to cut back on government expenditures. We want the government to cut back on wasteful, unnecessary and excessive government expenditures.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: That will not in any way greatly harm economic conditions within Canada, but it will lower the debt load, lower the demand upon the capital market by government, and allow private enterprise to use more of the money which should be available to it to do the things which will provide more and more jobs for Canadians. Last year our country had to bring in something like $4 billion. This year it is estimated that government borrowings will cause an input of foreign capital into Canada at the rate of $5 billion, and this has the tendency to keep our dollar above par with the United States. Many may think that is a good thing, but it is very detrimental to the

possibility of our trading in manufactured goods, and this is what this motion deals with today.

The *Financial Post* of March 13 clearly spelled out big deficits, calling for retooling of trade policies. It pointed out that Canada's slump on the manufacturing trade front is getting worse. Canada ran up an $8.2 billion deficit last year, $1 billion worse than the year before. The article goes on to describe the difficult position in which Canada finds itself. How will we get out of that difficult position? Rather than the dollar increasing in value in relation to the American dollar, it should be decreasing. That might increase the cost of foreign goods, but it would allow our Canadian manufactured goods to search out and find markets which are available.

The Minister of Finance blamed the slump in our trade picture on world economic conditions. World economic conditions are not as bad as he suggested they might be. In fact the economies of Europe and the United States are improving at a much more rapid rate than that of Canada right now, and yet our trade picture, particularly with regard to manufactured goods, is not at all encouraging.

On the question of contradictory economic policies, the government has come out with high interest rates, a high growth money supply, and a high growth in government spending. On his famous telecast the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) suggested that the government is going to cut back on the growth of government spending. It will be limited this next year to 15.2 per cent. Government spending contradicts other policies and encourages inflation.

The government has come along with a poor application of what I call wage and price controls. It is a poor application because these controls do not freeze food prices, the cost of housing, the cost of energy, the cost of transportation, the cost of money, or the cost of imported goods. These are the six major commodities which fall within what we might call the desires of the average consumer in purchasing and carrying on a business or livelihood within this country. The cost of living for the average person may well continue to rise because of the things the government is doing and the things the government is not doing.

We certainly will have a freeze on wages, and it does not take a financial genius to realize that somewhere down the road, perhaps in the middle of 1976, the ordinary, average worker, whether unionized or not, will find that he cannot keep pace with the cost of living, and he will find himself financially worse off than he was the year before.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: There are steps the government could be taking. There could be a cutting down on federal and provincial government borrowings outside Canada. I think borrowing outside Canada is only being done because to some extent interest rates are too high in Canada, and it is less expensive to borrow outside Canada. Foreign countries are prepared to invest in Canada because of our high interest rates, which are artificially held so high because of the action of the Governor of the Bank of Canada.

I think we must also concern ourselves with our energy picture and our energy needs. What has the government done to encourage further development of our energy resources? We are now a net importer of oil. We are still exporting something in the neighbourhood of 500,000 barrels per day, but we import about 700,000 barrels per day. We are a net importer, but the sale of that oil still does help our balance of payments and our trade picture.

The minister stated how well Canada's trade picture compares with other countries. Our trade picture did as well as it did in the last year purely because we were able to export our raw materials, our agricultural products, oil, gas, minerals and lumber. If we had not had a market for raw materials we would have been in a severe economic recession. We were able to export those raw materials through no good policies of the government. In fact many of the policies of the government made it even more difficult for those products to be exported.

What we need is for the government to create a climate where business can operate with some degree of confidence that conditions will remain the same for the next year, the next six months, or even the next three months. There has not been that degree of confidence in the government in the past couple of years. Business has become edgy, hesitant, and worried about investments.

The minister brought in an anti-inflation program under which he was going to freeze dividends, and then the next week he took that freeze off dividends. He brought in a tax on export profits, and then somehow or another that was negotiated away. Business does not know where it stands. Canadians are taking their savings out of Canada and investing them in the United States. That is not a healthy thing to see. They are forced to do that because they have no confidence in what the government is planning economically for the country.

It is the duty of the government to create a healthy economic climate. This climate cannot be created if economic policies are contradictory. A climate of growth and stability cannot be created when governments are changing their minds every other day.

The Minister of Finance quoted out of context some of the suggestions made by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). He only has to look at his own cabinet ranks to see the difficulties in which the Canadian business world finds itself. There have been changing and contradictory policies over the past two years with regard to the whole question of energy and energy development. There have been contradictory policies with regard to investment within Canada, and the situation became so bad that the former minister of finance had to resign and leave the government completely. That must have shaken the business community—to have the minister of finance leave the government without saying why, without fully disclosing the differences of opinion he was having with the cabinet.

● (1700)

Since that time another minister has resigned, and there is one who should have resigned. These conditions do not create a climate of confidence or contribute to the growth and stability of the Canadian economy.

Yesterday a great confrontation took place between organized labour and the government. This does not create confidence and stability within the union movement, nor even on the management side. Management sees greater unrest in that confrontation. In the summer of 1976 labour

will try to exert itself to break down the impasse government has placed upon the old well worn collective bargaining system.

This motion is timely because the government must make a clear and sharp appraisal of its actions and do something about them. We as a parliament must encourage Canadians to produce more and perhaps to consume less—to save more and invest more in Canada. The attitude of the government in not saying when the wage and price controls or economic controls will be removed, although we are now led to believe they will be removed sooner than the three years first mentioned and we hope this will be the case—this attitude must be improved upon. Controls have never been envisioned as an economic instrument; they are a psychological tool—in fact they are inflationary in themselves. They encourage Canadians not to reinvest in their own industrial plants, and they discourage Canadians from producing more. All they have done is increase the size of the government as we have seen in regard to the Anti-Inflation Board.

Another subject I should like to touch upon is our trade with our major trading partner, the United States. Something like two thirds of our exports go there, and something like one job out of every two in our industry is concerned with the export of goods to that country. In order to improve our economic climate and our competitive position in international markets the government would do well to improve its relations with the major trading nation to the south. It worries me greatly to see the erosion and breakdown of what was once considered a good neighbour policy—to see it becoming what might be considered a poor neighbour policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: If that were improved I am certain it would help us reach a competitive position with other trading nations.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity this afternoon to speak on the motion put forward by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) in which he deplores what he refers to as the "contradictory economic policies" practised by the government; in which he further complains of the so-called failure to "enhance the growth and stability of Canadian employment and industrial production" and, presumably in order to complete his all encompassing and one shot sweep of the horizon, he talks of a failure to encourage investment in industry. He wraps the entire effort in a backward sweep in which he condemns the government for permitting "a serious decline in our competitive position in international markets".

The very nature of the motion is, I would suggest, somewhat indicative of the practice of the hon. member for York-Simcoe—if you throw enough stones in the general direction of the barn door, sooner or later you are likely to hit something. So far we have seen the stones flying through the air, but the barn door remains unscratched. Sometimes one must wonder whether he becomes confused about barn doors and aims his stones in more than one direction. Certainly I find it confusing to be aware of the 180 degree switch in his attitude from time to time on major factors relating to the economy. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) referred to some of these in his address earlier.

The hon. member speaks of contradictions. May I bring to his attention, and that of the House, his recent vote against the government's inflation policy through which the government was attempting to come to grips with the serious inflationary trends prevailing in the country last summer and last fall?

Over and over again I have heard the hon. member express concern about the seriousness of our economic problems—of a too large increase in the monetary expansion—in essence, showing his concern over the serious effects of high rates of inflation. Mr. Speaker, he cannot have it both ways; either he is in favour of containing the operation of the Canadian economy within reasonable bounds under which we can all survive, or he is not.

Mr. Epp: That is not logical.

Mr. Martin: I should like to quote the Governor of the Bank of Canada who in his statement, at the time of the recent rise in interest rates, was firmly committed to an increase in monetary expansion within moderate limits. It seems to me the hon. member for York-Simcoe was rather keen on this at one time. Frankly I do not know where he stands now, and I doubt if other hon. members are much wiser.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: an hon. member with the business and financial background of the hon. member for York-Simcoe should, in my view, be in a position where he can put forward positive and constructive views relating to the operation of the Canadian economy and the government's role in it—

An hon. Member: He did.

Mr. Martin: —rather than continuing on a negative and, to use his own terminology, contradictory course. Surely as chief financial critic of the official opposition this House and the Canadian public can expect more from him.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You would not listen.

Mr. Martin: The hon. member complains of the failure—as he sees it—of the government to enhance the growth and stability of Canadian employment. But let us look at some of the facts. I wonder if the hon. member is aware of them.

In Canada the statistics for 1973 indicate that 7.2 million people were employed; in 1975 the figure stood at 8.6 million. It is true that unemployment is at a higher than desirable rate, but this is the case in the United States, and in a number of other industrialized countries as well. It is well known that the big swing came at the end of 1974 and the beginning of 1975. The increase since then, however, has generally tempered and it is anticipated that 1976 should show little or no increase—yet it will remain high. This is a problem with which the government is faced, as well as the governments of other industrialized nations.

Again, by comparison with our giant neighbour to the south, it is still expected—I am referring to the rate of unemployment—to continue at a somewhat lower rate in

Canada than in the United States. Whereas at the end of February the unemployment rate in that country stood at 8.3 per cent, Canada's rate of unemployment is not anticipated to exceed 7.5 per cent in the current year. So much for stability of employment in this country vis-à-vis other industrial areas at the present time.

As for industrial production to which the hon. member also made reference, I wonder if he is aware of the predictions by experts in the private sector that the real increase in the Gross National Product will be in the range of 5½ per cent. This compares with some 6 per cent being predicted in the United States; and experts for a long time had said that the recession in that country bottomed out long before it bottomed out in Canada.

● (1710)

While I am on this topic I suggest that it must be acknowledged that productivity in this country is still a real problem. Yet here again there is a clear indication that a low point has probably been reached, and improvement may be anticipated in this area in 1976.

The hon. member in his motion speaks of what he calls the failure of the government to encourage investment in industry. Is he aware—

Mr. Whiteway: The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) knows what he talks about.

Mr. Martin: Are hon. members opposite aware of the various tax incentives provided both federally and provincially to stimulate investment in new plants? Is the hon. member familiar with federal and provincial incentives to support and stimulate various industries establishing in the less well developed areas of the country? Is he familiar with the direct investment the government has made to prop up the teetering project known as Syncrude, in order that this vital undertaking may proceed? That it shall proceed is in the interest of the many industries associated with the project, and of the Canadian public in general.

Is the hon. member familiar with the incorporation of Petro-Canada, a corporation which alone will stimulate much new, essential investment by the private sector in various industries associated with the exploration for and development of new oil and gas resources? Does this constitute a failure to encourage investment?

As the hon. member well knows, stimulation of new industrial investment has been one of the cornerstones of the government's policies in the last 30 years and, undoubtedly, will so continue in the years ahead. Obviously one must do one's best to ensure that stimulation, when provided, is effective, both as to method and area of the economy selected for stimulation. The real problem in the immediate years ahead will be to find the tremendous sums of capital which industry will require. It will not be difficult, as the hon. member suggests, to stimulate investment. It will be difficult to find the capital which will be needed for investing. How right is the hon. member's thinking. Is he aware of just how much capital business in this nation needs? Does he know what the businessmen of this nation are saying? One wonders.

The hon. member wraps his argument in what I called a backward sweep. He condemned the government for permitting a serious decline in our competitive position in international markets. Let us consider some aspects of this comment.

First, as the hon. member well knows, governments neither allow nor do not allow serious declines in competitive positions on international markets. The hon. member knows well the factors affecting the ups and downs of international trade. I am surprised that one with his business acumen should suggest, that the swings, up and down, occur mainly in response to specific acts of a national government. Perhaps he is referring to current difficulties having to do with the auto pact agreement which was entered into by Canada and the United States.

Let us look at this situation. Yes, we experienced a $700 million trade deficit in our merchandise trade in 1975. The auto pact and trade in auto parts have had a great deal to do with this deficit. At present we are seeing, I suggest, a rationalization process in the United States designed to counteract, in part, substantial U.S. deficits which occurred under this agreement a few years ago. Yes, the swings are there. The point remains that the swings will remain, no matter what governments do. They are independent of specific government involvement.

Hon. members, including the hon. member for York-Simcoe, are familiar with the general decline in the rate of growth of industrial activity in most countries of the western world. Without doubt, high wage and salary settlements in Canada in the last few years have hurt us. The point to bear in mind is that all these are factors involved in the over-all operation of the economy. Certainly they do not arise from any specific government action. Actually, Mr. Speaker, because of the leadership shown by the government in introducing its anti-inflation policy, a policy which the hon. member for York-Simcoe does not support, Canada, generally, has come through this economic period in somewhat better shape than a number of other countries.

It is also predicted that our exports of raw materials and semi-processed goods will rise as the economies of other countries improve. In this regard we must consider both the value and the volume of exports. In my view we ought to be more concerned about the value of our exports, because a relatively small rise in volume in the export of certain valuable raw materials and semi-processed goods could significantly affect over-all values of exports.

The hon. member spoke of interest rates. As the Minister of Finance said, it is clear that the Bank of Canada acted as it did in recent days in order to keep the rate of monetary expansion within moderate limits. Surely this moderate increase in the money supply indicates an increase in economic activity in this country. There have been substantial increases in bank borrowings in the last several months. Borrowings are up about 15 per cent. Does the hon. member for York-Simcoe not agree that this clearly shows that our economy is fast being stimulated? The rise in rates is consistent with the professional opinion of the Governor of the Bank of Canada with regard to future trends. He, unlike the hon. member, is obviously able to see encouraging developments as they take place.

Allow me to make passing reference to housing. There was a big upswing in house building in the last half of

1975. Some professionals in the private sector now predict a further increase in the rate of starts for 1976.

Let me also say a word about inventory investment. There was some evidence of disinvestment in 1975. It is anticipated that there will be a major upswing in this area in 1976. Growth in inventory investment may reach the figure of $350 million.

To conclude: generally, Mr. Speaker, the outlook for the coming year should be one of optimism. That is the thinking which I am pleased to see reflected on my side of the House. We do not support the pessimistic, confused, contradictory and aimless views on the Canadian economy held by hon. members opposite and epitomized in the motion moved today by the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks today to the manner in which economic policies of the present administration have failed to encourage and sustain investment in Canadian industry. I think, in dealing with a matter such as this, that it is essential to reflect on the present situation and ask ourselves why it is the way it is.

It was obvious in 1974 that Canada and its economy were in a major economic and financial crisis which was likely to worsen before it improved. Inflation during 1974 ran between 11 per cent and 14 per cent depending upon how it was measured, and for the first half of 1975 it was still running around 10 per cent. Increases in wage settlements, which in 1973 were under 10 per cent, were 17.4 per cent at the end of 1974, and 18.5 per cent in mid 1975.

● (1720)

Meanwhile unemployment rose from 5.4 per cent in 1974 to 7.2 per cent in mid 1975, strikes were causing major disruptions in the economy and exceeded one day per year for every member of the labour force, real GNP and industrial production had been falling for almost a year, and the value of the Canadian dollar had declined by over 6½ per cent during the preceding year. All in all it was a pretty grim picture, and inflation was correctly identified as the villain.

Unfortunately the government refused to recognize that this situation existed until late 1975, and then in complete contradiction to its stated policies of only a few months previous, it imposed upon Canada, as a solution, an ill-defined, hastily organized, and so far ineffectual program of wage and price controls.

Economists offer a variety of explanations for inflation, ranging from cost or price push explanations to sociological explanations. According to Lawrence B. Smith, writing in the January-February, 1976 "Tax Journal", and I quote:

> There is really only one explanation for our present inflation, namely that there has been too fast an increase in the rate of growth of the money supply. In fact the money supply, regardless of how it is measured, has been increasing at an astronomical rate for the last five years, and in 1974 alone it rose 20 per cent. In the first three-quarters of 1975 it rose at an annual rate of 17.5 per cent, and during the three months ending November 30, 1975, it rose at an annual rate of 21.9 per cent.
>
> Since real output in Canada has been increasing at an annual rate of under 3 per cent during this period, there has been annually an extra 15 per cent to 17 per cent more money available to purchase every unit of output.

[Mr. Martin.]

> Thus, either people must increase their savings very considerably or else prices must rise rapidly to absorb this extra purchasing power.

Rather than display restraint, however, the government allowed its own rate of growth and spending to sky-rocket. Between 1965 and 1974 government expenditures as a percentage of GNP rose from 29.9 per cent to 39.1 per cent or, stated differently, government expenditures rose approximately 65 per cent faster than expenditures in the rest of the economy. This type of uncontrolled spending is especially harmful because to a very large extent the financial resources for this expansion were raised internally.

By borrowing from the Bank of Canada, that is to say, by increasing the money supply, or by borrowing abroad under a fixed or managed exchange rate, the government generates inflationary pressure.

Since the Bank of Canada's holdings of government securities rose at an annual rate of 13.5 per cent over the last five years while holdings in the private sector rose at an annual rate of under 1.0 per cent, excluding Canada Savings Bonds, and since increases in the Bank of Canada's holdings of Canadian government securities were the primary way of meeting federal government dollar financing requirements, it is clear that a massive increase in the money supply financed the increase in government expenditures.

As Lawrence Smith says, and I quote:

> Consequently, in the sense that the need to finance the growth of government expenditures was a major reason for the excessive expansion of the money supply, the growth in government expenditures directly contributed to the accelerating inflation.

There are few members here who do not realize that there is one essential ingredient in all plants to start up a new business, to expand an existing one, or take on new lines, and that is capital. If we cannot find the capital for investment in productive Canadian business enterprises in sufficient quantities, in the right form and at a reasonable price, then we will simply not grow as a nation, and the miseries of unemployment, inflation, and human disappointment will certainly jeopardize our society.

There are four basic forms or sources of capital: first, savings from individuals; second, savings by business, normally in the form of retained earnings; third, savings by government; fourth, foreign investment in our country, either in the form of debt or equity.

Since we must concern ourselves with government and its effect on business investment, we must direct repeated attention to the inability of the government to save. All levels of government, as we have learned, tend to be dis-savers. All governments, and especially this government, tend to develop extravagant habits. To finance their extravangance they draw on the savings of business and individuals, with the result that these savings do not reappear in the economy in the form of capital for investment. Governments in Canada at all levels last year dissaved over 4.5 billion to finance their budgetary deficits.

Andrew G. Kniewasser, President of the Investment Dealers Association of Canada, in a recent speech said:

> Indeed, Canadians are going to have to save enough or import enough of other people's savings to finance unprecedented levels of capital expansion all over this country. The agreed figure in constant dollars is $500 billion between now and 1985, and in current dollars, close to $900 billion.

Mr. Kniewasser adds:

> I am using GNP deflators of 6 per cent over the next five years and 5 per cent over the following five years in making these estimates. Gross capital formation will have to rise from 22 per cent to 26 per cent of GNP, an enormous shift in financial management. We will have to produce more, consume less, save more and invest more in our country than ever before in our history. We will also probably have to persuade foreigners to divert their savings from their own countries to Canada as never before in our history.

Canada has become one of the most highly capital-intensive countries in the world. Some sources say that more than $130,000 in new business investment is needed to create the average new job in Canada. High taxes and continued inflation prevent the public from saving and investing as much as is desirable, and the situation for business savings is also difficult.

Governments and perhaps the public, including labour unions, which have a direct stake in the prosperity of business, appear to have little interest in the capital-formation problems of corporations. Two decades ago Canada was among the leaders in the industrialized world in terms of fixed capital investment as a proportion of total output. By 1973 it was estimated by at least one source that Canada had fallen to sixteenth position on this scale among 23 industrially advanced countries.

One very graphic example of how government has shown little interest in this problem appears in the undervaluation of inventories problem. In 1974 Canadian industry earned $4.3 billion in inventory profits and paid an extra $1.5 billion in taxes that would not have been payable under stable price conditions. Total taxes paid in that year were $6.4 billion, so the taxes on inventory profits added 20 per cent to the corporate tax bill. This was a welcome windfall for government, but it was a serious drain on corporate cash flow. The result is that inventories account for an increasing proportion of current assets and firms need a lot more cash in order to finance these inventories. Inflation also has the obvious effect of making new development more expensive and therefore less attractive to business.

The results of inflation on business decision-making in Canada can be summarized in four basic points. First, the risks involved in investment in new productive capacity are increased because of the wide disparity between the prices at which existing plants can be operated profitably and the prices needed to make new plants profitable. This diminishes the incentive to invest.

Second, the illusion of prosperity created by understated costs may have encouraged firms to accept higher wage settlements and to take greater risks with inventory accumulations than they otherwise would have done.

Third, the concern about the inadequacy of cash flow, in contrast, has encouraged firms to raise their prices by more than they otherwise would as a way of replacing the savings that are not being generated by depreciation and that are being drained away by taxes on inventory profits.

● (1730)

Fourth, the over-all liquidity of the corporate sector has been reduced, with the result that corporations have less resilience in confronting new challenges. The situation, simply stated, is not healthy and it is obvious something must be done.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to conduct for the benefit of the members present a one man inquiry into Canada's economic situation and I shall simply conclude my remarks at this point with some thoughts on what I believe must be done to improve the situation.

First of all, individual savings must be encouraged by winning the attack on inflation and by reducing taxes. In order to do this all Canadians must help by reducing their demands on all levels of government. Too many people still believe that when the government does something it is free.

Secondly, corporations must be encouraged to save more. This means a better environment for the development of retained earnings within the firm, lower levels of corporate taxation, greater opportunities for true profits, and the acceptance by the tax authorities of more realistic accounting techniques for the replacement of assets.

Third, government must save, not dis-save, for if it continues to skim off the cream of the savings of individuals and business it only drives up the cost of money for business and seriously impedes new business investment.

Fourth and finally, foreign investors must be encouraged to divert a portion of their savings to Canada rather than to use them at home.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I quote from Judith Maxwell's excellent study recently published by the C. D. Howe Research Institute entitled "Challenges to Complacency in our Society":

> 1976 will be a time of transition and of adjustment. The really wrenching adjustments will have to be made by institutions—government, business and labour—adapting to the tougher environment of the late 1970's. Now is the time to stop the confrontations and get on with the job.

Mr. D. M. Collenette (York East): Mr. Speaker, I was not sure whether I would get the opportunity to speak this afternoon, but I am sure I can fill up the next five or ten minutes with some comments about this very interesting motion.

The motion before us is a prime example of how the official opposition seeks to mislead the Canadian public. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) really amazes me by his criticisms in view of the obviously difficult world economic climate in which Canada has been forced to operate for the past two years.

Mr. Gillies: Same old trash.

Mr. Collenette: It may be the same old trash but it got us elected two years ago. I should now like to show in the next few minutes, if hon. members opposite will permit me, how despite the general inflationary and recessionary climate experienced by all industrialized countries Canada has maintained a relatively healthy economic environment. This relative stability is due to the policies of the federal government.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe appears in many ways to profess—I do not want to be too harsh—a profound ignorance of an essential economic fact today, and that is that it is not possible to isolate the performance and work-

ings of one country without regard to economic conditions in other countries, especially without regard to the United States with whom we do some 60 per cent of our total trade.

Not only must we in this country concern ourselves with the inter-relationship between personal incomes, consumer expenditures, output, employment, capital investment, prices, profits, savings and interest in an analysis of our own economic health, but we must also look at each of these items as they relate to our major trading partners. There is also the additional variable, when we take this more global view into account, of analysing the impact of exchange rates.

This world-wide inter-dependence of economic conditions was the principal reason why the Liberal party fought extremely hard, and as we know very successfully, against the policy of a wage and price freeze as proposed by the official opposition in 1974. Because Canada is one of the world's major trading nations we were very vulnerable to the inflationary pressures that swirled around us in 1973 and 1974. In effect we were inporting inflation, and no degree of price and wage freeze would have isolated us from the effects of the most serious bout of inflation since the second world war, 30 years ago.

However, I do not want to flagellate the opposition too much, Mr. Speaker, because they paid their price with interest two years ago for the errors of judgment they made. A freeze at that time would have been iniquitous in its effect upon the Canadian people. Perhaps the official opposition would have preferred this iniquitous solution. Perhaps they would have preferred a solution which was really put into effect by our American neighbours to the south, but maybe I can come to that in a moment. I do not believe that the Canadian people would have appreciated that kind of policy.

Repeatedly over the past year we have read reports from august economic bodies such as the Economic Council of Canada, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, and others, which laud the policies pursued by the Government of Canada during this period. In order to refute the implications of the motion before us, let us look at some of these policies, since this is the essence of the criticism that is made in the motion.

The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) dealt extensively with the subject of energy, but the one price oil system has for two years provided a balance in this country. It has meant that all Canadians have been forced to shoulder the burden of the increased world price of oil. In addition to the one price policy we have kept the domestic price below the world price. This has not only benefited consumers who have had a chance to adjust themselves to higher fuel prices and scarcity of supply, but more important, certainly in terms of the motion before us, Canadian industry has benefited from a lower than world price for oil and natural gas. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the results of this policy have been to keep more Canadians in work than would have been otherwise possible. It has kept industries operating at a healthy capacity.

The subsidization of one price oil has resulted in a net deficit to the treasury. With the decline in export tax revenues from the sale of crude oil to the United States, the deficit in the oil account had to be met from general revenues. This, of course, placed additional cash demands upon the government and has contributed to inflation.

But, Mr. Speaker, think of the alternative. Think of the industrial havoc that would have been wreaked in Canada, especially in Ontario. It is interesting that the hon. member for York-Simcoe is one of my neighbours in Ontario, and I ask him to think what could have happened in Ontario had the government not pursued this policy. Perhaps he does not appreciate the number of jobs saved as a result. Certainly the industrial workers in my constituency and in other industrial areas of this country appreciate the effect of this policy.

We have been attacked for our expansionary fiscal and monetary policy over the past two years, but we had little choice. A government that is Liberal, that is responsible but compassionate, had no option but to expand the monetary supply, to pay for existing government programs hit by inflation. Is the hon. member for York-Simcoe telling this House and the Canadian people that he was against cushioning the effect of inflation for the elderly, the poor with children, the unemployed, and the veterans? That is what the government did. It indexed old age pensions, family allowances, unemployment insurance benefits. Is the hon. member for York-Simcoe against this, and are the members of his party?

The government also indexed personal income tax and reduced personal taxes as well as corporate and commodity taxes so that incomes could keep pace with inflation, consumer demand could be sustained, and capital investment encouraged. As a result we were able to keep Canada's productive capacity in manufacturing and other areas stimulated at a time when the rest of the world crumbled into recession.

Mr. Elzinga: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether the hon. member would entertain a question?

Mr. Collenette: Well, Mr. Speaker, I might have been disposed to answer a question had the hon. member sat in his seat for the last two hours awaiting his turn to speak, as I did. With only two minutes left I feel compelled to continue.

I am sure hon. members on the other side would argue that we have encouraged inflation in Canada, and I suppose to some degree we have. But look at the alternatives, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for York-Simcoe talked about the United States. Is he saying that his party would have liked to inflict upon the Canadian people the heartless and, indeed, almost ruthless policies of the Ford administration in the United States? Has the hon. member paid many visits to the United States over the past couple of years? Has he seen the swarms of unemployed in the major cities; has he digested the tremendous increase in the welfare rolls, especially in the northern American states; has he been to Buffalo, Detroit or any other northern city and seen how an insensitive government has almost ground the economy to a halt?

● (1740)

Sure, the inflation rate in the United States last year was well below ours. The hon. member for York-Simcoe is

correct in saying this, but at what cost to the dignity, the self-esteem, and the economic health of American citizens?

A couple of percentage points more in the rate of inflation are fine with me if it means that the old will not go hungry, the young will not be poorly clothed, and the worker will not end up in a lineup at an unemployment insurance office.

If we had decided to limit government expenditures, if we had kept tax levels at previous levels so that we might have had a balanced budget, as is often advocated by hon. members on the other side, what would have been the result? I shall tell you, Mr. Speaker, and members on the other side. It would have meant lower personal income, lower personal spending, lower national output and lower profits, but substantially higher unemployment. Is this what members on the other side want?

I see that my time has almost expired. I do not really want to review the very excellent summary in the 1975 Bank of Canada Report which detailed the health of this country, but I do suggest that the hon. member for York-Simcoe might do well to read it.

Hon. members opposite would do well to generate their talents and energies into thinking about the type of society we want in the post-controls period rather upon government policies of the past. It is coincidental that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) said at a convention recently, "We want to tell Canadians what the Progressive Conservative party is for and not what they are against." I suggest that hon. members opposite might heed their own leader's advice.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Whelan), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), Nipissing (Mr. Blais), Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), Welland (Mr. Railton), Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley), St. Catharines (Mr. Parent), Kitchener (Mr. Flynn), Scarborough West (Mr. Martin), Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Milne) and Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier), has been filed with me pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario. Is it agreed that the said objection shall be appended to today's *Votes and Proceedings*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

SUPPLY

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10B, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Mr. Speaker: It being 5.45 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier this day, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply relating to Supplementary Estimates (B), and all stages of the bill based thereon, together with interim supply and first reading of the bill based thereon.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 10b, in the amount of $298,000 of the Department of National Revenue for Taxation—Office of the Administrator—Anti-inflation—Programme expenditures in Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is a matter to which reference has been made in the past, and it is one to which I would take great exception, particularly in respect of the nature of its appearing on the order paper.

Standing Order 58(4) reads as follows:

Forty-eight hours' written notice shall be given of motions to concur in interim supply, main or supplementary estimates, to restore or reinstate any item in the estimates. Twenty-four hours' written notice shall be given of an opposition motion on an allotted day, or of a notice to oppose any item in the estimates, or for the purpose of setting down any item or items in the main or supplementary estimates for consideration in a committee of the whole.

The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) gave notice at precisely 6 p.m. yesterday, just at the limit of the 24 hours, of his intention to oppose an item in the estimates. That was written notice of intention to oppose or, in other words, to reduce the item. How is it now that there appears ahead of it a motion restoring the item? I see that Mr. Speaker is shaking his head, but the motion in respect of Vote 10b involves the restoring of the item.

There was a motion put down by the hon. member which complied with the rules requesting approval for a reduction of a particular item. Now the procedure, and I suggest it is quite erroneous procedure of this House, which has become the practice is that the motion is never put, but there is a prior motion which appears somehow out of thin air. How did it get there unless it was by an arrangement with the Clerks at the Table? There can be no other way.

An hon. Member: Collusion.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I do not suggest there is collusion because there is no time for that. On previous occasions, as on this occasion, it is 24 hours' notice. The rule says specifically that 48 hours' written notice shall be given.

What I am concerned about is an expression of the House with regard to the motion of the hon. member. Your Honour was a member of the procedure committee when

these rules were devised and you will know it was clearly indicated at that time, and this was followed for a period in this House, that an hon. member can oppose an item in order to allow for the expression of an opinion by the House either in respect of the reduction of the item to $1, or to a specific amount, or in opposition to it entirely.

Then there was a change, notwithstanding protests from this side of the House. Former Speaker Lamoureux decided that somehow a procedure could be followed whereby automatically out of thin air there appeared a motion under the name of the minister of the department with which the item is concerned to restore the total amount.

This caused a great deal of difficulty in the House because in many instances when there are main estimates the House is being asked to vote on an omnibus item when there is no procedure whereby the House can be asked to express its opinion on the item that is posted.

These rules were put in for a particular purpose, namely, to allow an individual member of the House to get an expression of the House on an item in the estimates. This is now totally impossible.

First of all, I say it is irregular for this motion appearing in the name of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) to appear on the order paper. I find no authority whatsoever for it in the rules. Secondly, I find no authority whatsoever, whether it is Standing Order 58(9), (10) or (11) which governs the procedure as to how the item shall be disposed of, and appropriation bills shall be considered, namely, the motion on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board to restore the item.

● (1750)

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I think we should be clear about the terms we are using. I will permit the hon. member to carry on in a moment. The motion to which he is referring in the name of the President of the Treasury Board is not a motion to restore an item. That would presuppose that the House had made a disposition to reduce it.

The motion in the name of the President of Treasury Board is a motion for concurrence in the item, and it is there because there is a blanket motion in the name of the President of Treasury Board for concurrence in all of the items in the supplementary estimates. They are not listed individually, because it is not felt necessary in the practice followed by the House over many years to list the items individually unless there is a notice of opposition. Therefore, in the face of a notice of opposition, in order to accommodate that vote, the motion is separated by practice—and by no other reason—in order to see to it that the notice of opposition by the hon. member is on the order paper together with a specific aspect of the general notice for concurrence. But it is not a motion to restore the item; it is a motion for concurrence.

If there were notices of opposition on every item contained in the supplementary estimates, presumably the House, for the purpose of recording that, would have to separate the general, blanket, omnibus motion for concurrence by the President of the Treasury Board into each item so that it would face opposite an item of objection. But it is not a motion to restore the item. A motion to restore the item could presumably only be made after the House had addressed itself to a notice of objection and had accepted it in some way.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): By your own words, Mr. Speaker, you have drawn my attention to what is contained in 58(4). It provides that 48 hours' written notice shall be given to motions to concur in a supplementary estimate. Where was the compliance of the 48 hours' requirement with regard to this particular item? There was no 48 hours' notice. There was undoubtedly a general 48 hours' notice for the motion which appears on the order paper to concur in Supplementary Estimates B. That I am not disputing. That item I am not disputing.

But I do find it singular, and I do object, that any hon. member on either side of the House who wishes to post a single item within the 24 hours is confined to the 24-hour rule, comes to the deadline, and finds that there suddenly appears on the order paper a counter-motion and, particularly, that the counter-motion takes precedence in being put. The net result is that there is no vote, there is no opportunity for opinions to be expressed by the House on the particular motion of an hon. member who has complied with the rules. That is the frustration, and that is where I suggest that in the past the Chair has misdirected itself.

I am not suggesting that ultimately, if a vote on the motion of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth is not carried by the House, the general motion therefore takes precedence. I am not questioning the general motion which I shall accept was filed within 48 hours to concur in Supplementary Estimates B, the same way that yesterday there was filed a notice to concur in interim supply. But nothing has been done with regard to this particular item appearing as 10(b) with regard to the Administrator of the Anti-Inflation Board.

How else is the House to proceed but to follow the procedure which I insist is the right one? It is my contention that the motion which should be put is that which stands in the name of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The other motion, I suggest with respect, is both irregular and not according to the rules. What happened to the 48 hours' notice? It was not on the order paper; it has not complied with the 48-hour requirement, and on the side of the government there has to be compliance. There cannot just be a general motion put down which can then be translated somehow by the Chair into a particularized item on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Edmonton West will permit me, in accordance with the rules the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth has filed a notice of objection; it is not a motion. There is no question to which the House can address itself. There is, in fact, a notice of objection which, in accordance with the rules, notified the House that the hon. member insists on a separate vote on the particular item.

There must be a question to which the House can address itself, and the notice of objection by the hon. member is not a question. Therefore the House has nothing to which it can address itself. It is therefore necessary that

some question be put on the order paper which identifies the area of objection, and which permits the House to address itself by a vote to a question.

If one reads the notice of objection by the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth it is clear that the House could not address itself to such an item under the present rules unless the hon. member had put down a motion that the House direct that something be done in respect to that item. But that is not what has taken place. Therefore this seems to be the only feasible practice. If there is a better one, we certainly would welcome any suggestions which would clarify the position. At the moment, however, this is the only course which seems feasible.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): With respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to appear argumentative, but what the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth did was in effect give notice to reduce item 10(b) from $298,000 to $100,000. Now, how this is expressed by the officers at the Table, I cannot say, but that is the intent of the motion. The intent is to reduce the item from $298,000 to $100,000. That is all.

Mr. Kempling: May I just clarify a point, Mr. Speaker? I approached the Table and asked for guidance on the proper form to use in order that I could register my objection. It was my assumption, perhaps wrongly, Sir, that by following their advice this matter would result in a vote. I took the advice of the Table and I was given an example, as a matter of fact, of a similar motion which had been put down in 1972. I followed that example and altered it only as to the particular circumstances and filed it with the Table at six o'clock. I assumed that with that direction the matter would then be brought to a vote.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth was correct in his course. The advice he received was right. As a result of the action taken by the hon. member, the method he used may in fact result in a vote taking place in the House on that separate item. But instead of it being a vote on a motion in the name of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth to effect the item, it will be a motion by the President of the Treasury Board to concur in the item. But that is as close as the House can come under present practices.

I say the point of order is well taken; it is well understood, and it is one to which we have addressed ourselves many times. If there is a better and more direct procedure for achieving this goal I am sure the House would be happy to hear it. However, with all due respect, I do not believe the time to solve the problem is in this particular instance. The procedure followed with respect to this instance is precisely the same as that followed the last time around on supply.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): On the same point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I came to this House—

An hon. Member: Too bad!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): —in the belief that there was some democratic procedure we could follow in this House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Disposition of Supply Motions

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a point and I wish to be heard. There have been two supplementary estimates brought before us. I cannot understand why it is not possible, first of all, to have all the estimates required at one time. There have been As, now there are Bs. Next year there will be Cs. There will be three or four supplemental estimates.

The only alternative to the proposal put forward by my hon. friend from Halton-Wentworth is an amendment to the unopposed items in the estimates of March 22, which are here. We should be able to register our disagreement with certain items in the estimates, to have them withdrawn or removed. I will vote against them. But there must also be a method.

● (1800)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I have a right to stand on my feet!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am prepared in these circumstances to listen to the point of order, but I think something should be made clear. The Standing Orders of the House provide a procedure whereby estimates are studied in the committee, amendments moved, and so forth, and if effective the estimates would be reported back to the House with amendments and then would have to be reinstated. I do not challenge the interest of the hon. member in raising this point of order; however the process has gone on for some time now. Undoubtedly there can be suggestions to improve the procedure, but it is a procedure that has been used several times in the past as a result of points of order.

The supply bill will be introduced today instead of tomorrow at the hour at which it is expected to be voted on. Furthermore, the supply bill will be debated in all stages tomorrow. This is moving further and further in the direction of getting away from the procedure we followed in the past. However, I wanted to be clear that at this moment the Standing Order is specific, that the duty of the Chair is to intervene and to put without debate or amendment all questions necessary to decide on the supplementary estimates that are before us.

The hon. member seeks the floor on a point of order. I have given three hon. members the floor on a point or order. Let us be clear that we should not be debating what we are doing, but continuing to speak about order, and if we are talking about improvements in the procedure for supply, these are procedures that have been not only in use for some time but in effect, in respect of these supplementary estimates which have been before standing committees, hon. members from all parties have been present there, have discussed them, have moved amendments to them, and so on, and at this point the final step is being taken.

The hon. member's point is well noted and continues to form part of the study which is going on to try to improve these procedures, but again I say that we cannot solve the problem entirely at this moment.

Disposition of Supply Motions

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the motion put forward in the name of the President of the Treasury Board has an order in advance, although posted later, than the order put in the name of the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling). That is the order in which they should be. The motion put by the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth should be first and should be followed, if necessary, by the motion put by the President of the Treasury Board. This is not order, this is disorder. The government motion, although posted later, has taken precedence over the other motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let me say again that the points which have been raised are points to which the Chair has addressed itself in the past. The suggestion is a valid one. Unfortunately, the implementation or execution of the idea contained in the suggestion is not as simple as it appears. The alternatives have been examined, and this has been felt to be the only feasible way to proceed as a result of an objection by an hon. member to the singling out of an item which must be voted on separately. This is the best procedure up to this point. If hon. members who have intervened have a better suggestion, the Chair would be delighted to receive it.

The question is therefore on the motion in the name of the President of the Treasury Board relating to the particular item. The motion has been read. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Chrétien) which was agreed to on the following division:

● (1810)

(Division No. 123)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
(Port Arthur)
Andres
(Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle-Émard-Côte
Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Lachance
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
Leblanc
(Laurier)
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Loiselle
(Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Maine
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy
(Timmins)
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stollery
Trudeau
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—124

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allard
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Benjamin
Brisco
Broadbent
Cadieu
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crouse
Dick
Dinsdale
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-
The Islands)
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Forrestall
Friesen
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gilbert
Gillies
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Howie
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Jones
Kempling
Knowles
(Winnipeg
North Centre)
Knowles
(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald
(Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the
Islands)
MacLean
Malone
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McKenzie
McKinnon
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Neil
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Orlikow
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Scott
Skoreyko
Smith
(Churchill)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart
(Marquette)
Towers
Wagner
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams—85

● (1830)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried. The question is, therefore, on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Sharp:

That Supplementary Estimates (B) 1975-76 laid upon the Table, Tuesday, March 2, 1976, except the item previously disposed of, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to on division.

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-90, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1976, be read the first time and be printed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chrétien moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 2 carry?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On division.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 3 carry?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 4 carry?

An hon. Member: On division.

Clause 4 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 5 carry?

An hon. Member: No.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 6 carry?

An hon. Member: On division.

Clause 6 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 7 carry?

An hon. Member: On division.

Clause 7 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the Schedule carry?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On division.

Schedule agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry?

An hon. Member: On division.

Clause 1 agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

An hon. Member: On division.

Preamble agreed to.

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Chrétien moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Interim Supply

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the question therefore is on the motion of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) with respect to interim supply.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board) moved:

That this House do concur in interim supply as follows:

That a sum not exceeding $4,970,732,370.57 being the aggregate of:

(*a*) three-twelfths of the total of the amounts of the items set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, laid before the House of Commons on February 18, 1976, $4,424,625,940.25;

(*b*) an additional eight-twelfths of the total amount of Energy, Mines and Resources Items L50 and L55, Finance Item 20, Regional Economic Expansion Item 25, Transport Item 110, Urban Affairs Item 20(Schedule A) of the said Estimates, $8,407,333.33;

(*c*) an additional six-twelfths of the total amount of Urban Affairs Item 10 (Schedule B) of the said Estimates, $3,315,906.00;

(*d*) an additional four-twelfths of the total amount of Industry, Trade and Commerce Item 55 and Urban Affairs Item 15 (Schedule C) of the said Estimates, $150,479,333.33;

(*e*) an additional three-twelfths of the total amount of Energy, Mines and Resources Item L45, Regional Economic Expansion Item L35, Secretary of State Item 90, Transport Items 40, 50 and 90, and Treasury Board Items 5 and 10 (Schedule D) of the said Estimates, $133,618,375.00;

(*f*) an additional two-twelfths of the total amount of Finance Item 5, Indian Affairs and Northern Development Item L65, Industry, Trade and Commerce Item 75, Transport Items 65 and L75 (Schedule E) of the said Estimates, $51,615,199.33;

(*g*) an additional one-twelfth of the total amount of Energy, Mines and Resources Items 1 and 70, Environment Item 15, Indian Affairs and Northern Development Items 5, L60 and L85, Manpower and Immigration Item 10, Post Office Item 5, Privy Council Item 25, Secretary of State Item 15, Solicitor General Item 1, and Supply and Services Items 1 and 15 (Schedule F) of the said Estimates, $198,670,283.33;

be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chrétien thereupon moved that Bill C-91, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be read the first time and be printed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to order made earlier this day, at the next sitting of the House. Agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: —this House stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow.

At 6:39 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, March 25, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST THAT BOARD BE ABOLISHED AND CRÉDITISTE PRINCIPLES APPLIED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Considering that in spite of the government's anti-inflation measures, inflation continues to play havoc with the economy of every region of this country, especially in the food sector, considering also that the Anti-Inflation Board's decisions contribute to reducing the purchasing power of Canadian workers faced with soaring prices, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House consider the advisibility of abolishing the Anti-Inflation Board, which will cost more than $13 million in 1976 while jeopardizing the social peace of our country, and consider the implementation of measures proposed by the Social Credit as expounded in Bill C-328, An Act to provide for emergency measures to deal with the inflation of prices.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion cannot therefore be put.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR PROVISIONS IN NEW AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC FAVOURING SOUTH SHORE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on an important and urgent matter.

Considering the very alarming unemployment increase in Quebec, particularly in the eastern area of the province, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House recommend to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion that at the time of the Ottawa-Quebec agreement, account should be taken of the disastrous economic conditions in the South Shore area, and that the economic needs of this area be mentioned in this agreement in order that the area might benefit from it and the number of its unemployed people be reduced.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is no unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR SUBSTANCE OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN REISMAN AND DEPUTY MINISTER

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the Minister of National Defence. I wish he would get here on time. In any event in his absence I will direct them to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Minister of National Defence told the House that there have been conversations by telephone "with my deputy minister" on the subject of financing the Lockheed LRPA purchase contract. Outside the House the minister appeared to be rather confused over the substance and nature of those conversations but indicated both inside and outside the House that the telephone conversations involving his deputy minister concerned financial aid to the company as well. Would the Prime Minister confirm the substance of these conversations; that is, would they constitute an attempt on behalf of Reisman and Grandy Limited to establish financing terms for the LRPA contract.

● (1410)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was not a party to these conversations. I think the best thing would be to take note of the question on behalf of the minister or to ask him a little later when he is in the House.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I would have hoped that, as a result of the minister's statements yesterday, he would have made himself aware of what those contacts were. In any event, the minister stated outside the House

that he believed the other party to the conversation was in fact Mr. Reisman. That was a statement made downstairs. I wonder if the Prime Minister would be in a position to confirm that Mr. Reisman was in fact the other party in the conversations with Deputy Minister Nixon and, further, which party initiated these calls?

Mr. Trudeau: I will inquire.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE OF CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN REISMAN AND DEPUTY MINISTER—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CONTRACTS WITH REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of these matters, and in view of the effect that such communications might very well have on a purchase contract such as the one which we are talking about, would the Prime Minister also confirm whether these conversations took place before the contract was announced on November 27, 1975 or was it during the period immediately following the announcement in which the financial difficulties emerged, and further, would the Prime Minister table all the contracts Reisman and Grandy had with the government since they retired and, as well, whatever additional correspondence or documentation there is which spells out the terms of reference of these contracts?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday in so far as the departments were concerned. I also said that no such contract had been entered into. I indicated yesterday that there had been two very short term contractual arrangements with two departments, and that is the extent of my knowledge. I also stated to the Leader of the Opposition that the matter was being looked into and that I would report when I had the facts.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROPRIETY OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES BEING DIRECTORS OF CROWN CORPORATIONS AND ACTING AS CONSULTANTS TO GOVERNMENT

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. While the Prime Minister is looking into the matter of former senior civil servants being employed shortly after retirement as consultants to the government, would the right hon. gentleman also consider the propriety of retired civil servants acting commercially as consultants on government matters, and who are at the same time directors of Crown corporations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will look at that also, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF OBTAINING INFORMATION FROM UNITED STATES ON PAYMENT OF BRIBES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday in the House, and I think on other occasions as well, the minister was questioned with regard to requests to the United States government for detailed information on bribes offered by Lockheed with regard to purchases of aircraft. The minister replied that he had had conversations with senior officials of the United States government. I should like now to ask him whether he or any other representative of the government have adopted or will adopt the procedure indicated by the justice department of the United States, namely, that foreign governments should negotiate with the justice department to obtain information gathered by U.S. agencies such as SEC in regard to so called "overseas pay-offs" by U.S. concerns?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have said that I do not believe we should have an investigation until there is something that we should be investigating. The hon. member is suggesting a kind of witch hunt—

An hon. Member: Not a witch hunt, fact finding.

Mr. Richardson: In the Senate hearings there was a full disclosure of the improper payments that the Lockheed company had made. The countries in which these payments had been made were named, and Canada was not mentioned at any time in those full hearings. I think that is all that we should expect. I do not think it is right to assume that there is wrongdoing when there is no evidence.

Mr. Brewin: I should like to say to the minister that I for one am getting a little tired of these cover ups.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: Many other countries have adopted the procedure suggested by the U.S. authorities, namely, they have gone to the justice department and are seeking information. What is the reason that this minister is not prepared to do the same as they are doing? He could keep the answer confidential, as far as I know, but why does he not find out what the facts are?

Mr. Richardson: The other countries which are seeking information were named at the Senate hearing, and they had a reason to investigate.

Mr. Brewin: I had slipped in a question which I had not expected to ask, but I will now go on to my last question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Did you get an answer to it?

Mr. Brewin: No answer.

Mr. Nystrom: I wish he would slip in an answer.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—SUGGESTED TERMINATION OF CONTRACT AND PURCHASE OF OTHER MAKE OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I should like to ask the minister whether, in view of the total history of this matter and the fact that no agreement has actually been made—and there is no assurance of delivery if an agreement is made—the government will terminate negotiations with Lockheed and seek the necessary long-range patrol aircraft through refitting the Argus or in some other manner.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): That is not our present intention.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR PROVISIONS IN NEW AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC FAVOURING SOUTH SHORE

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, I shall put my question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

As last night over the CBC's French network news bulletin the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion stated that the Ottawa-Quebec agreement on the eastern part of Quebec would lapse on March 31, 1976 but would be renewed any day now, can the Prime Minister tell the House whether the south shore between Lévis and Rimouski will be included in this agreement or whether it will be covered by special agreement, as requested by municipal councils and other groups?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in fact the minister is in the process of discussing with his colleagues renewal of this agreement due to lapse soon. When an agreement has been approved by cabinet, its terms will be announced to hon. members.

PROPOSED DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY TO FAVOUR UNDERDEVELOPED REGIONS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Prime Minister for his answer and put a supplementary to him.

As several political personalities have expressed, these last few years, a wish for industrial decentralization, may I ask if his government intends to encourage it further to the advantage of the underdeveloped or developing regions where skilled labour already exists to meet the needs of new industries?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to the extent where the question deals with industrial decentralization, I shall convey to the minister the representations and arguments of the hon. member. With regard to the decentralization of government services, that matter concerns the President of the Treasury Board who has already made very helpful decisions for the province of Quebec in that regard.

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR NAMES OF PEOPLE MR. DRURY CONSULTED ABOUT APPROACHING JUDGE HUGESSEN

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works following up questions regarding the confrontation issue raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South. Yesterday the Minister of Public Works admitted that he had consulted some of his colleagues in cabinet on the question of confrontation which he raised with Mr. Justice Hugessen. He stated further that he would try to get some precise recollection about whom he talked to before he approached Mr. Justice Hugessen. Has the minister succeeded in recollecting with whom he discussed this matter, and will he now give us the names of his colleagues?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I have read over the question and answer of yesterday, and it is apparent that there was some confusion in my mind as to whether we were talking about the rumour or the confrontation. I have been endeavouring to recollect where I had heard or might have heard this rumour, which I gave an undertaking to do. In so far as the hon. member for Vancouver South was seeking from me the names of my cabinet colleagues with whom I had discussed the issue generally or the nature of the law case, I think I cannot do better than repeat my previous position, that conversations as between cabinet colleagues should not be disclosed in answer to questions during the question period.

● (1420)

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I submit that is a lot of nonsense—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: —because yesterday the Minister of Public Works stated, regardless of whether he is talking about confrontation or ganging up, in no uncertain terms:

> Mr. Speaker, I have no very clear recollection but I thought I probably did mention this to some of my other colleagues in cabinet.

I just want to tell the minister that the hon. member for Vancouver South—

Some hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ALLEGEDLY CONFLICTING STATEMENTS OF MR. DRURY CONCERNING GANGING UP ON FRENCH SPEAKING MINISTERS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my second question and I hope the minister will be able to answer this, is that on Thursday of last week the Minister of Public Works stated:

> . . . it is difficult to ascribe a precise source to baseless rumours.

He was referring to the alleged ganging up of the English-speaking establishment against prominently placed

French-speaking persons. However, *La Presse* of March 17 stated—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member please put his question?

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, apparently in the House, regarding the ganging up, the minister advised that this was a baseless rumour while outside he stated, according to *La Presse*, that the matter came from the hon. member for Papineau, which is a contradiction. Can the minister explain this obvious contradiction between statements inside the House which describe the rumours as baseless and statements outside the House which pinpoint the precise source of such rumours as the hon. member for Papineau?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the so-called statements outside the House.

Mr. Alexander: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister now advise this House whether in fact the question regarding the ganging up stemmed from the hon. member for Papineau or not? Can he assure the House of this or not?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what the hon. gentleman is driving at.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): He is driving at the whole truth.

Mr. Drury: He is asking me, it seems, to reveal the substance of a conversation with a cabinet colleague. On a number of occasions I have stated—and I think I am right—that those conversations should not be disclosed, should not be published.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Drury: If he is asking me something else I do not quite understand what it is.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERIM FINANCING

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services regarding the LRPA contract. Could the minister indicate to the House whether interim financing has been arranged as of today and if so, in what amount? If not, can the minister give us some indication whether it will be achieved before April 1?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, this question is still under discussion.

[Mr. Alexander.]

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF PRICE INCREASE AFTER APRIL 1

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister, who is responsible for the writing of this contract, give some indication to the House of what the situation will be on April 1 should the contract not be signed? In other words, will the price of the LRPA program increase by about 15 per cent after April 1?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot answer the hon. member's question, which is purely hypothetical. I think I cannot give more details to the hon. member at the moment.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEASURES TO INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? As the Prime Minister told me on October 30, in the House, that he would refer to the Privy Council and the Department of Finance for study my suggestion for paying productivity incentives in direct proportion to productivity gains, as incentives for greater productivity in industry, which would make our products competitive; and as, on February 4, nearly two months ago, the Prime Minister promised to make a statement soon, but has not made a statement in the House on the matter, may I ask if he has lost interest in this important matter, particularly as most economists agree that there can be no real recovery, and the AIB program will not succeed, unless industrial productivity increases substantially. Will he tell the House if he intends to make a statement, and when?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I agreed at the outset that the hon. member was asking an important question, one to which we made explicit references in the white paper published on October 14. Since then a few studies have been progressing and the committee I referred to, the interdepartmental committee, is looking at a whole series of proposed programs. One has to do with the nature of Canadian productivity problems, another is on opportunities for productivity improvement; another is for the preliminary identification of policies and programs to exploit those opportunities.

Other studies have been initiated in other areas. They include the Canadian historical record of productivity growth; the improvement of the measurement of productivity; the measurement of productivity in the public service; regional development programs and productivity performance.

Studies have been undertaken in other areas which are directly related to productivity, such as—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As I am aware that these studies are not expected to be presented to cabinet for consideration for at least another six months, which means that one year will have passed since I brought to the Prime Minister's attention the need for productivity incentives to increase industrial productivity, which is the key to the whole matter, and as it is obvious that the Prime Minister, who is delaying, is determined to take over Sir John A. MacDonald's title, "Old tomorrow", may I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham.

Mr. Hees: —if the Prime Minister does not realize that since our convention of a few weeks ago, and in view of the government's recent bad performance, his "tomorrows" are disappearing at a rapidly accelerating rate?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN REISMAN AND DEPUTY MINISTER

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of National Defence is in the House, may I direct a question to him about the Reisman and Grandy affair. Yesterday the minister suggested that no representations had been made on behalf of the Lockheed company but that there had been conversations concerning the contract. In fairness to the minister, the matter may involve semantics rather than an attempt to mislead the House. I am sure that, in fulfilling his responsibilities, he knew specifically and definitely what was said by whom to whom. Will he now tell us exactly what those conversations were about? Who said what to whom?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the conversations with my deputy minister, which took place by telephone, were in the new year and they took place after the decision by cabinet to purchase the Lockheed long-range patrol aircraft. As far as I am aware, they concerned financing and how that financing might best be achieved. I do not think it is possible to provide details of these conversations without a much more careful examination of the individuals concerned.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF APPOINTMENT OF REISMAN AND GRANDY AS CONSULTANTS

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It seems that we are drawing a fine distinction in language between representation and conversations. May I ask the minister if either he or the Prime Minister knew that Mr. Reisman—and I gather Mr. Reisman was on the other end of the telephone line talking about the announcement of this particular contract—was actually on a retainer from the Lockheed company.

● (1430)

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I did not know of the conversations, as you would know from my reply a day or two ago. I had no personal knowledge that conversations had taken place. I was aware, because it was not in any way a secret, that the firm of Reisman and Grandy had been appointed as consultants to Lockheed. I was aware of that as of a fairly short time ago, but I was not aware that any conversations had taken place.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INCREASE IN PRICE OF COPPER—GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO COUNTERACT

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. It arises out of recent reports that four major copper companies in Canada have raised their prices by about 5 per cent from 63 cents to 66 cents a pound. In view of the indications that the rise in price is the result of increases in the international price for copper rather than an increase in costs, and in light of the fact this increase in price is likely to work its way into the cost structure of the economy as a whole in coming weeks, what action does the minister intend to take immediately rather than wait for the Anti-Inflation Board to examine the quarterly reports of these companies which may take weeks or months, especially with the huge backlog facing the Anti-Inflation Board?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we indicated with respect to certain of the basic commodities, copper being the example, which trades, as it is said on a sawtooth market, that we were not applying the same criteria with regard to cost pass through that would apply with respect to other commodities. Indeed, 53 cents a pound was the price that had been prevailing for much of the early part of this year. Most of the copper in Canada was probably being sold at less than the cost of production. We should indeed look at the returns in the industry over a longer period and not apply strictly the cost pass-through formula. In that sense, the copper industry and other base metal industries would be treated in a different form than other companies in Canada with, however, the over-all restriction on profits that would apply, but over a longer period.

Mr. Saltsman: In view of the fact that in 1974 Noranda, for example, had earnings of $155 million whereas in 1975 it had earnings of $50 million and in 1973 of some $121 million, if it is subject to a proviso that earnings will have to be 95 per cent of the average for the base year, it will be able to raise copper prices sky-high before being caught by any form of regulations the minister is setting up. Can the minister assure the House that when he comes to looking at the permissible profit and price levels of companies like Noranda, he will take into account the result of unjustifiable windfall profits over the last couple of years rather than use that as a way of determining what their profit should be in the future?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of an averaging formula, to try to average out the different years and different experience.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORT OF CONSULTING GROUP ON RELATIONS WITH AFFILIATES—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Jean-R. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Following the completion of the Canada Consulting Group report concerned with the CBC and its relations with its affiliates, will the minister ensure that this report will be made available to the House and that the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts will be asked to study it and make recommendations in this regard in order that members of parliament may have at least minimal participation in the elaboration of the general CBC policy as it applies to its affiliates and as it affects its monstrous budget?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have to take under advisement the status of the report. However, that certainly does not prevent the hon. member and other members of the broadcasting committee from discussing with the president of the corporation its affiliate policy. I know the CBC would be quite willing to discuss the matter.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ARGENTINA—SAFETY OF CANADIANS FOLLOWING TAKEOVER OF GOVERNMENT BY ARMED FORCES

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In light of the takeover of the junta in Argentina, can the minister advise the House if he has received a report from the Canadian embassy as to the security of Canadians in Argentina and the protection of property owned by Canadians?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We had a report yesterday from our ambassador who has informed us that our chancery is operating in a normal way and that there has not been any report of danger to Canadian citizens or Canadian property.

ARGENTINA—POSSIBILITY OF RECOGNITION OF NEW GOVERNMENT—STATUS OF SALE OF CANDU REACTOR

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Can the minister advise the House if the government is in the process of granting recognition to the military government now in power in Argentina? Also, in view of the obvious dangers of the unstable political situation, does the government still wish to proceed with the sale of a CANDU reactor to that country?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the embassy of Argentina has been in touch with us advising us of a new government of Argentina. Obviously, the question of recognition by Canada was in the mind of the Argentinian authorities. We have not yet extended recognition and we will do so when the normal criteria are fulfilled. With regard to the sale of a reactor, which is the subject of an intergovernmental agreement, these intergovernmental agreements are binding even though there may be a change of government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

CUBA—SUGGESTED REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF ARMED FORCES FROM AFRICA

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Prime Minister. In light of the breakdown of talks in Rhodesia, plus the statement by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger that further aggression in Africa was unacceptable to the United States and the buildup of Soviet and Cuban forces in Mozambique which could lead to the outbreak of all out conflict in Rhodesia and other countries in Africa, will the Prime Minister express to Premier Castro of Cuba the concern of Canadians over the continued participation of his 12,000 troops in African conflict and will he request their withdrawal to Cuba in the interest of world peace?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to repeat publicly once again that we are opposed to all outside armed intervention on the African continent, whether it applies to Cuba or any other country.

Mr. Crouse: I can appreciate the Prime Minister's concern. I can assure him it is a concern that is shared by all Canadians, according to correspondence which I and members of my party are receiving. I simply ask at this stage if the Prime Minister will express that concern to Premier Castro by asking him, in the interest of world peace—to withdraw his troops from Africa so there will not be a continued threat of aggression in that part of the world.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crouse: Some members apparently are in agreement with this type of policy. I ask the Prime Minister whether he will give that request consideration.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that I made such representations to Premier Castro a couple of months ago. I made them to him personally. I will give consideration to the hon. member's suggestion, but I think he flatters me if he thinks I can get Premier Castro to change his mind just by sending him a message when I was not able to do it by talking to him personally.

TRADE

CONFERENCE BETWEEN COPPER PRODUCING AND CONSUMING COUNTRIES—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It deals with the conference going on in Geneva between the copper producing and copper consuming countries. Has the minister any report on the conference this week? In particular, will he inform the House who is the person representing Canada?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): On the second part of the question, I apologize. I meant to get this for the hon. member because he asked me privately the other day. I have not got the names of the participants. As to the first part of the question, I can say that the UNCTAD, or United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, has convened its meeting in Geneva and that we are taking an active part—that is to say, Canada is in the conference. In answer to an earlier initiative by the hon. member, let me tell him that the report I have says it is not likely a commodity agreement will be reached at this particular meeting, but it is expected considerable progress will be made toward a more rational approach to the production and supply problem. I will undertake to find out who the representatives are.

● (1440)

SUGGESTED RESTORATION OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): In view of the minister's answer which, I presume, means that the government is in favour of international commodity agreements, would the hon. gentleman, as the minister of trade, join with the United States and Australia in trying to restore the International Wheat Agreement because the grain farmers of the world have had no floor protection, now, for eight years?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I hope I did not convey the wrong impression, Mr. Speaker. I said the objective of the meeting was to discuss commodity agreements. The Canadian position on this subject is that there ought to be a producing as well as a consuming nation arrangement. This might be somewhat different from what the hon. gentleman has in mind. As to the question concerning the International Wheat Agreement, I should like to have some time in which to find out what is the current status of the agreement before trying to reply in detail.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): It ran out.

* * *

HEALTH

MEASURES TO ENSURE ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF SWINE 'FLU VACCINE—CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare? In view of the possible imminent danger of a worldwide "swine 'flu" epidemic and the decision taken by the President of the United States in that connection I should like to ask what steps are being taken to ensure supplies of vaccine for the immunization of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, we have been in communication with the American authorities for several weeks on that subject, as well as with the World Health Organization and health services in Great Britain. Unfortunately the vaccine as such does not exist now. It will have to be manufactured. In Canada, we have the capacity to produce a maximum of about 300,000 doses until next fall. We would have to get the surplus from abroad. We are currently in consultation with other countries to study this whole matter and I shall perhaps have something to add on that subject early next week.

[*English*]

Mr. Rynard: Has the minister been in touch with the provincial ministers of health who are awaiting his announcement before deciding what to do?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lalonde: The officials of my department should already be in communication with provincial authorities; they have already been in communication with provincial authorities on this subject. If they have not, they will be before the end of the day.

POSSIBILITY OF PROGRAM SIMILAR TO UNITED STATES TO DEAL WITH SWINE 'FLU

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, considering that this illness can affect Canada as well as the United States, can we expect in Canada an announcement similar to the statement the President of the United States made yesterday?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I would like to remind the hon. member that no case of this illness, of this virus, has been identified in Canada to date. As for the announcement I shall have to make on this subject, the hon. member should show some patience and wait till early next week. Even if I made an announcement today, this would change absolutely nothing. There is no vaccine at the present time.

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another supplementary of the minister.

Unless I am mistaken, the minister is telling me that this does not affect Canada as gravely as the United States. I assume this epidemic will stop at the 49th parallel.

Mr. Lalonde: I am afraid the hon. member did not understand my reply and I suggest that he read it carefully. He will then realize that all I said was that there has not yet been any identified case of that illness in Canada. The illness, the virus, is so far limited to a very restricted area of the United States, around Fort Dix, in New Jersey.

Oral Questions

BILINGUALISM

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF CARTWRIGHT REPORT

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the President of the Treasury Board.

Considering that the conclusions of the research which was carried out by Professor Cartwright of London's Western University, Ontario, on behalf of the Bilingual district Advisory Board, were released by the Secretary of State Department on March 23, 1976, and considering that in the five year census which will be taken in May, the working language will not be on the list of questions asked, against the recommendations of the B and B Commission, will the President of the Treasury Board tell the House whether or not he intends to refer the result of Professor Cartwright's conclusions to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts so that the issue of the survival of French minorities in Ontario and New Brunswick may be discussed?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, this question was considered within the government during the present study on the report of the commission, although it has not yet been decided to proceed immediately with bilingual districts. We hope to do so very shortly. Of course, we shall then take Professor Cartwright's comments into account.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

CRITERIA USED TO SELECT DEALERS TO IMPORT EGGS

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question, if I may, to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As a result of the government decision to double the number of United States eggs imported into Canada, a situation appears to be developing in which the egg import regulations will allow a number of selected egg importers in Canada to share in an annual profit of between $600,000 and $1,000,000. Can the minister describe to the House the criteria used to select the Ontario dealers who will share in this profit? It is understood that at present these licences are approved by one individual, this individual being an official in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I, too, saw the news report and have asked for a detailed explanation. I understand, from a casual explanation which has been provided to me, that permits are allocated on the basis of the historic trade pattern to importers who have been in the business in the past, and that there is a surplus wich is allocated on a first come, first served basis. I shall let the hon. member have the details. I might add, though, that I am looking into this whole arrangement. If the quantity is substantially higher, then, conceivably, we ought to increase the number of people who participate.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

CONTRACT WITH COMPUTING DEVICES FOR SAMSON PROJECT—DATE FOR DELIVERY OF TERMINALS

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services or to the Minister of National Defence—it is supplementary to a question asked yesterday by the member for Grenville-Carleton. In view of the fact that Computing Devices of Canada have allegedly lost a contract for supplying computer terminals can the minister advise whether or not the officers in the Samson program office had advised Computing Devices of Canada that they did not need any terminals until September of this year, although it was later?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the contract entered into by Computing Devices of Canada was cancelled because the company did not fulfill its obligations with respect to both the date of delivery and the price indicated in the tender, which it wanted to have revised, a request which is absolutely unacceptable.

[*English*]

Mr. Dick: I appreciate the details which the minister has been able to provide. I am inquiring as to whether or not the Samson program office at any time, even though there may have been a delay in the contract, said to Computing Devices: We do not need the terminals until September, 1976?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I shall inquire about this situation.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION OUTLAWING TRADE IN NAMIBIAN GOODS—CANADIAN POSITION ON RATIFICATION

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the United Nations have passed a resolution outlawing trade in Namibian goods and in view of the fact that these goods are still entering Canada legally, since Canada has not ratified or consented to the UN motion, may I ask when is it Canada's intention to concur in the UN motion—or is it the intention to continue to permit entry of Namibian goods?

● (1450)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the only sanctions that Canada had accepted within the United Nations system, of course, are the sanctions that applied to Rhodesia, and there have been no such sanctions applied with regard to trade with Namibia.

INCOME TAX

WRITEOFFS GRANTED FALCONBRIDGE NICKEL—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary and is addressed to the Minister of National Revenue. I understand that a couple of weeks ago at a meeting of national church leaders with the Prime Minister concerning tax writeoffs being granted to Falconbridge Nickel as a result of investments in Namibia it was decided to refer the matter of these benefits to the Department of National Revenue for review and decision. I wonder whether the minister could report when we may have some action in respect of Falconbridge?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I will discuss it with my officials and try to get back to the hon. member sometime today and give him an exact time.

* * *

GRAIN

FEED GRAIN—POSSIBILITY OF PLEBISCITE ON MARKETING SYSTEM IN VIEW OF MINISTER'S PROMISE

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the promise he made in May, 1974, that he would have a plebiscite on marketing of domestic feed grains within one year of the inception of the program, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture yesterday said he was not aware of that promise, and that the promise is now one year overdue, I would ask the minister whether he is going to keep the promise and, if so, when are we going to have the plebiscite?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated prior to this time to farm organizations and farmers that not all parts of the feed grain program are in place yet and, in addition, the very unusual marketing conditions for grain have made it somewhat difficult to assess the program. I have not, therefore, arrived at a decision as to the time it would be appropriate.

POSSIBILITY OF MARKETING ALL GRAINS THROUGH WHEAT BOARD—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Food Prices Review Board has commissioned a study on the futures market and has concluded that the marketing of grain on the open market means lower prices for producers and higher prices and costs to consumers, I wonder whether the minister is reconsidering the policy and now intends to bring all grains under the purview of the Canadian Wheat Board?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the premise of the question.

BARLEY—LOSSES RESULTING FROM WIDE SPREAD BETWEEN PRICES FOR TWO GRADES—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO COMPENSATE

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, last Friday I asked the acting minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board the following question which he took as notice, and I wonder if the minister can answer it for me today:

Many farmers are annoyed at the fact that in the 1974-75 crop year when they shipped cars of barley for malting, one car would be graded 2CW and the next No. 1 feed, yet both cars ended up for malting. Then, this year the final payments of 99 cents per bushel for 2CW and 18 cents for No. 1 feed were announced. Can the acting minister tell the House what the government plans to do to compensate the farmers for this unrealistic spread in the final payments between 2CW barley and No. 1 feed which amounted to losses of $2,000 per car for many farmers?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member has in his hands a two-page letter which details the situation and which indicates that there are two parts to the problem in respect of the differences in final payments last year. One of these problems, it is hoped, will be cured by the creation of a separate malting barley pool, and a bill to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act is before the House. The other problem relates to the fact that the barley originally selected is reclassed as feed and goes into the regular feed pool, and then later on, as the Wheat Board sells barley, it may well sell that barley for malting in a year when there is a great shortage of malting barley. This is a matter of internal Wheat Board distribution of grains. Those farmers who received a final payment for additional barley shared in the amount that was available from that barley sold as malting.

Mr. Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, hopefully Bill C-88 will correct this situation in the future, but could the minister tell me what his plans are to compensate the farmers for the severe losses they suffered in the 1974-75 crop year?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have no plans at all. For a number of years I had discussions with farm organizations on the question of a separate pool for malting barley, but they were generally not very receptive to the idea and, therefore, we did not move to create a separate pool. About a year ago when they indicated they had changed their position and would accept a separate pool we immediately made a move in that direction and put a bill before the House.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

DATE OF DECISION ON NEW TRIAL FOR KEITH LATTA

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I gave notice to the Minister of Justice of this question regarding a matter I have asked about before, namely, the Keith Latta case. Now that the meeting with departmental officials of both the federal Justice Department and the Attorney General of Alberta, on March 10 last, has been held in reference to the Latta murder case, when will the minister be in a position to make a ministerial decision

regarding a new trial for Mr. Latta, particularly in view of the fact that he may have been wrongfully convincted because of a signed statement by Miss Sylvia McCauley, who later married the jury foreman, which statement was made in 1972 and corroborates Latta's version as to the facts? I wonder now if the minister can tell us when he will be in a position to make a decision on such an important matter of justice, particularly in view of the fact that this man may be wrongfully incarcerated?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): I would hope very soon, Mr. Speaker. However, since the hon. member last asked a question on this matter, we have had very considerable difficulty interviewing the witness involved and, in fact, have had to proceed without interviewing her. We are now awaiting the formation of a final decision and report from the Alberta Attorney General's office.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the evidence may have been known to the Crown but not presented at the trial, and may have influenced defence counsel at the time not to call the accused to give evidence on his own behalf, and if this evidence had been heard by the jury the verdict may have been one of acquittal and not one of guilty, will the minister not take these facts into consideration, particularly the fact that this was not known to defence counsel?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, without accepting entirely that version of the trial, in making a decision either to refer the matter back to the court of appeal or to have a new trial we will take all factors into account.

* * *

THE MINISTRY

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF CASE AGAINST STATION CFCF MONTREAL BY SOLICITOR GENERAL—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Solicitor General and it relates to a question I asked on Tuesday regarding his conversion on a Winnipeg radio program which led him to comment at the end that he hoped his comments were not in contempt of court. In view of his statements regarding a case presently before the Quebec courts involving CFCF radio station, Montreal, I would like to ask whether he has discussed this matter with the Prime Minister, as the Prime Minister gave me his undertaking would happen, and has he anything to report about this rather unusual conduct of a minister of the Crown?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I did discuss this with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Communications. As the hon. member points out, I was on a hotline show and was asked what I thought about the CRTC investigation into radio station CFCF. I was asked if I thought this was an infringement of the freedom of the press. I said I felt the CRTC had an obligation to investigate this complaint, but I did not know what the outcome of the investigation would be. I also said I had objected to Bill C-22 and that as far as I knew I did not see anything wrong with doing that.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

● (1500)

[*Translation*]

COMMUNICATIONS

CABLEVISION—POSSIBILITY OF GRANTING NEW POWERS TO PROVINCES FOLLOWING CONSULTATION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Communications.

During a conference last week in Montreal, the minister stated that in the near future Quebec could very well exercise some quite legitimate powers over many local but very important aspects of cablevision. In view of the cultural impact of cablevision on all small communities whose vitality she deems essential to the cultural integrity of Quebec, in the present circumstances and given the quite different but very encouraging attitude of her predecessor, I would ask the minister if she intends to put forward, as soon as possible, some propositions corresponding to the spirit of her conference last week so we will know the powers she seems willing to leave to the provinces?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is racking his brains to find significant differences between the propositions put forward by my predecessor and mine. Basically, in my speech last week I tried to summarize all the propositions already made in rather broad terms, I admit, but I also submitted them to the provinces in broad terms because the negotiations will not be initiated with the same provinces. I said it was necessary, in my opinion, particularly for the province of Quebec if it is to maintain its cultural integrity that it regain some authority over the cable system which undoubtedly has a local impact and which can have a great effect on the culture of small communities. Consequently I reiterated this offer which was never withdrawn, and the terms of this offer will get more precise as I grow more aware of the provinces' claims and needs.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer of the Minister, who always seems very cooperative, may I ask her if she intends to meet the provincial ministers involved in this issue and to inform the House of the decisions by way of propositions?

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, no meeting of Ministers of Communications has been arranged for the near future. However, next week I will initiate a visit of the provinces to get in touch with my provincial counterparts.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the government House leader, although the business for the day is pretty well

confirmed, what the business is for tomorrow and the beginning of next week.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume consideration of the second reading of Bill C-89, the amendments to the Anti-Inflation Act. If second reading should be concluded tomorrow—which seems to be the prospect—and any votes are required, I believe there would be a disposition to put them off until the first order of government business on Monday. When the second reading of Bill C-89 is concluded, we will call Bill S-31, the third reading of Bill C-61, and consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-71. That business, if not concluded tomorrow, will be continued on Monday, and we will then return to the second reading of Bill C-83.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there is one further matter which arose during the course of the question period. I wonder, because the Prime Minister did not want to offend the rules of the House and he did not answer or comment in respect of my question concerning the tabling of the contracts with Reisman and Grandy tomorrow, whether the government House leader, as part of the House business, might review the question I asked and inform the House tomorrow whether or not there would be this submission. At the same time, would he undertake overnight to speak to the Minister of National Defence and give him a lecture in respect of his cabinet responsibility in knowing what his deputy ministers are doing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on the same point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I realize that Thursday will not seem like Thursday if I do not have to ask again the question I have asked every Thursday since last October. May I assume that before next Thursday we will have the bill respecting Canadian Veterans who were prisoners of war?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, it is my intention to bring down notice of that bill either tomorrow or very shortly.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

TABLING OF REPORT RESPECTING PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table the report from the Anti-Inflation Board with regard to property and casualty insurance.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF LAW REFORM COMMISSION REPORT "OUR CRIMINAL LAW"

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(1) I wish to table, in both official languages, the Law Reform Commission report entitled "Our Criminal Law".

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Spadina (Mr. Stollery), London West (Mr. Buchanan), Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald), Halton (Mr. Philbrook), York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), Windsor West (Mr. Gray), York East (Mr. Collenette), Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), Trinity (Miss Nicholson), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), Welland (Mr. Railton), St. Catharines (Mr. Parent) and Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) has been filed with me, pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

If the House agrees, may we appendix these objections to today's *Votes and Proceedings*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Further, I have received an objection signed by the hon. members for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence), Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty), Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), Oxford (Mr. Halliday), Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes), Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling), Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott) and Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard), which has been filled with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

Again, may we agree that these objections be made an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings.*

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Mr. Speaker: May I also inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Chambly (Mr. Loiselle), Sainte-Marie (Mr. Dupont), Levis (Mr. Guay), Beauce (Mr. Caron), Longueuil (Mr. Olivier), Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Fox), Saint-Michel (Miss Begin), Gaspé (Mr. Cyr), Compton (Mr. Tessier), St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), and Duvernay (Mr. Demers), has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec.

If the House agrees, we will make this an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings.*

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order Paper Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,526, 3,701, 3,989 and 3,990.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

LIFT PROGRAMME

Question No. 3,526—**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'appelle-Moose Mountain):**

1. What was the total amount paid under the LIFT Programme?

2. What was the cultivated wheat acreage in (a) Saskatchewan (b) Manitoba (c) Alberta in (i) 1963 (ii) 1969 (iii) 1970?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. $63,106,576.

2.	1963	1969	1970
Saskatchewan	17,910,000	16,600,000	8,000,000
Manitoba	3,153,000	2,500,000	1,400,000
Alberta	5,933,000	5,300,000	2,600,000

USE OF X-RAY BY CHIROPRACTORS IN CANADA

Question No. 3,701—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the Minister of National Health and Welfare information on the extent of the use of X-rays by chiropractors in Canada and, if so, does he, or the Health Protection Branch, medically agree with the use of total body chiropractic X-rays on the Canadian public?

2. Has the Minister information on the extent of treatment of children by chiropractors?

3. Does the government extend official recognition to the practice of chiropractic in any way, for example, the signing of passports, workmens compensation, etc.?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Radiation Protection Bureau of Health Protection Branch has recently initiated a computer program for collecting and analyzing data on the radiation doses received by Canadians in the course of medical and para-medical diagnostic procedures. Discussions are proceeding with provincial health departments at the technical level with the object of incorporating data from provincial X-ray surveillance programs into the central pool. However, the study has not yet proceeded to the point where the extent of use of X-rays by chiropractors can be evaluated. However, based upon utilization data of those provinces that pay for chiropractic and chiropractic X-rays under their medical care plans, and other related data, it is estimated that some 584,000 chiropractic X-rays were taken in Canada during 1974. As chiropractors are free to bill patients for additional services not covered by provincial plans, and since Workmen's Compensation Board cases were not included, the foregoing estimates likely understate the case. It appears that in practice, chiropractors generally do not use either total body or full spinal X-rays as a matter of routine, but use X-rays for selected areas of the spinal column. Chiropractors use X-rays essentially for diagnostic purposes and not as a selective screening process or as a routine evaluation of new patients. The Health Protection Branch regards X-rays as an essential diagnostic tool, although their use involves some risk to the patient and should, therefore, be used only for valid medical reasons. Full spinal chiropractic X-ray examinations are not regarded by the Health Protection Branch as medically justifiable and this view is shared by the Canadian Medical Association.

2. Based upon the utilization data and other factors mentioned in Part 1, it is estimated that some 144,000 services or 2.1 per cent of all chiropractic services rendred during 1974 were for children 14 years of age and under. Of these 144,000 services, 4.4 per cent involved the use of X-ray. When children 15 of 19 years of age are included, the number of services increases to 332,000 and the percentage of services involving the use X-ray increases to 5.2 per cent.

3. The signature of a chiropractor is considered satisfactory for certification of federal employee sick leave (Form NHW-500). Subject to certain conditions chiropractic reports are accepted by the Department of National Health and Welfare medical officers who review Unemployment Insurance Commission medical assessments. Chiropractors are excluded from the list of passport guarantors. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police has added chiropractice as a benefit under its employee benefit plan. The Group Surgical Medical Insurance Plan for federal employees provides chiropractic benefits beyond those provided by the provincial insurance program. Several provincial health insurance plans cover chiropractic care on a limited basis, although the federal government does not share in these latter benefits as an insured service under the Medical Care Program. Workmen's Compensation Boards in all provinces except Quebec and Newfoundland have authorized workmen to receive chiropractic care.

POST OFFICE—ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT

Question No. 3,989—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. Has new electronic surveillance equipment been installed in post offices and stations across Canada and, if so, which ones?

2. What is the actual or estimated cost of having such equipment installed in a (a) large (b) medium (c) small sized postal station?

3. To what extent will such equipment be used to monitor postal sorters and other inside workers and will the surveillance be daily?

4. Will letter carriers and wicket workers also be monitored?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. No electronic observation equipment installations have yet been completed.

2. It is not contemplated that such equipment would necessarily be considered for all post offices in the various categories questioned. (*a*) The estimated cost for an equipment installation in a large post office (Grade 10 and up) is $250,000 plus, depending upon actual size. (b) The estimated cost for a medium post office (Grades 8 and 9) is an average of $70,000. (c) The estimated cost for a small post office (Grade 7 or lower) is an average of $40,000.

3. The equipment will be used solely by postal inspectors, only when there are reasonable grounds to believe

that criminal activities are taking place in a postal facility. It is not proposed to use such equipment on a daily basis nor for productivity or staff control purposes.

4. Equipment will be used to observe any person located in a postal facility where there is reason to believe criminal activities may be taking place. No such observation equipment will be used in employee rest rooms or cafeterias.

MAIL REPORTED MISSING OR STOLEN

Question No. 3,990—**Mr. MacKay:**

1. In each of the past five years, how many pieces of mail were reported missing or stolen and how many were eventually recovered?

2. For the same years, by province, how much money was paid from the Post Office budget as remuneration for lost mail?

3. From what part of the budget was this remuneration taken?

4. Are monies for the remuneration set at a certain limit in each fiscal year and, if not, is the amount limitless?

5. For the same years, did the Post Office Department recover any money from persons convicted or dismissed for mail theft and, if so, which section received the money?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): 1. Customer Complaints Received by District Offices for Ordinary Letter, Parcel and Special Delivery Losses.

Fiscal Year	Total
1970-71	55,231
1971-72	61,675
1972-73	68,856
1973-74	72,932
1974-75	64,211

NOTE: Our recording system does not include such information as the number of items reported stolen or the rate of recovery of articles said to have been lost.

2. Provincial indemnity payments made for all classes of Domestic losses over the past five fiscal years are shown on the attached sheet. We are unable to give separate payments made by N.B. and P.E.I., and B.C. and Yukon, as combined reports are submitted. Payments for uninsured items are only included in provincial totals for the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75.

3. Indemnity payments for losses of registered, insured and C.O.D. items are paid out of postal revenue in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 (1)(C)(i), (ii) and (iv) of the Post Office Act.

4. By gazetted regulations, the amount of indemnity payable on individual claims is limited and the Department may authorize payment of claims within these limits.

5. On a number of occasions in the past five years, the Post Office Department has recovered monies from persons convicted or dismissed, and in each instance the monies recovered were either returned to the rightful owner(s) or deposited to the Post Office account. Such monies were recovered as a result of voluntary restitutions by offenders or pursuant to orders issued by the Courts.

	1970-1	1971-2	1972-3	1973-4	1974-5
Newfoundland	8,481.10	7,521.64	10,843.53	19,241.46	23,741.67
Nova Scotia	18,631.01	19,747.55	26,305.99	33,364.74	36,974.19
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island	17,976.60	18,876.57	25,214.44	27,998.36	34,564.11
Quebec	271,019.43	390,224.60	418,660.28	507,712.45	653,688.32
Ontario	294,930.21	352,450.02	473,942.38	721,447.83	811,646.91
Manitoba	19,622.91	20,565.16	44,570.43	64,799.00	65,159.52
Saskatchewan	10,956.09	13,812.25	26,249.42	38,331.94	55,823.44
Alberta	15,789.60	14,449.94	27,632.70	48,352.12	46,259.53
British Columbia and Yukon	19,652.56	18,995.95	28,884.42	42,809.70	59,589.31

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

INTERIM SUPPLY ENDING MARCH 31, 1977

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board) moved that Bill C-91, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to express the hope that we might come to some understanding about today's arrangements. We, on this side of the House, would like all the debate on Bill C-91 to take place in committee of the whole. I am not sure the government is in full agreement with that, but perhaps we could have some statement from the government House leader so that we could have an understanding as to how we are to spend the day on this bill.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, following upon what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, I think there is the same disposition on the part of the official opposition. I think it would be best, in what is a rather unique procedure, that we go right into committee of the whole for consideration of the bill. I hope the government House leader will agree. I think there will be ample opportunity for the statement someone would normally make on second reading to be made at the committee stage.

Mr. Sharp: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is not the government's intention to have a long debate on second reading. However, I think it would be desirable for the minister to present the bill and if, of course, there should be a disposition on the part of members on the other side of the House to contribute to the debate on second reading, we could not stop them if they wished to participate. However, on this side of the House I have an understanding that the minister will be the only speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, under the Financial Administration Act, the government is requesting from the House, through this second bill, an appropriation of funds, the authorization to spend approximately $4.971 billion during the fiscal period 1976-77, which is slightly more than one quarter of the disbursements I submitted on February 18. By the same token, the government is asking for the authorization to borrow up to $6 billion to finance public works and other projects during the fiscal year starting April 1, an amount unchanged from 1975-76. It goes without saying that the government will not necessarily make use of this entire borrowing power. And my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) has assured me that if such was the desire of the hon. members, he could personally come to a committee of the House to explain that borrowing policy for 1976-77.

As indicated yesterday by my colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), the changes made to procedure governing the passing of this bill give members the opportunity to express their opinion on the spending policy and the borrowing policy of the government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity offered me by this intervention on second reading to comment on and refute some of the criticisms directed toward this policy since the submission of the main estimates last February 18.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Hon. members are aware that many Canadians are concerned about the scope and effectiveness of public spending at all levels of government. We share these concerns which have been promoted by the abnormally high increase in federal and provincial expenditures during the last two years. Accordingly, we have taken a series of measures to limit the growth of expenditures, to curb the expansion of the public service and to improve productivity throughout the government.

Costs can be, and have been controlled; productivity gains can be, and have been, achieved in the federal public service. This is very much the business of the Treasury Board and its secretariat, and they have been far from inactive. Ministers and senior executives will testify—even complain, occasionally—that over the years the budgetary controls administered by the secretariat's program branch have become much more rigorous. The administrative policy branch has kept regulations and guidelines constantly under review and tightened them whenever feasible and justifiable.

The personnel policy branch had managed to keep the salaries and wages of federal public servants at levels

comparable to the average remuneration of other Canadians in similar occupational categories. The planning branch, apart from conducting, each year, effectiveness and efficiency analyses in major policy areas, as well as government-wide managerial studies, has developed and begun to implement systems of operational performance measurements and methods of benefit-cost analysis applicable to government operations.

[*Translation*]

Judging from the accusations they make right and left, it is not unwarranted to remind hon. members of the opposition some of our recent initiatives in this field.

On January 22 of this year, a Treasury Board circular informed federal departments and agencies of reductions they have to make in administrative practices of the government, to comply with the Prime Minister's undertaking to reduce government spendings, as part of the fight against inflation. These reductions affect in particular the purchase of photocopying equipment and of motor vehicles, the participation of public servants in non-government conferences, office furniture, travels and the use of taxis.

I do not believe these measures will enable us to save huge amounts. However they will generate necessary restraint in the public administration and put an end to abuses which, though not too frequent, rightly concerned Canadian taxpayers.

In February, I urged the Treasury Board officials, in the memoranda they were sending to deputy ministers and managers of federal agencies, to remind them of the announcement made last December by the Prime Minister, who emphasized that the budgetary restraint policy of the government was not to be applied in the current year only, but had to be maintained for several years in order to be efficient.

In early March, following the review by the Auditor General on financial management and control within the federal government, I announced the creation of a new branch of the financial administration within the secretariat of the Treasury Board. On the same day, I announced to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts that we fully agreed with 22 out of 34 recommendations by the Auditor General, that we accepted with some reservations 10 other recommendations and that only two were unacceptable to us. It has been argued by some people, when hearing of this new branch, that the government had finally decided to appoint a "watchdog" for federal spendings. It is not so, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, the Program Branch of the secretariat has been examining the estimates of the various departments for a long time, just as the Planning Branch has been assessing their efficiency and output and the Administrative Policy Branch has been reviewing their practices in many areas, including financial administration. The re-structure now under way is rather designed to strengthen and tighten financial controls that have existed for many decades.

[*English*]

To complete this review of some of our recent initiatives toward better spending control, I might add that the secretary of the Treasury Board, at my request, tabled this morning in the public accounts committee the new benefit-cost analysis guide which is being issued to all depart-

ments and agencies. As you know, the Treasury Board has been actively involved in fostering the use of this modern management technique by individual government departments, while carrying out itself a number of benefit-cost studies of major expenditure programs.

Put simply, benefit-cost analyses can provide ministers and public administrators with some rough and ready measures of the social usefulness of a project or program by considering all the benefits to society arising from it—even the less tangible one—and comparing them with the total cost of the project. It is not a substitute for administrative, common sense or political judgment, but it provides a more concrete basis, more economic facts, on which to apply such common sense or judgment. The new guide prepared by the planning branch of the Treasury Board secretariat lays down the conceptual framework for benefit-cost analysis, discusses the methodological problems which government analysts must resolve, and gives them practical advice on how they should proceed.

Finally, I would like to announce a further measure to trim down operating costs and raise productivity levels within the federal public service. At my request, the Secretary of the Treasury Board wrote last week to all deputy ministers and heads of agencies to inform them of the government's decision to establish a senior interdepartmental committee on administrative improvements. The terms of reference of the committee are as follows: first, to identify those areas in which improvements can be made in the management and control of administrative inputs; second, to establish priorities for the review of those areas; third, to establish or redefine the study objective and the organization required to develop solutions to each of the identified areas in which improvements can be made; fourth, to make recommendations to the cabinet, as required, through the Treasury Board, on the administrative improvements proposed as a result of the studies; fifth, to recommend to the Treasury Board the most effective means of implementing and monitoring the administrative improvements approved by cabinet as a result of the studies; sixth, to report semi-annually to the Treasury Board and, if appropriate, to the cabinet on the progress of the committee.

A number of departments and agencies will be permanently involved in the committee because the scope and complexity of their operations require attention on a continuing basis; others will be invited to participate whenever the committee deems it useful to review operations under their responsibility where efficiency could be improved and savings made. But I suspect that this is far too complicated to discuss in detail in the House with hon. members of the opposition. They are not really interested in a more efficient public service or in more effective government programs. What they want is blood on the floor and a knife in the financial gut of every department, even if its operations are vital to the Canadian economy; even if thousands of people are thrown out of work, and even if economic and social progress is brought to a halt.

● (1520)

Mr. Paproski: Shame on you, Jean.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Towers: Mr Speaker, I take strong exception to the remarks of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) because of the hours of toil members of the public accounts committee have put into the committee and in working on this type of program. While we may have doubts as to the agreement of the President of the Treasury Board to go along with the recommendations of the Auditor General, I certainly take exception to his comments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will admit that this is a question of opinion and has no relation to the procedure of this House. The hon. member can intervene at a later time in committee of the whole.

Mr. Chrétien: I think that is a good illustration, Mr. Speaker, of why the people of Canada decided that we should sit on this side—because hon. members opposite are not able to face any criticism. They spend days and days criticizing. I read three or four lines from my speech, and they blew up. Obviously, they are not ready to take the responsibility of running the nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Call an election: we'll show you.

An hon. Member: What do you think this is—a hockey game?

Mr. Chrétien: If you want a good fight, okay, let's go.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: All we hear from hon. members opposite on expenditure policy are contradictory and irresponsible statements, constant bickering and politicking to confuse and mislead Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: Our Conversative opponents, for example, profess to be shocked by the recent rise in federal spending.

An hon. Member: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Paproski: Is that an $800 speech, or a $1,600 speech?

Mr. Chrétien: We have a good government. We are well organized and we have good speeches.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chrétien: It is unbelievable how they lose their control. They profess to be shocked, even if additional expenditures are mainly attributable to policies which they urged upon us and supported, such as subsidies to oil importers in the eastern provinces. The official opposition misses no opportunity to call for spending cuts, but always in general, never in specific terms. Hon. members opposite sneer when we point out that it is difficult to limit outlays

on statutory programs, but they make it even more difficult with their stalling and filibustering when we try to do it.

There was an example of that shameless double-talk last week during the debate on the medical care legislation. Conveniently forgetting the mindless calls of their colleagues from Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) and Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) for austerity and more austerity, the Conservative members from Huron-Middlesex (Mr. McKinley), St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), Joliette (Mr. La Salle) and Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle), did their best to delay passage of that bill, as if the government could live indefinitely with runaway medicare costs. They have been consistent. We are here every day, and there is not a single question period in which some of them do not get up and ask for more expenditures.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The debate in this House on second reading of Bill C-68 is over. This is no time for the minister to revive that debate.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

An hon. Member: It was stopped by closure, remember!

Mr. Chrétien: Okay.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Tell us about Bill C-91.

Mr. Chrétien: The expenditure policy of the government between 1968 and 1973 can be considered as the continuation of post-war Liberal economics which have been so beneficial for Canada. Federal expenditures were allowed to grow at a rate which varied from year to year depending upon the needs of federal programs and the requirements of the economy as a whole. Because we introduced new programs and expanded many of the existing ones, the share of national output, absorbed by federal expenditures, increased slightly—by less than 1 per cent on average, but the growth of real GNP remained above 5 per cent during that entire five-year period, with the single exception of 1970. Moreover, the surpluses accumulated during the good years, on a national accounts basis, more than offset the deficit incurred in 1971 and 1972. What happened, then, in the past two years? Why were we not, in 1974 and 1975, able to maintain the balanced policy of the previous five years? Why has the increase in federal expenditures been higher than usual? Why was it necessary to absorb a sizeable deficit last year?

My colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), will have much to say on these questions in his forthcoming budget speech. However, the short answer is that the four-fold increase in oil prices, compounding years of chronic inflation and instability in international markets, plunged the world economy into its worst slump since the end of the Second World War—and, confronted with declining exports and sluggish domestic demand, our government simply rejected the Bennett solution. We refused to make matters worse by savage cuts in federal spending, even when slower growth cut into our revenues and when inflation bloated our expenditures.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

With the support of all provincial governments, including those of oil producing provinces, we refused to let the oil importing provinces of eastern Canada bear, without relief, the full burden of higher energy prices. But that cost a great deal of money. Had it not been for oil compensation payments, the over-all increase of federal expenditures—measured on the public accounts basis—would have been about $4.2 billion less in the last two fiscal years as well as the one beginning on April 1, but the private sector would then have been saddled with a huge financial burden which would have depressed the economy even more. The fact that the recession was relatively milder in Canada than in most other industrial countries, and much milder than in the United States, bears testimony to the basic soundness of our economic policies. We have managed to avoid a contraction in real output even in 1975, a year when only half a dozen members of the OECD group were able to achieve any real growth.

In conclusion, I should like to remind our critics that the main estimates of expenditure are only one half of the government's budgetary policy. They must wait for the budget speech proper to learn about the other half, namely, the government's policy and expectations concerning revenues, borrowings and general economic conditions during 1976 and the early part of 1977. I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) will greatly enlighten them on that issue.

Unlike Conservatives and New Democrats, Liberals are not dogmatic about public expenditures. We believe that the government should not hesitate to spend more when the state of the economy and the general welfare of Canadians require it. But we also believe that the government should not hesitate to trim its sails when conditions change and the private sector provides adequate impetus for economic growth. In addition, whatever may be the level of expenditures, the government constantly tries to ensure that funds are spent efficiently and that Canadians are provided with effective public services—and I mean all ministers, not just the President of the Treasury Board. I am so enthusiastic about my job that I sometimes get carried away.

● (1530)

Mr. Paproski: Like this afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: A few weeks ago I said that I am the only one who has an incentive to control public spending. I was speaking, of course, for the Treasury Board of which the Minister of Finance is also a member and on which nine other ministers sit either as permanent or alternate members. But even then I was perhaps unfair to my colleagues. They are responsible for programs which are all essential, one way or another, for the continued economic, social and cultural development of Canada. It is, therefore, natural that they should constantly strive to improve and expand these programs, and such improvements usually cost money. Since resources are always limited, the Treasury Board must, unfortunately, intervene at this point to implement the over-all expenditure policy previously set by all ministers.

I can assure the House that the overwhelming majority of submissions made by ministers to the Treasury Board stay within the financial guidelines and the social priorities set by cabinet, but I must emphasize that the few submissions that are beyond these guidelines are not rejected out of hand. The responsible minister then discusses the matter with his friendly treasurer; sometimes he manages to convince me that the projected expenditure is indeed an essential and urgent one, and sometimes I manage to convince him that the project can be delayed or phased over several years.

I wanted to make these few comments, Mr. Speaker. I have cut out the middle of my speech because I am so involved in the technology of the government that I did not want to lose my natural instinct to be a little bit of a politician—because that is what this House is all about. I am certain that if I did it would annoy my friends opposite. I do not want them to look too bad for the public, because they are so thin-skinned that the public might think they will never be able to form a government. Of course, I do not want to be part of the government for generations and generations.

An hon. Member: Speak for yourself, Jean.

Mr. Paproski: You won't be, after 1978.

An hon. Member: In 1978 you will be on this side of the House.

Mr. Chrétien: I love to have this kind of debate, Mr. Speaker, with a little bit of life in this House of Commons—and my good friend from Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is in complete agreement. I think that on occasion we have to debate some aspects of interim supply because we want to have the money to operate until the end of June. In committee, of course, members will have occasion to review all the expenditures. There is a good procedure for that, but we must have authority to spend on an interim basis until June 30. All members on the various committees of the House will have occasion not only to question me but to question all ministers about their estimates and the operation of their departments.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this bill is a new procedure. I was a bit caught by surprise because I thought it was to be a long debate on second reading. It is obvious that I have worked very hard on this speech—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: —just to accommodate my hon. friends. But I have cut many pages from it. Many of them were to be very political, and I know I should not be political so let us go back to the figures. I am always willing to co-operate with members of parliament and give them all information possible. I have taken many of their recommendations into account. I am glad to say that members of the public accounts committee have developed good working relations. In fact, the other day we set a precedent; the chairman of the committee is a member of the opposition, the Auditor General was there, and so was I, and the three of us were in complete agreement. I think that is the way we should go about controlling expenditures within government. In fact, it is not a question of being on one side of government or on the other side—we have a collective responsibility to make sure the money is well spent. I am not a member of the Social Credit party, and it is too bad no one from that party is in the House.

An hon. Member: That is nasty.

Mr. Chrétien: We do not print the money; we collect it from taxpayers, and that is why we are careful with every penny.

Mr. Alkenbrack: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question regarding part of the schedule of Bill C-91?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. This will have to be done when we are in committee of the whole. The motion in front of us is for second reading of the bill. We cannot debate the bill at this time unless we do so on its principle. This is not the time for the calling of questions.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think there was a general understanding that the minister would be permitted to make the statement he did and then we would immediately go into committee of the whole and take care of those matters. I understood that to be the case. The government House leader is not here, but I think that was the understanding.

Mr. Chrétien: That is the understanding.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is no definite order, but there seems to be an understanding.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

On clause 2.

Mr. Stevens: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If I understood the President of the Treasury Board correctly, I believe he indicated that the Minister of Finance would be willing to appear and give us an explanation concerning the borrowing requirements as indicated in clause 5 of the bill before us. I was wondering whether we could have the minister take up that suggestion and request that the Minister of Finance so appear.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I discussed this matter with the Minister of Finance during the question period and he said that he would be available, when requested by the House, to come and deal with the borrowing authority requirement in this bill. I think that is an improvement on the rule, because I know the frustration of members with the strict rule we had before: it was not satisfactory.

Mr. Stevens: Eight o'clock?

Mr. Chrétien: I will check and report to the House.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to have the bureaucrat, turned politician return to the chamber and hope to find blood on the floor. I found it particularly interesting that he stabbed himself in the course of his own speech. Perhaps the blood on the

floor is his own! I am glad he changed his tune somewhere after the middle part of his speech, because I had assumed that this procedure, which was a special procedure, was brought about because of the absolutely ridiculous ways in which this parliament, representing as we do the people of the country, is without the ability realistically to review the estimates and expenditures of government.

● (1540)

A few minutes ago the minister suggested that standing committees can review estimates. I tell the minister that I and other hon. members, including government supporters, have attempted to do this elsewhere, and I tell him that our rules of procedure do not permit us to examine in depth the details of government spending.

Many years ago, when I was a student at Carleton University, I used to sit in the gallery and watch the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and others consider the estimates in committee of the whole. Then the House exercised control over government spending. We watched committee of the whole deal with the estimates of each minister. The consideration of estimates was not restricted by time. The quality of ministers' answers determined how long estimates were given consideration. Only after the minister had answered all questions were the estimates passed. Some ministers were candid with the committee, others were not so candid. When ministers were candid, no matter how complex their estimates were, the estimates were passed. If ministers did not answer fully, or refused to answer, or evaded questions—as ministers have been known to do from time to time—the estimates were held up.

The rules were changed in 1969. The review of estimates was made the responsibility of standing committees and the rights of members restricted. It became difficult for members to determine the real cost and purpose of various provisions in the estimates, and almost impossible to see if they were sound. It is one thing for any minister to tell the House he has embarked on a program, but quite another for parliament to be satisfied that the program is operating properly as the minister may claim. At present, the representatives of this country's 23 million people are given little right to examine the estimates. Certain things, nonetheless, are apparent. The government claims that it has no control over the growth of certain expenditures, but it is evident that it is responsible for increased spending in certain areas in which there is no evidence of diminution of costs.

Let me quote some figures. About 45 per cent of the increase in government spending is attributable to grants, contributions and transfer payments. Yet in other areas, significant savings could be made. It is clearly evident that the bulk of the increase in spending is accounted for by spending in areas where the government exercises a high degree of control. Consider the following categories of increases: salaries and wages have increased 13.6 per cent; other personnel costs, 18.4 per cent; transport and communications, 12.4 per cent; information, 16.5 per cent; professional and special services, 9.9 per cent; rentals, 18 per cent; purchased repair and upkeep, 15.1 per cent; utilities, material and supplies, 13.5 per cent; capital, land, building and equipment, 11.9 per cent; capital, machinery and equipment, 24.4 per cent; public debt charges, 23.1 per cent; and all other expenditures, 36.4 per cent.

Clearly, the minister's claim that the government is exercising restraint is unfounded. The facts are to the contrary. Members of the government talk a great deal about fighting inflation and about the white paper on inflation, but the government does not intend to follow its own guidelines when increasing wages, salaries and other personnel costs. I suggest that an examination of the estimates will show I am right. If the government is sincere in what it says about restraint, let it practice that restraint. It alone must decide if it will follow its own policy. It cannot look to the opposition for guidance; it must look to itself. It alone can determine if it will follow its own policy. The government is basically responsible for establishing short-term as well as long-term priorities for expenditures, and it has not done so. For instance—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order. I am a little confused by the procedure. I have nothing against the way the hon. member is proceeding but I had understood that if we were to proceed in such a way, we would have to go in committee and, generally, when we are in committee it is not to deliver as long a speech as this one but to answer questions. It is something of a general debate that the hon. member has just launched because normally I should be invited to answer several points he has made. I cannot possibly make any remarks if he delivers a 20-minute speech. I do not mind. It will still be possible on second reading.

The Chairman: Order. To inform the hon. minister, I must state that it is a fact that in committee there is time for questions but each member is entitled to use his 20 minutes as he sees fit. The minister may speak as often as he wishes to answer questions which have been raised. He also has 20 minutes each time he takes the floor to answer objections or points put forward by hon. members.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I respect that. Questions will be asked. The difficulty is that the minister is most reluctant to answer questions asked in committee of the whole or elsewhere. I was talking about the government's restraint program and spending priorities. What has happened? Ministers are beating their breasts, telling us they practice restraint. But what, actually, are they doing? In these times of restraint, the government has launched a program for decentralizing government. The cost is not less than between $50,000 and $60,000 per employee involved. Is that restraint? How much is the government spending on information? According to my information, the total cost of information services and staff is at least $138 million. If we make reasonable allowance for the cost of accommodation and support services, that figure rises to about $150 million.

● (1550)

What do we have? What do we get for it? Does anybody feel well informed? Government press hand-outs are considered by the press as a bad joke in terms of number and quality—glossy publications, overproduced, underread and poorly created. What has the over $5 million budget of

external affairs done to our image abroad? What will the planned increase of over $1 million in 1976-77 add? There is the first question.

The $14 million spent by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce will be increased by over $4.5 million in 1976-77. While tourism seems to be doing well with its $834 million, what is the other $10 million going to do for us? It, visibly, has not done much for our exports recently. Why does Statistics Canada need almost $4 million more in 1976-77? What does the $10 million, plus, spending by national defence do to improve our defence posture when we have not even made up our mind which way we are going? These are the matters to which this government should direct itself—and not in terms of its restraint program, a program that, as a matter of fact, is not a restraint program at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is one other matter which affects every member of the House of Commons. It is the ability that we, as parliamentarians—not just ministers or government supporters, but all of us—have to examine expenditures of government. What is the attitude of a bureaucrat toward committees of the House of Commons? I have a quote from a retired bureaucrat, Frank Howard. He was a communications officer, and is now a writer. He tells us what he thinks of the parliamentary system and the ability of committees to find out how the Queen's money, the money of the people of this country, is spent. This is what he had to say about his job as a communications officer, and I quote from the March 7 edition of *Saturday Night*:

> I came to worry about what I was doing to the press. My job was to manipulate it. The simple truth was that it was easy: the press didn't know how to ask the right questions, so you went out and fed them the answers you wanted.
>
> With parliament we operated the same way. We figured out a way of getting off easy with Commons committees. At the first opportunity possible we'd get the top scientist in the department to speak. He'd come across with a whole lot of stuff about gigahertzes and geostationary orbits and if some MP asked a question, he'd say no, they hadn't quite understood and come back with more jargon, and so the MP would give up and none of them would come even close to understanding the real problems of communications.

Here is what he had to say about the right of parliamentarians to know:

> In the end, you come to view information as something you put out when it's to your advantage. By your advantage, I mean the advantage of the system. People within the system who don't understand that information is a commodity, to be used and exploited for the system's advantage, don't get along.
>
> Parliament can't control government. MPs don't know what questions to ask, and even if they asked them, there's no way of forcing the government to give answers. Even ministers don't control the bureaucracy. Ministers spend their first year trying to get into their department, and then they're co-opted by the department. For people outside trying to represent the public interest, it's even worse. Ranged up against them is a bureaucracy that amounts to a vast information processing machine with years and years of experience.

That says something to every member of parliament. It says something to those who want to see the rules reformed. The government is always talking about shortening the length of debate. The government House leader talks about television in the House. There are much more important things to be done. Forget about the cosmetics. Give us the tools. Give us the means to ask the proper questions. Give us the answers to our questions. Make our committees independent. Give us those tools and we will show this or any other government what ought to be within the power of a parliament, properly equipped, to inquire. We would not use these tools to obstruct, as we are accused of doing, but honestly and objectively to look at the estimates of each department. We do not have that power, and that is what we require.

When the government House leader raises in this House the necessity of reforming the rules, I completely agree with him. However, I want the government House leader to understand that if we are going—

An hon. Member: Do you want a soap-box?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Apparently the hon. member does not care if the regulations are changed. If we are going to make the legislative machinery move more quickly, the price for that change is going to be a heavy one indeed. The price will be to give to parliament assembled here and in the various committees a revision of the committees' system so there can, at long last, be something that we have not had since the rule changes were pushed through this parliament by closure in the sixties; that is, the right to know and the right to examine.

Mr. Blais: You cannot ask questions.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I have something to say about asking questions. The man who wrote the article I quoted had the following to say about that matter:

> The people who are interested in finding out things have to be given the means of finding things out. There's a rough rule of thumb in government that you spend about two to three per cent of the budget of a program on information relating to the program. Why not insist that, say, one-tenth of one per cent of a program's budget be channelled into research by the opposition parties. If you put down $80 million for LIP this year, then you put down $80,000 for research into LIP. And so on. Now if you started that tomorrow, the opposition wouldn't know what to do; they'd still concentrate on the horror stories. But over time, they'd build a competent research staff. This might turn into a bureaucracy. At least it would be a counter-bureaucracy.

If these suggestions were taken, we would see, for the first time in many years, an honest examination of government expenditures. It would not only serve parliament, which it should serve first, but the government as well. The government would know that committees were a well-informed, articulate sounding board for their programs. After the programs were considered by the committees, they would be acceptable without suspicion—and this is something that is very important. The knowledge that we have, in terms of the operation of government, is vested in the bureaucracy, the government. In terms of parliament and its operation, access to knowledge has become overweighted on the government side.

I ask the President of the Treasury Board, as the keeper of the public purse, whether he is prepared to recommend to his ministry, as a first priority in terms of spending, and to the commissioners of internal economy of this place—of which he is one—a substantial increase, on a negotiated basis, with respect to funds for the operation of research offices of all political parties represented in this House.

● (1600)

I make this request so that the work of this parliament can determine the examination of the estimates, the study of the government's legislative program, the study of its priorities, the questioning of its objectives, finding out whether those objectives are being met, and discussing whether the offices, in terms of cost analysis, cost-benefit work referred to by the minister, are being carried out. We in this parliament should be able to examine that work. You are an officer of parliament, Mr. Chairman, and you must care about it as well. If this kind of thing does not start now, we will see a continuation of the ability of the government to stonewall not only in this chamber but in the committee. Those things which should be exposed will not be exposed, and as to those things for which the government ought to get credit, we will not know about them in a way in which we can honestly accept them. If this is done, this institution will take on a new life of its own. I hope the minister will consider the propriety, the rightness of asking for an amendment to the rules of this House so that we can bring back, once more at least, some departmental estimates into the committee of the whole in the old way.

Some people look upon this public institution with some cynicism. From what we have seen in the last few days, I can understand that. But what I suggest would constitute a great improvement.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, like the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, we welcome this day during which we can spend some time on the estimates for the year just ahead of us. We shall all discover very soon that the day will go very fast, and my contribution to avoiding that will be to speak for less than the 20 minutes I am allowed.

I was interested in the reference the previous speaker made to the days when he sat in the gallery as a student watching some of us who were already on the floor dealing with estimates in the committee of supply. I was a member of the committee which changed all that and put the estimates into the various committees. We were involved in quite a struggle when that was done in 1968, but I am prepared to say that we did win certain gains though we also suffered a very real loss. I think we had very much more control when the estimates were on the floor and there was no time limit. I know we cannot go back to that system. The number of departments, the amount of money which is spent, the items on which the money is spent—all these things have multiplied so much that we cannot go back to that earlier arrangement. However, I think that when we reform the rules with respect to the handling of expenditures we ought to make provision for bringing back to the floor of the House of Commons two or three departments a year, picked by the opposition, and discussion on those estimates when they are on the floor should be without time limit. If it is done the other way, ministers can just sit it out, members on the government side can exercise their right to use up some of the time, and any sense of control by the House of Commons over expenditure of money is gone. However, I do not want to be guilty of using this day, when we have estimates before us, in discussing procedure, though I welcome the comments the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton made in that direction.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

I welcome the speech made by the President of the Treasury Board. I enjoy him when he deals with the technicalities of his position. I enjoy him just as much, perhaps more, when he launches into a political tirade. He is good at it. I have seen him grow into quite a politician since he first came here some 14 years ago. But I want to say to him there is one taunt he may think he can throw at the Progressive Conservative party but he cannot throw it at us. He likes to say to the Progressive Conservatives that though they call for restraint, though they call for cuts in expenditure, they also demand new expenditures. He knows he cannot throw that charge at us because we have said many times that we realize that civilization costs money. He knows that we do not look upon government taxing and spending as a form of highway robbery but as a means of redistributing the wealth which is created in this country.

Our quarrel with the government is not with its level of spending but with its order of priorities. Right now, if the government wants to talk about restraint, about cutting expenditures, the way to implement such a program is not just to cut everything by a certain percentage, not for the President of the Treasury Board to become "Mr. No" to every one of his colleagues, but to make cuts where they can be applied without causing suffering, and to realize that in some cases the circumstances call for increases.

We have before us today an interim supply bill which provides for three-twelfths of all the estimates for 1975-76 and some more twelfths for certain of the departments. This being so, discussion can cover virtually an unlimited range of subjects. We regret very much that the estimates are such that they carry out the government's announced intention to freeze family allowances at the 1975 level. Even in a period of restraint, even when cuts are being made, it is the responsibility of the government to face up to the difficulties of those who are in need, and we contend that failure to escalate family allowances in 1976 in accordance with the rise in the cost of living is a gross piece of unfairness.

By the same token, I regret that no provision is made in the main estimates for an increase in the basic amount of old age security payments. Provision is there for an escalation corresponding to the rise in the cost of living, and this applies not only to the basic amount but to the guaranteed income supplement. However, the government takes the view that nothing more needs to be done in connection with that issue, and says—especially to hon. members on my right, "If you want expenditures cut, you cannot be asking for further expenditures at the same time." I say, again, that what concerns us is the scale of priorities, how the money is spent.

I cannot join in all the complaints the previous speaker made about government spending, but I suggest to the President of the Treasury Board that there is cause for complaint when the number of public servants in the SX category has risen from 400 a few years ago to over 1,000. I would remind the minister that between 1969 and 1974, while he was minister of Indian affairs and northern development, the number of public servants in that category in his department—these are the highest paid public serv-

ants—rose from 16 to 47. This is hardly restraint: it is a sample of what the government does.

Then there are these huge expenses on buildings for the defence department, some of which may not be necessary; and there is the kind of expenditure we seem to be facing in connection with the Lockheed contract or agreement. The people of Canada wonder what is going on, and have reason to be cynical. Our position as a party is not that the government is doing the wrong thing in raising money by taxation and in spending it. Our contention is that the money is being spent, in many cases, on the wrong things—and that where money is needed, this government does not come through. We think it is wrong for the President of the Treasury Board simply to stand up with confidence, because he is saying "No" to everybody else, and say "No" to those on family allowances, those on old age pensions, and so on.

● (1610)

Initially I said I would try not to use the 20 minutes that is allotted to each of us because I hoped that during the day a number of members could take part. Some of my colleagues have specific points they want to speak about, and since I probably will not get a chance to speak again in the day, I should like to say now that I welcome the fact that the Minister of Finance is going to come in to deal with the borrowing business. I will not go into the technicalities of that, but I hope when he comes he will answer some questions in relation to the "Orion" which Lockheed is trying to sell us. My colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood, was asking questions about this "Orion" business today. Most of us feel that the whole situation is such a mess that the government should walk away from it right now.

What bothers me, in terms of this borrowing authority, is that under clause 5 of this bill the government will have the authority to borrow the sum of $6 billion—$6,000 million. I should like to know whether that will include the authority to borrow money for front-end financing of the "Orion" aircraft. The minister shakes his head. I hope that is the position; but I trust we will get a clear answer on that from the Minister of Finance when he comes in.

I could go on, Mr. Chairman, but in all fairness to others I shall not. We welcome this day and we want more days like it, but we do not want days that end the way this one will, with the clock telling us it is 9.45 p.m. and we have to quit. We want more days like those we used to have when we could put the ministers on the spot in respect of their expenditures and get something done.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I understand that a few members on this side of the House would like to intervene in the debate. Hon. members have asked me several questions and I would like to be sure that if I reply to those questions it will take away from the right of hon. members on this side of the House to reply.

An hon. Member: Tell them to say something, if they are going to speak.

Mr. Chrétien: We are supposed to have a question period here.

An hon. Member: We are in committee of the whole.

Mr. Chrétien: The opposition House leader did not ask too many questions, but he made a speech. I think that some of the points he made will be answered by my parliamentary secretary in a few minutes.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, would you instruct the President of the Treasury Board what it means to be in committee on a bill? We are here, not just to ask questions but to express views in respect of the bill which the government is asking us to pass. It is not for the President of the Treasury Board to tell us that all we can do is ask questions; we have the right to express opinions, and that is what we are doing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Order, please. I do not think the Chair is here to give lessons or courses in procedure. I will do my best to direct the proceedings of this committee. The minister has the floor now, and I think he has the right to answer at least the two speeches that have been made. After that, I will go to the opposition and the hon. member who follows the minister will do as he wishes, ask questions or make a speech, and then I will go to a government member. I hope that after a while hon. members will appreciate that I am going in the right direction.

Mr. Chrétien: That is exactly the point. If I get up and take away from the right of hon. members on this side to take their turn, I will sit down and not reply. I think members on this side of the House have exactly the same rights as anybody else.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: My long experience in the House tells me that they ask questions, and this is a question too.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, must I understand that when I am finished with my remarks you will return to the opposition or give the floor to a government member? I would like to have your opinion before I reply.

The Chairman: The minister has the floor, he has 20 minutes to address the committee. As I said, the Chair intends to alternate from one side to the other, but if the minister speaks after each intervention, it will be difficult to do this.

Of course, nothing prevents the minister from taking part in the debate as often as he wishes, but perhaps he can limit his interventions or group his answers so that from time to time a government member can be recognized.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I shall speak for a few minutes and I hope that my remarks will not deprive my colleagues on this side of the House of their right to take part in this debate, because I think a minister must be in a position to answer members from both sides of the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Let us get the rules of the game straight. The President of the Treasury Board and members on the Liberal side are not going to take up

most of this day by the President of the Treasury Board answering every intervention and not having that counted as a Liberal member speaking. If the President of the Treasury Board speaks, that is a speech to be—

The Chairman: Order, please. I would hope that the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands would listen to the Chair. I have explained that and I have laid down the procedure I intend to follow.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: The hon. President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Chrétien: Well, he has the floor. If I have the floor, I will reply.

The Chairman: I would hope that the hon. minister would look at the Chair, not at the opposition, and speak to the Chair.

Mr. Chrétien: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am a bit too polite, and that is why I hesitated. I would like to answer a few of the points that were raised. Of course, I cannot deal with all the points. I would like to point out, for example, to the hon. member for Winnipeg South, who said we had neglected some segments in our priorities—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): "North Centre."

Mr. Chrétien: "South Centre?"

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): "North Centre."

Mr. Chrétien: "North," all right.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): "North Centre."

Mr. Chrétien: Well, Mr. Knowles, all right!

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: True, we have decided in the current restraint exercise not to index family allowances on the cost of living. But if the hon. member looked at statistics instead of dealing with generalities he would realize that family allowances have increased threefold during the past few years. From a $616 million budget in 1969, they were increased to $2.07 billion in 1975-76. This means that the government of Canada have always shown great concern in the area of social security, much so that we are now allocating 35 per cent of government expenditures to health and welfare, as compared to a mere 26.8 per cent in 1961.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), the House leader for the official opposition, raised some points. He referred to statistics in the blue book pointing to a 20.3 per cent increase in salary expenditures. Only, he implied we have no intention of remaining within the guidelines we issued as the controls program was established on October 14, 1975. I said so in this House, but the hon. member chose to ignore that.

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

This year however, 130,000 public servants are renegotiating their collective agreements with the federal government. At the end of February, we had signed contracts with upwards of 80,000 of the 130,000 public servants, and all such contracts remained within the guidelines of October 14. The 20.3 per cent figure, if the hon. member wants to use it includes certain factors. But as far as salaries are concerned, we were always within the guidelines. Only there has been an increase in the number of public servants over last year, and also the natural promotions within an agency. And there is nothing I can do about that. It must be that our public servants are well treated because they live longer and longer, they get their pensions longer and this is reflected in the cost of public service.

When we spend money for the well-being of retired public servants, this cannot be considered as expenditures on the current force.

Earlier the House leader for the New Democratic Party—

● (1620)

[*English*]

He spoke about the increases in the government. Of course there was a great increase in some departments.

Mr. Orlikow: All departments.

Mr. Chrétien: Yes. But I want to say that since I have been President of the Treasury Board in the last two years we have reviewed the increases that we had in 1971, 1972 and 1973 which were at a level of something like 24 per cent—and the result is that they have been 4 per cent or 5 per cent in the last two years.

An hon. Member: Tell us what you did when you were minister of Indian affairs.

Mr. Chrétien: We increased expenditures in Indian affairs when I was there, and I am not ashamed of that. It is true that I spent a lot of money when I was minister of Indian affairs, but we had a very difficult situation. For the first time in our history, this nation gave money to the Indians in order to help them get organized. We have given their associations money to give me hell and to bring forward their problems. When I became the minister there were only a few Indians attending university. This year, I think there will be 3,000 Indians at university level in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I have been obliged to give this assistance. I am not ashamed of that, because I think our Indians have gained greater respectability in our nation—and the hon. member is not contributing anything to the achievement of that.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before we get into my comments I might suggest to the minister, in view of the fact that he has asked the Minister of Finance to come in to listen to some of the debate when our members speak on finance, and since we on this side of the House also wish to make some comments in respect of the Department of National Health and Welfare, it might be advisable to have the Minister of National Health and Welfare here. He does not listen very well, but if he is here physically, perhaps some of it might sink in.

I was somewhat interested in the minister's comments with regard to giving the Indians money "to give him hell". I think he would be better off if he gave them money to enable them to have a decent living in this country. But this is not the area to which I want to dedicate most of my comments. I wish to touch on a subject of great importance which, according to the government, does not have too much political sex appeal. I refer to the subject of medical research. It seems to me that the attitude of the President of the Treasury Board to this subject has been inexcusable insofar as his policies may result in the decimation of the research community in this country.

I do not wish to sound as if I am speaking contrary to what other members have been saying, which is that as a whole the minister and the government have failed to make cuts in expenditures. As a general rule, that is true: they have not made the required cuts in government spending in keeping with the times in which we live. However, the research field is a strange place in which to have cuts. Cuts in expenditures in respect of research are, indeed, not cuts at all, but the fact. The minister is getting a little excited. I wish he would pay attention to what is being said. He has intervened to say there were not any cuts. The fact is that the budget has been frozen. Since inflation has been very rampant in this country, and in so far as medical research is concerned it has been running somewhere in the vicinity of 18 per cent, when the budget is frozen in the face of 18 per cent inflation this is the same as cutting it by 18 per cent in practical terms.

What we are seeing here is a government which is trying to ride to political glory on the back of the research community of this country. This is just as shameful as riding to glory on the back of the poor, which the minister has been doing by putting a freeze on family allowances and thereby making things difficult for the children and mothers of our nation. The minister has challenged our party to say where he should be making cuts where he has not done so. I could give him a long list. One place is in respect of the Canada Development Corporation. That could be cut out completely. The other is Petro-Can. It is unnecessary. Then there is the Prime Minister's office and the Privy Council office. The extravagant expenditures by the government are completely unnecessary, but nothing is being done about that.

Then we come to something closer to the minister's heart. How about the bilingual program? How necessary is that in so far as our social and economic structure is concerned at a time of restraint? We know that the bilingual program not only has failed in unifying Canada but has divided Canada very substantially. What this boils down to is that the minister is saying to the people of Canada that he does not mind if they die of a heart attack so long as on their death-bed they can speak in both official languages.

Mr. Chrétien: Nonsense.

Mr. Yewchuk: That is the kind of priority we are being faced with. The minister does not like to hear these facts, but the fact is that if he would look at the total budget of the bilingual program he would see that there is a somewhat mixed-up priority on his part, and not on my part.

I should like to bring to the attention of the minister a little information about the Medical Research Council, because I do not think he knows what it does. I want to read some of the objectives so that he will realize it is a rather important program for the health of this nation and its future. These are the objectives for which the grants of money have been made. The first objective is to expand the scientific and technological base for health care. Does the minister say that is a good objective, or does he say that it should be cut?

Mr. Chrétien: There is no cut.

Mr. Yewchuk: I have already explained that there has, indeed, been a cut of 18 per cent, which is what the inflation rate has been in the research area. That 18 per cent inflation rate is there, and it is real, not imagined. People have had to face up to it and make substantial cuts. As a matter of fact, I am glad to hear the minister shouting that there is no cut, because I have a letter here, produced by his own department, called "newsletter from the Medical Research Council." I will read to him a little later what cuts have been ordered, because obviously he is not aware of them.

● (1630)

I would like to conclude by stating the objectives of medical research. The second objective was to improve the application of scientific principles to health care. I do not think anybody can argue with that. It is a good objective, and it should be upheld. The third objective is to ensure an adequate research base for education in the health sciences. I think that is the area which is being severely damaged by the short-sightedness of this minister. The fourth one is to support the training of research investigators in the health sciences. That follows the broad field of education. We are not training our research investigators any longer, and we are asking them to go into other fields of employment because there are no funds in this field. The final objective is to support research contributing to new knowledge in the health sciences. I know that the attitude of this government was that it did not want to be confused by knowledge and facts. Perhaps that is why we are faced with these cuts.

Mr. Chrétien: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarification, may I give some information to the hon. member?

Mr. Paproski: No, he is not ready.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Béchard): Would the hon. member allow the minister to clarify a point? If so, the chair would have no objection.

Mr. Yewchuk: No, Mr. Chairman, the minister has already spoken three times. I listened very carefully while he was speaking, and I hope he will do the same while I am speaking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: We have only 20 minutes each in this debate.

An hon. Member: The minister wants to hog the floor.

Mr. Yewchuk: Yes, I know, he likes talking. I know hon. members on the other side do not like to hear the truth. Every time it comes up in the House they seem to be upset and they start to shout.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: Would you like to know the definition of truth? Would you like a dictionary?

Mr. Yewchuk: The hon. member for Vancouver—I am not sure what her constituency is, I think it is Vancouver-Kingsway—needs a dictionary to know the meaning of the word "truth". If she wants to leave the chamber for a few minutes to find out the meaning of that word, we will forgive her.

To get on with the business at hand, I have information here with regard to the record of grants since this minister became President of the Treasury Board. We have information about projects which have been approved for April 1, 1976. The information is that the renewal rate for programs which have been going on for some time—research projects which are now in process—is 60 per cent. This means that 40 per cent of ongoing projects have been eliminated. Does the minister say that is not a cut?

Mr. Chrétien: No, that is not a cut.

Mr. Yewchuk: But 40 per cent of the projects have not been approved for renewal.

Mr. Chrétien: The hon. member is asking a question. May I reply to it?

Mr. Paproski: Mark it down, Jean. Answer it later.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Béchard): The minister will have an opportunity to answer the question.

Mr. Chrétien: I object to that ruling, Mr. Chairman, because one of our members has been prevented from speaking. I will reply only in opposition time, not in our time.

Mr. Paproski: Thin skin, eh?

Mr. Chrétien: It is a fact.

Mr. Yewchuk: The minister's skin is thin.

Mr. Chrétien: Don't ask me questions if you don't want my answers.

Mr. Yewchuk: I hope the minister has a pen and will take note of all the questions and answer them all at once. I have many questions to ask, and perhaps it would be easier if he would simply answer them later. I want to compare the renewal rate for April, 1976, of 60 per cent with that of last November when it was 75 per cent. So the minister can see the difference. Last November, 25 per cent of the projects were thrown out; but in April, 40 per cent of ongoing projects will be cut.

In terms of new applications—and research is not simply intended to carry on programs which were started, two, three or ten years ago—if we want to satisfy one of the objectives to which I have referred, that is, to contribute new information in the research field, we must also accept new applications for entirely new programs. Starting in April, 345 such applications were filed, of which only 10 per cent were accepted, or only some 35. That means that the other 300 were simply turned away. If the minister is pleased and proud of that kind of record, let him rise in the House and say so. If I were in his boots, I would be ashamed of such a record. The argument which he has used from time to time has been that this is going to save money.

Let us look at the people who are in research. I am inclined to think that a significant number of them, perhaps 30 per cent or 50 per cent, are medical doctors. I do not have the exact figures, but I am sure the minister will be able to find them. Once these people are rejected, in terms of applications to do research, they will not go and dig ditches, drive a truck, go on welfare or on unemployment insurance, which the minister perhaps would like them to do: those medical doctors will go into practice. We know that a busy physician in active practice not only draws a salary above that of a researcher in a health insurance program footed by provincial and federal governments, but generates substantially higher costs in terms of expenditures in hospitals, laboratories, X-ray departments, and so on. Indeed, it has been estimated that an active, practising physician generates a total cost of perhaps a quarter of a million dollars.

So we may be rejecting a research project which may cost $50,000 a year, if we say, roughly, that a researcher's salary is $20,000 a year and he may require another $30,000 for equipment, staff, and so on. Even from the short-term point of view, there is no saving at all. In fact, it will create a higher cost to the taxpayer than if this budget had not been cut and these people were kept in the research field. I do not believe, either from the short-term point of view or the long-term point of view, that cutting costs in medical research will in any way save money to the taxpayer.

The minister became a little excited when I said he was cutting costs. I have here the newsletter to which I made reference previously. It indicates a substantial number of things which have been cut from the usual program and have been followed by the Medical Research Council. The first one was the cut respecting the planned heart research project. I thought it was rather strange and ironical to see the Minister of National Health and Welfare, on television a week or two ago, doing the three-step test to check his cardiac fitness while at the same time he cancelled the heart research program which had been planned by the Medical Research Council.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Yewchuk: It is typical of the kind of priorities by which this government lives. I think we, as a people, as a country, and a parliament, should have some explanation for this ridiculous state of affairs. Just to get back to the cuts, the Medical Research Council "Newsletter," volume 6, No. 2, of January 15, 1976, indicates that for the fiscal year 1976-77 the programs of the Medical Research Council are altered as follows: no visiting scientists awards will be made for the coming year; no funds for summer undergraduate research scholarships will be made available to the deans of the medical, dental and pharmaceutical facul-

ties for the summer of 1976; and the awards which are normally made in June for grants are cancelled completely for 1976. They are completely cancelled, not just cut back, and in this case perhaps several hundred projects will not get a chance to be considered at all. That is what the minister calls not cutbacks. I notice he left the House because he could not listen to the truth.

● (1640)

An hon. Member: He couldn't listen to you for long.

Mr. Yewchuk: I should like to quote from that same "Newsletter:"

At three per cent cut will accordingly be made in the operation component... of all MRC grants for 1976-77... A similar reduction will be made in the operating component of 1976-77 funds provided to MRC groups...

The new program of one-year research professorships announced by council in its April 1975 Newsletter has, with regret, been shelved for the time being.

I think, in plain English, "shelved" means "cut".

The allocation for symposia will be held to the amount already committed for 1976-77.

That will not be changed. There is another one—

—the general research grants to deans of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy will be continued during the coming year, but at two-thirds the amount for 1975-76... No provision has been made for an increase in the number of MRC groups. Program grants, announced in April 1975, will be initiated but on a more modest scale than had been planned.

Finally, in the awards section—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Chairman, I want to reply to some of the points made at the beginning of this debate by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, who I regret is not in the House at the moment, and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Paproski: Walter will be right back. You can go ahead with Stanley.

Mr. Francis: At the beginning of every debate of this nature there is an almost routine reference to the good old days. The allegation is made in the days of committee of supply, parliament did some great and wonderful things, and that this place has somehow degenerated into an institution which has no control whatever over estimates any more.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Francis: I sat in a parliament which was alleged to have been so great—and so did you, Mr. Chairman, as I think back—and I recall what happened in the parliament of 1963-1965 in which I served. It is true that the estimates procedure was in committee of supply and committee of the whole House, and hon. members who sat on the other side eventually had to face their own consciences. I know the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was one who did. It was not an examination of estimates, it was a procedure of obstruction which took place, and I remember very clearly that over 20 days were used on a very small item of supplementary estimates involving a single department. It was passed eventually without even a dollar being changed, and that was alleged to have been the great democratic procedure of the House of Commons in those days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Francis: All the members of this House came to the conclusion that parliament was being disgraced by the procedure, and that it was not what it was alleged to be by those on the other side who spoke. They realized that the people who voted us to this place expected us to do a job and not to go through the kind of sham which took place in committee of the whole. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was attempting to say things in, I think, a fair and impartial way. He said that when the changes of 1968 were introduced, from his point of view there were certain gains and certain losses. He admitted that there were improvements, and the strengthening of the committee system is, I am sure, one of them. The attempt to deal in a more fundamental and honest way with the question of estimates has probably plagued more than just this parliament. The British parliament has grappled with this question, and if I may suggest, with even less success than this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Francis: On an inventory of gains, I wish that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre had catalogued a few more of the gains which actually did develop, because there were very definitely some. One of the gains which did not come right away, but which came a little later, as referred to by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, was the development of research services in this House of Commons. Research services were made available to every party. It is for hon. members of the parties to answer for the use made of these research services. If they are used well, this House is a better place: if they are used poorly, this House is not doing its job.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton said the remedy was to give more and more money. I have been trying to find out just what would be an appropriate sum. His answer is that of the old Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labour, just give us more and more. He does not quantify what he wants; he does not offer any standards; he just says we have to have more. In one breath he says, "don't spend as much," and in the next breath he says, "Give us more research services." In fairness, we have to come to some understanding of the goals and objectives of the elected representatives and parties in this House and how they are going to deal with the problem.

Mr. Paproski: Just remember, you may be in opposition some day.

Mr. Francis: No doubt. I hope to see more than one change in government before I am through. I hope I will be able to survive as long as my friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, although that would be a very long time indeed.

Mr. Paproski: You will be in opposition in 1978.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Francis: Let us look again at what has to be done by way of innovations in an attempt to come to grips with the problem. Just about a year ago a package of new rules was introduced into this House, and I think everyone agreed that the rules introduced were steps forward; for example, the termination of the question period at three o'clock, the reduction of the number of Standing Order 43 motions which could be introduced, and so on. However, I wonder how many hon. members opposite recall that one of the items in the package which was offered was the ability to call departments before the House, in committee of the whole, on supply days. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is looking at me, and I am sure he remembers that. It was part of the package and there were hon. members on this side of the House who looked on this with some trepidation. They were concerned that this was giving a great deal. But I must say that the one or two rather feeble attempts to use that particular item in this House were not very impressive. Hon. members in the House gave up even trying.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Oh, oh!

Mr. Francis: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre intervenes, but he was one who not long ago said in the House that he hoped to bring individual ministers and individual departments back into committee of the whole again so that there could be some control over them. I think that is almost a complete paraphrasing of his words. When the opportunity was offered in the rules' package of a year ago, I suggest that no good use was made of that opportunity by hon. members opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Francis: Virtue does not reside just on any one side. We are all members! We all carry out our responsibility and we are all aware of the problems of estimates. There is too much money, government is too big and it is hard to come to grips with it. The amount of knowledge which individual members can assimilate and use effectively is limited. We are aware of this, so there is a real attempt being made today by the Auditor General before the public accounts committee. It was looking at the estimates book, looking at the procedures, looking at the changes made as a result of an investigation by an outside group which examined the question of estimates some years ago and offered suggestions for reform. There is an honest difference of opinion amongst representatives of the Treasury Board who have maintained with a good deal of conviction before the committee that the new form of estimates is an improvement. A group of independent accountants was brought in by the Auditor General; they made the argument that the changes were not an improvement and tried to suggest a better format.

● (1650)

Hon. members opposite said that we were not doing the right things on estimates. It is like a ritual, Mr. Chairman: they have an obligation to go to the public accounts committee, make representations to the Auditor General, tell him how the estimates can be improved and make suggestions for improvement in the means by which hon. members of this House can exercise their ancient and democratic right of voting supply.

[Mr. Paproski.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Francis: It is not enough just to bitch about it, to just say time after time that parliament has lost something, that in the good old days we did great things and that now we are a sad reflection of what we were before: that is not the way to deal with the question. Some very good and diligent members from the other side sit on the public accounts committee. There is a definite lack of partisan atmosphere in the examination by the public accounts committee, and I think it is to the credit of hon. members on all sides to recognize that we have a problem.

I have just made these observations because I hoped that when the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, for whom I have the greatest personal respect—he represents a riding adjoining mine, and we have known each other for 20 years—would do more than talk about the good old days, the great things that were done and our democratic right. He referred to articles by a former member of the public service, Mr. Frank Howard. Mr. Chairman, I served nine years in the public service and appeared before committees to answer questions for my minister. I had to go through the whole exercise, and I cannot share the view that this parliament has in any way lost any of its democratic rights.

There are just one or two other things I should like to add. I listened to the hon. member for Athabasca and I should like to set the record straitht on some of the things he said. He repeated allegations of cuts to the Medical Research Council. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the actual money voted for medical research in the fiscal year 1974-75 was $42,800.000, in the fiscal year 1975-76 it was $47,400,000, in the fiscal year 1976-77 the amount indicated in the estimates is $48,400,000.

I know there are hon. members an all sides of the House on the public accounts committee who are more competent than I am to review the heroic efforts of the Auditor General to come to grips with the basic problem of how an elected legislature should deal with estimates of the magnitude on which we have to vote. I hope they will intervene in this debate.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, my time is limited and I want to spend most of it dealing with the question of medical research. Let us get the record clear when this minister, who has designated himself "Mr. No", boasts so loudly. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put some of the figures on the record in so far as we have them. It is not always easy for us to get answers. If a member of parliament does not ask precisely the right question—and it is difficult to know all the titles and categories—he gets an answer only to the question he asks.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Sometimes, not even that.

Mr. Orlikow: There is one small, but important group that I am concerned about—the senior executive officers, the people who earn from $30,000 to $66,000 a year. According to the figures supplied by the minister's department, in 1968 there were 381 of these people; by 1974 there were

1,062. I will leave it to the minister to calculate the percentage increase. In the Treasury Board alone, the increase was from 20 to 47. So when the minister says he is "Mr. No", he is "Mr. No" with a good deal of reservation. I think he knows he is being unfair when he critizes us or suggests that we object to the increased expenditures on the native people of this country. What we object to is the tremendous increase in the amount of money that has gone to senior bureaucrats.

I am not going to take much time to expound on this theme, but I suggest to the minister and to the parliamentary secretary that if they are honest and want to look at the situation realistically, they should look at the current issue of *Saturday Night* which contains an article by Douglas Hartle who for some time was a deputy secretary of the Treasury Board. I think Mr. Hartle knows what he is talking about, and his article shows how far out of whack the system is. As the hon. member for Athabasca was talking about the plight of medical research, one might have thought it a figment of the imagination of the opposition. We heard the usual rude and loud interjection of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. If she could read—which I sometimes doubt—I would suggest that she should take advantage—

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, on a point of order.

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest to the hon. member that not only can I read, but I have written and I have achieved a certain degree of success, where the hon. member seems to have failed. As a matter of fact, I have just discovered that his colleague, who is the great expert, cannot read: he does not even know of a simple bill that was introduced the other day, and has been misquoting it.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. Would the hon. lady resume her seat?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member: she interjects, and hon. members on this side know how often she interjects. I want to put a few things on the record so there will be no misunderstanding of what people in the scientific community have to say about the fact that the government has frozen the amount of money given to medical research in the current fiscal year. I should like to read from a letter sent out by Dr. Malcolm Brown, chairman of the Medical Research Council of Canada, a government agency. The letter is dated January 16, 1976, and is addressed to the deans of the medical colleges in this country. It reads in part:

● (1700)

The visiting scientist, research professorships and summer undergraduate research scholarships programs have been suspended for 1976-77.

The June, 1976, grants competition has been cancelled.

A number of new programs about to be announced have been shelved for the time being.

Program grants, announced in April 1975, will be initiated in a modest way.

General research grants have each been reduced by one-third for 1976-77.

A 3 per cent cut will be made in the operating component (exclusive of support provided for approved trainee and professional assistants) of all MRC grants for 1976-77 except term grants in their third year and terminal awards, as well as in the operating components of funds provided to MRC groups, development grants and program grants. A number of terminal awards which would in the past have been of eight months' duration will be reduced to three months.

The number of new scholarships to be offered for 1976-77 will be 15.

The intake to the fellowship program has been reduced from 75 in 1975-76 to 50 in the post-MD, DDS and DVM category and from 55 to 44 in the post Ph.D category—

I understand that the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the minister responsible for science received close to 500 letters from people in the scientific community. Some scientists were good enough to send copies of letters to members of the opposition. May I quote part of the letter written by Dr. Victor Chernick, professor and head, department of pediatrics, at the children's centre in Winnipeg, and sent to the Prime Minister on March 1, 1976. Dr. Chernick said, in part:

The level of funding for medical research in Canada on a per capita basis is approximately $2 (MRC budget of $50 million) while that in the United States is approximately ten times this rate. Thus, we are in danger of losing our best people, scientists who would compete very favourably in the U.S. funding arena.

May I quote from another letter sent to the Prime Minister on January 29 by Dr. J. C. Haworth, professor of pediatrics, director of clinical investigation and research at the health sciences centre, Winnipeg. He said, in part:

Reduction of our research programs will have the following results . . . Since about 70 per cent of our research funding is used to pay salaries, the reduction in the value of research funds will inevitably require the discharge of some technical staff. Quite apart from the personal hardship this will cause, it must be recognized that many of these people are highly trained and skilled in their work and it will take years to train others to the same level of competence when research funds again become more plentiful.

Allow me to quote from another letter which Dr. William A. Bridger, secretary of the Canadian Biochemical Society, sent to the Prime Minister on January 15, 1976. He said, in part:

I wish to express my dismay and frustration, shared by the over 800 members of the Canadian Biochemical Society, which arise from your recently announced freeze upon the budget of the Medical Research Council. The freeze results in a cut of about $7 million from a budget that was already inadequate to the extent that the very survival of a viable medical research establishment in this country was threatened. This cut, together with inflationary pressures upon research budgets which have accumulated over the past few years, can be guaranteed to have profound deleterious effects upon the activities of the Canadian medical research community, with widespread, irreversible ramifications for future medical care that I am sure all thinking Canadians would wish to avoid.

Writing to the Prime Minister of January 26, 1976, D. G. Scraba, associate professor of the department of biochemistry, University of Alberta, said in part:

While I support your government's intention to control its spending, I seriously question its priorities for restraint. Surely the saving of $7 million from the total federal budget cannot justify the harmful immediate and long-term effects upon medical research in this country.

On January 14, 1976, Alec Sehon, Ph.D, D.Sc., F.R.S.C., professor, head and director of the medical research group, University of Manitoba, wrote to me as follows—

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Did he not send a copy of his letter to the government?

Mr. Orlikow: I do not know. The government agreed to table it. Professor Sehon said, in part:

This funding has amounted to less than $50 million for 1975-76. By comparison, the cost of the Olympic Games in Montreal this year—which is of little, if any, long-term consequence to the nation—is predicted to be in the order of $1—$2 billion!

I quoted part of the letter Dr. Bridger sent to the Prime Minister, a copy of which he sent to me. Dr. Bridger wrote another letter. I raised the very question I am raising at present in the adjournment debate on March 4. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Science and Technology answered me. I sent a copy of that day's *Hansard* to Dr. Bridger. Dr. Bridger wrote to the parliamentary secretary. I did not ask him to write; he sent me a copy of his letter. I shall put part of it on record as he, being an expert in the field, can express the concerns of the scientific community more adequately than I can. Dealing with the parliamentary secretary's answer, Dr. Bridger, who was obviously concerned about the effects of the government's freeze on medical research, wrote in part, in his letter dated March 17, 1976, as follows:

You state that "scientific research cannot be an exception" in the effort to reduce inflation. In fact, research councils have been singled out for devastating cuts. While the rest of society is given a ten per cent guideline, the research council budgets for the coming year have been frozen at the fiscal 1975-76 level. Surely you can appreciate that this results directly in a decrease in our research capacity which is precisely equivalent to the rate of inflation, estimated to be nearly 20 per cent in recent surveys of research laboratories. Although excellent cases can be made for expansion of Canada's research effort, we are at the moment falling away behind. And then, you have the audacity to say that—

Dr. Bridger then quoted the words of the parliamentary secretary:

—it certainly does not mean that there will be a dismantling of our research teams.

That is the end of the quotation. The letter goes on to say:

It means exactly that! By 1974 the level of support of research had reached a critically low level; all mediocrity had been weeded out. The present freeze means that about 7 per cent of the research teams in this country, employing over 1,000 highly trained scientists who have survived in the fierce competition until now, will be forced to shut down. Your allegation that the freeze would not have this unavoidable consequence is utterly preposterous.

Allow me to put on record two brief excerpts from the letter sent to the Minister of State for Science and Technology on January 16, 1976, by Keith Yates, professor and chairman, department of chemistry, University of Toronto. He said, in part:

I am writing to you, both as a practising scientist and as chairman of one of the largest university chemistry departments in Canada, to express my grave concern over the steadily deteriorating position of basic science in this country.

He went on to say:

One has only to examine the budgetary treatment of the National Research Council over the past six years to realize that support of basic science in this country has occupied a very low position in terms of federal government priorities. This council, which plays a crucial role for all Canadian university scientists engaged in fundamental research, has received budgetary increases over the period 1970-75 which have fallen far short of increased costs due to inflation. In a period when the Consumer Price Index increased by well over 50 per cent, the NRC budget received cumulative increases totalling only 5.5 per cent. In the forthcoming budget year (1976-77), when the CPI will probably again increase by more that 10 per cent, the NRC budget will be frozen at the already inadequate 1975-76 level.

The minister suggested that it is not enough to criticize: we ought to show where we can make cuts. Need I remind the minister how much the government spent on Mirabel and of the tens of millions spent on Pickering airport, not needed and not be proceeded with? Each year this government has been in power the Auditor General has listed a tale of horrors. One would hope the government would pay some attention and that some year there would be a lessening of his criticism. After all, it can no longer be said that the Auditor General is a political enemy of the government, that he was appointed by a Conservative government. This government has chosen the Auditor General. He may not be a Liberal, but I am sure they knew when they appointed him that he was not against the Liberals. However, the tale of horror continues about waste, poor management, poor planning and an escalation of senior civil servants, with all that means in the way of salaries, extra secretaries and fancy office space costing hundreds of thousands of dollars which is unused each year because they are not ready for it.

● (1710)

The minister tells us that this is a firm budget and they are determined to hold the line, to show restraint and to make cuts. I hope that from the few remarks I have made it will be obvious to everyone that we in the opposition have every right to say that we are still skeptical about the minister's words.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity of the debate on Bill C-91 to make a few representations to the cabinet and underline once more the needs of the province of Quebec, in particular the region I have the honour to represent. I would like as well to emphasize the fact that in a few areas, the province of Quebec has not reached the level it should have reached in view of the efforts that were made and the propaganda broadcasted on the news both on the CBC network and private stations.

Mr. Chairman, the economic situation of eastern Quebec is such that it requires immediate action from the central government. I am really staggered when I hear entirely contradictory news, as I did yesterday on the CBC. The Quebec Minister of Industry and Commerce, on one hand, was asserting that the province of Quebec is experiencing a real growth and that the economy of the province has never been so flourishing. A moment later, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard) whom I respect for his frankness, after looking at his department's report, deplored the fact that the province of Quebec is lagging behind other provinces, that its per capita income is lower and that industrial development is slower than in the other provinces.

I will take this opportunity to make a comment that I wish to be as kind as possible. I heard in the House from some of my colleagues comments to the effect that the federal government is in the hands of the French power. The French power would mean that the federal cabinet is governing first and above all according to the interests of

the province of Quebec, the only French-speaking province in this country. And yet, if one looks at statistics, one sees that this French power is not acting only in the interests of the province of Quebec since the latter is lagging behind other provinces.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to raise a debate which might jeopardize or eliminate the unity that must exist in our country. We are first of all Canadians. We also have different cultures. We have two official languages: English and French. Both have the same rights in this country and in this Parliament, and I think we would be wasting very precious time if we were to discuss those questions which were settled many years ago and to which we should not come back. But still there are economic problems, and the interests of the French-speaking or English-speaking people are absolutely the same in this country. I have never seen a $20 bill speaking either English or French; the $20 bill speaks both languages.

We also need an income, both in the east and in the west, to enable each Canadian to meet his obligations, to buy the things necessary to satisfy his personal needs at the individual, family and community level.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I find inacceptable these glaring contradictions between the statements of a French-speaking minister of the Parliament of Canada and those of a minister of the National Assembly of Quebec on the same subject, who analyzed the situation and came to completely opposite conclusions. And if I consider the budget of the Canadian government, the budget allocated to each province of our country, I find it equitably distributed, but still it remains the duty of the Canadian government, of the Canadian Parliament, to see if there is an equitable distribution among the regions of Canada, whatever the province in which they are.

The Gaspé peninsula, the south shore of the St. Lawrence, the Quebec City area, and the province of Quebec within Canada, deserve as much attention from the Canadian government as the Vancouver or Victoria areas, or the Maritime provinces. To my mind, our role consists in administering funds without consideration of race or religion. We must see to it that the budget of the Canadian government is shared equitably, taking into consideration the needs of each area, whether it is inhabited by Francophones or Anglophones. That is how I see things, Mr. Chairman.

Now, this is what happens: the province of Quebec has transportation problems that may not exist elsewhere. That is what brings me to speak of the wharves located along the St. Lawrence river which help communications between those who live out on the islands and those who live on the mainland. At the present time, Mr. Chairman, there is a quarrel going on between the federal and Quebec provincial governments, about whether the wharves located in the province of Quebec, along the St. Lawrence, should be considered part of the highway network of the province. If so, responsibility for their maintenance should fall to the province. The federal and provincial governments have set a body to look into the matter and share responsibilities; according to my information, the Quebec government is quite willing to accept the responsibility for the maintenance of those wharves as part of its highway network conditional upon the central government's first repairing them before handing them over to the province for future maintenance. That is the bone of contention, Mr. Chairman.

● (1720)

This afternoon I communicated with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) and I asked him some clarification about the items contained in Bill C-91 which request a borrowing power of $6 billion. That is quite a lot of money, Mr. Chairman. Can we hope that with these $6 billion, the central government, through the Department of Public Works, will make improvements to the wharves along the St. Lawrence and on the islands of the St. Lawrence which need maintenance work to remain operative? I am not talking about wharves which should be maintained because of their history, for instance, but about those that have to be used regularly to maintain constant communications between the islands and the mainland.

The minister, who is an intelligent and an honest man, did not want to give me any definite answer. He simply gave me a note saying that he would review the program and that if the wharves in Bellechasse—and Bellechasse is part of Canada as far as I know—are included in the estimates, part of the budgetary items will be used to upgrade the wharves which need it, and this would come under this borrowing power of $6 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if this is the case, I shall be glad to support this bill. This money is needed to effect these improvements, to upgrade the wharves. There should be an agreement with the Quebec government for these wharves to be properly maintained, and come in the future under the jurisdiction of the Quebec government as part of the Quebec network. I am in complete agreement on this point. However, it matters little where these billions of dollars come from; this is something that must be discussed. I hope that this year, when Parliament studies the legislation giving chartered banks the power to create credit and to loan money to the population, we shall discuss this issue. However, for the time being, Mr. Chairman, it is my duty to support this budget item if they agree to use that money to solve a problem which has been swept under the carpet for too long. I very much hope that the Minister of Public Works will take into account the representations I am making now so that this matter can be solved once and for all.

A second point I would like to make in this debate is the federal-provincial agreements on the economic development of our country. There is an absolute necessity for the central government to sign agreements with the governments of all provinces, because the provinces are regional administrations closer to the people and they are in a better position to determine the real priorities for Canadians.

I wish that the central government could speed up all forms of negotiations. Not that the central government should impose its views on provincial governments but negotiations should be conducted on a meaningful basis. People appointed by the government or by ministers of various departments—civil servants, the senior civil servants of our administration—should understand once for all how urgent it is for Canada's unity to expedite those negotiations as people become impatient. The public at

large cannot understand in every detail the various forms of negotiations and it gets impatient.

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, some elements of our population take advantage of the slowness of negotiation to raise linguistic, racial and regional issues likely to divide Canadians further instead of uniting them so that all together we could work seriously and efficiently toward the development and prosperity of our country.

Mr. Chairman, within our parliamentary duties we sometimes have the unique opportunity to visit other countries as delegates. Mr. Chairman, in countries we only know by name and whose customs are unknown to us, we can see that people of all races are living there, black, white, orientals, Indians, people who speak several languages and who succeed in living and working together.

I wish to mention Mauritius that I visited last fall. Those people succeed in working together for the prosperity of their country.

Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad if we could do the same in this country. Whether we eat in French, in English, in German or in Italian, whatever the language we use, we must always keep in mind that we are first and above all Canadians.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, Canada is the most beautiful country in the world. In spite of our hard winters, of our snow, we still have four seasons we should be proud of. If Canada is to continue its development and growth for the profit of all the people who live in it, we must of necessity cooperate. We must work together and, as Canadian parliamentarians, we must always keep in mind that we must administer the revenue of our country by distributing it equitably.

Mr. Chairman, I make these remarks so that we can have a fair distribution in Quebec.

It does not matter whether we are Liberals, Conservatives, members of the Social Credit Party or members of the New Democratic Party. What matters is that we can say to the Canadian people that we made what we could to have a fair distribution of incomes between Canadians so that each area of the country has its shares and that we can say proudly: Canada is developing all its areas, regardless of our language.

● (1730)

[*English*]

Mr. Holmes: Mr. Chairman, I am sure those members who know me in the House will recognize that I will not be partisan during this debate. I do want to indicate my very grave concern about this science policy for Canada, and particularly that component that deals with medical research.

The minister in his comments which, if I may say so, were of a highly political form, has indicated a program of restraint. I have no difficulty in identifying with that. I think he should also note the importance of research and development in terms of the productivity about which he talked. Of course, whether it be in economic terms or in human terms, research and development in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of many, are an investment in the future.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

If one wanted to dramatize the importance of medical research I think all he would have to do is point to the questions which were raised in the House today, and I am referring specifically to the problem of swine influenza and the recent announcement of the President of the United States, who indicated his administration will be introducing a comprehensive program to prevent the outbreak of this particular disease. I only need to refer to the great epidemic of 1916-18 in which 15 million to 18 million lives were lost. May I simply say that without medical research and without the bio-medical community, that type of commodity and that type of progress would not be with us today.

At the outset I want to quote, if I may, from an article which states:

> It is difficult to realize at such short range just how important an influence the work of Dr. Banting and Mr. Best has been in stimulating medical research in Canada, and indeed throughout the civilized world; but it seems likely that history will view the discovery of insulin, not only as a valuable contribution to the science of medicine but of peculiar significance in as much as the efforts of several ancillary sciences were focused upon its discovery. In a peculiar way, therefore, the work of Banting and Best represents medical research at its highest. So far as Canada is concerned we may be forgiven our special pride, in that our owns sons, in our own country, have produced something so worthy of the noblest traditions of our calling, and that their discovery was given freely to the whole world. We are well aware that Canada has produced many exceptional men of science, but only too many whose contributions have brought renown alone to the countries of their adoption, rather than to the land of their education and birth.

That editorial appeared in the *CMA Journal* in 1923, and it depicted the spirit of our pioneers in the bio-medical research community. It also, of course, outlined the successes of that particular day. We have seen that spirit throughout the 1960's, but I want to say with all sincerity that in recent years we have seen the strangulation of that pioneering spirit, with a very demoralizing effect on the medical research community in Canada.

I have followed with great interest and concern the Ministry of Science and Technology, and in particular the Medical Research Council. I have done this, as I indicated, with great concern since my arrival in Ottawa as a member of parliament in 1972. I think one can best describe the system, in my experience, as one of action, reaction, confrontation, and innumerable committee reports; in fact, a constant upheaval regarding the funding of research and, in particular, medical research in Canada, something that is most undesirable where stability is required.

I was prepared at the outset today to argue that the Medical Research Council requires an additional 15 per cent to 20 per cent in funding for the coming fiscal year, and I believe I would have no difficulty in presenting that argument. However, after hearing the President of the Treasury Board speak I have no intention of entering into the numbers game at this particular time, which in my view would be counterproductive when the government is employing political tactics to give the impression that it is actually introducing measures of economic restraint but without any consideration of priorities.

Let me make it very clear, and I want to make this very clear so there is no misunderstanding among hon. members in this Chamber, that if in fact the federal government had a national policy for science, and if in fact the federal government had a national policy in respect of health

research, and medical research in particular, then I would suggest to you in all sincerity that this debate would not have been necessary today. It would have been redundant and, indeed, the scientific community would have had adequate funds to carry out its particular disciplines.

As the scenario of government inaction in developing policy and the demoralizing confrontation with the scientific community have unfolded, one fact has become perfectly clear. The scientists for their part have a good deal to learn about policy and the political process; and the government and, I say in all sincerity, the bureaucracy of mandarins associated with it, have a great deal to learn about science. I have no doubt that if dialogue between the two parties I have mentioned had been better, and if the government has seen fit to establish a mechanism for an ongoing exchange of views, a realistic and effective science policy would have been established. As I indicated previously, this debate would have been redundant and unnecessary.

● (1740)

I indicated that scientists have a good deal to learn about policy and the political process. Frankly I have some degree of sympathy with that section of the scientific community which believes they must devote their efforts to their primary work rather than being involved in the political arena. However, the recent experience of representatives of the Canadian Society of Clinical Investigations at their meeting in Quebec, and their dealings with the press, are an example of an unfortunate communications gap that can occur and be very detrimental to their cause. Without attempting to defend their action I believe that many scientists are afraid of the media and have found the political process to be frustrating, time-consuming, and non-productive.

On a more positive note I wish to emphasize the importance of good communications and to state that this was demonstrated very ably by a Dr. John Bienenstock of McMaster, and Dr. Charles Schriber of Montreal, when they appeared as witnesses before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, and articulated in a positive manner the concerns of the research community.

I submit to the government, Mr. Speaker, that this is the type of dialogue that is extremely important. I indicated that the government and the mandarins associated with the government have a great deal to learn about science. I wish to take a moment or two to mention briefly a few principles I feel are important, principles which I believe the government has not grasped and does not understand in the whole field of scientific endeavour.

In the area of health I do not think anyone would argue that the ultimate goal of all health research is to improve the health of each Canadian. Society expects, and we have the responsibility to assure high standards of medical education, health services, and health care. Research is linked to the training of professional manpower, to learning, and to a high quality health care system, and is therefore dependent on a viable research base. I find it inconceivable that the government cannot understand this very simple fundamental principle that medical research is interrelated with medical education, which in turn is related to the quality of medical care that is given Canadians.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, in relation to this particular aspect I should like to quote from an article by Dr. J. B. Armstrong entitled "Quality Teaching, Care Depends on Research". I should point out that Dr. Armstrong is Chief Medical Adviser to the Canadian Heart Foundation. The article states:

> Scientific research is a part of the culture and has a role not unlike creative activity in the arts. But it has an additional function, a dividend if you will, in the expansion of knowledge as well as experience. Scientific research is thus a learning experience, of asking questions and seeking answers. Research in the humanities tends to rely on interpretation of the work of others, that is, library research as distinct from the bench research of the natural sciences. My point is that scholarly research is a creative learning experience for the worker and at the same time adds to the general fund of knowledge.
>
> The learning aspect of research is a most important component of university activity, where most of the organized higher learning now takes place. Medical knowledge is no exception. It is growing very rapidly, almost certainly doubling in less than every five years. To keep abreast of this rapid expansion, the learning process in Canadian health centres requires that our imaginative teachers be learners also, at the threshold of their particular fields of endeavour. This form of learning in our medical schools is medical research. The recognition of this learning component by MRC and other health agencies has meant that the distribution of grants and awards has offset, to a degree, regional disparities. It is essential to the continued development of health care in Canada.

Again I must re-emphasize the very fundamental principle, which has not grasped by the government or by the ministers on the opposite side, that medical research and medical education are involved with the delivery of quality health care. I have no intention of developing the arguments in respect of basic or pure research versus applied research or mission oriented research since I believe there is an important role for each of these areas. I think it is clear that we must establish some priorities which require urgent attention, and therefore there must be appropriate research programs for this. However, I must also point out that in my opinion we must ensure an adequate freedom for the researchers in our community.

In this regard I was particularly disturbed by a recent article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of Thursday, March 18, 1976. It is entitled "Scientists Come Out Fighting as Research Money Frozen". I wish to quote the article as follows:

> Science Minister C. M. Drury recently told the Senate science policy committee that science and technology should be supported 'to the extent that it can serve to resolve the problems we face, social or national problems. The extent to which it would exist for and in itself is, in my mind, a great deal more doubtful.' Mr. Drury argued against a 'blind faith' in science as 'a good thing'. If science and technology can be helpful 'it should be supported,' he said, 'and if it can't it shouldn't.'

I realize that newspapers at times have been known to misquote, but I want to remind hon. members that in the throne speech of 1973, at which time the science policy was espoused, on that day there was no doubt in my mind, or in the minds of these who followed it closely, that the decision of the government was in fact to make certain that the various research councils and the various granting bodies should more directly serve its own policy objectives.

I know there are many individuals in all parts of this House who believe there is no room for basic research or for curiosity research. However, I want to suggest this is a very dangerous assumption. I would simply refer to the present classification that is used in terms of grants. As I understand it there are three classifications. There is type

I, referred to as curiosity-oriented research. There is a type II, which is real research for support of departmental goals. Finally, there is research for the support of national objectives. If one looks at this very carefully one will see there are certain dangers.

I want to emphasize that I believe in theory there is some merit to this type of approach. For example, I know that curiosity-oriented research or so-called pure research can be and is evaluated by the peer review mechanism guaranteeing scientific excellence. The danger, of course, is when the politician or bureaucrat, or some other individual raises the priority rating of a scientifically inadequate type of program and is prepared to make it fundable under a type II program. Of course we have the situation where the pure science will be pursued for political reasons, and of course in such an instance, in my opinion, everyone will lose.

Before closing I should like to quote what I think is a very worthwhile comment by Albert Szent-Gyorgyi in an article on research grants which appeared in "Perspectives in Biology and Medicine—Autumn 1974". I should point out that Albert Szent-Gyorgyi was the Nobel Laureate for the discovery of Vitamin C. It states:

● (1750)

Scientific research is, in many ways, related to art. If one wants good music to be produced, one looks for a good musician and not for a project. Projects have no meaning and value anyway, because there are only two kinds of science: good and bad. Good science is made by good scientists, poor science by poor scientists, and the most brillant project is worthless in the hands of a poor scientist, while, conversely, a good scientist has a good chance to come up with something valuable whatever he touches, because "die Welt rundet sich im Tautrophen" (Goethe) which could be translated by saying that all the great laws of nature are represented in a drop of dew. Pasteur went to Germany to study brewing beer and came home with the discovery of optical isomerism.

It is easy to find good scientists, because the good scientists are mostly those who have produced good science. Find them and support them, enable them to work. That's all there is to it. Don't torture them with senseless projects.

Let me simply say in conclusion that the entire problem related to medical research, to the science policy in Canada, is, in my opinion, more than the need for a temporary transfusion of funds. I believe it requires an understanding, a grasp of the problems of science and its importance in our community, and a recognition on the part of the government of the importance of science in our community and to Canadian citizens. Finally, it requires a commitment to develop that type of science policy.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. Before I recognize the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell), the Chair should receive two reports. Therefore, I ask leave to rise, report progress, and request leave to consider this bill again later this day. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

[Mr. Holmes.]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin), Ontario (Mr. Cafik), Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), York West (Mr. Fleming), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), Mississauga (Mr. Abbott), St. Catharines (Mr. Parent), Trinity (Miss Nicholson), Fort William (Mr. McRae), and Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier) has been filed with me pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): It is also my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Pontiac (Mr. Lefebvre), Mercier (Mr. Boulanger), Bonaventure-Îles de la Madeleine (Mr. Béchard), Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), Rivière du Loup-Temiscouata (Mr. Gendron), Lévis (Mr. Guay), Frontenac (Mr. Corriveau), Labelle (Mr. Dupras), Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) and Longueuil (Mr. Olivier) has been filed with me pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec.

If the House agrees, I would suggest we follow past practice and print the text of the objections as appendices to this day's *Votes and Proceedings*. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

INTERIM SUPPLY ENDING MARCH 31, 1977

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-91, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31 March, 1977—Mr. Chrétien—Mr. McCleave in the Chair.

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. McCleave): Is it agreed that it is now six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At 5.55 p.m. the Committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the hon. member for Scarborough East. There were some discussions earlier today with respect to the presence this evening of the Minister of Finance, and I think at some inconvenience he did make an arrangement to be here sharp at eight o'clock in order to answer some questions to be asked by one hon. member. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the hon. member for Scarborough East if that could be done so that the minister could be questioned, and then we would carry on with the normal course of things.

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad indeed to co-operate with the suggestion made by the hon. member.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I wish to thank the hon. member.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Boulanger): There still must be unanimous consent of the committee. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I wish to express my thanks to the hon. member for Scarborough East for yielding the floor, and also to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton for his courtesy with regard to the arrangements which were made.

My statement is with respect to clause 5 of the interim supply bill which, as hon. members know, seeks new statutory borrowing authority of $6 billion and would serve the purpose of cancelling all outstanding and unused borrowing authority.

As hon. members are aware, the Financial Administration Act, section 36, requires that no money shall be borrowed or security issued by or on behalf of Her Majesty without the authority of parliament. This refers to new money only, because there is a continuing authority in the act for the government to borrow funds to repay maturing debt. Authority to borrow sufficient new money to cover estimated financial requirements, together with a margin for contingencies, is normally sought and granted in one of the first appropriation acts of any fiscal year.

Hon. members might find it helpful if I begin by reviewing the situation in fiscal 1975-76, which will come to an end in a few days time. It will be recalled that a borrowing authority of $4 billion is provided in Appropriation Act No. 2 for 1975, and a further $2 billion in the Supplementary Borrowing Authority Act 1975. Under this total authority of $6 billion we have obtained net new money of $4.6 billion this fiscal year, and a further $214 million will be obtained from the April 1 bond issue. Thus the unused authority which will be cancelled by the passage of the bill will amount to about $1.2 billion.

In sum, by March 31, 1976, the increases in debt issues will be as follows: treasury bills, $865 million; Canada savings bonds, $2,600 million; marketable bonds, $1,175 million, making a total of $4,640 million. The amounts offered at the 90 day and 180 day treasury bill auctions were increased, starting a year ago, at the rate of $10 million per week, and this subsequently increased in July to $15 million, and in October to $20 million.

After a pause during the Canada Savings Bond campaign the program was reinstituted with a weekly offer of $20 million, and this figure is now $25 million. The one year bills were auctioned four times during the year, with increments totalling $150 million over the period.

In fiscal 1975-76, $1,774 million in marketable bonds matured, and in exchange $2,550 million worth of bonds were sold. In August a gap in the maturity schedule was used to raise a further $400 million of new money. Emphasis was placed during the year on raising money on the long term bond market, and it proved possible to build up a $600 million single issue maturing October 1, 1995.

The 1975-76 Canada Savings Bond program was most successful with gross sales of about $3,700 million, while redemptions over the fiscal year totalled about $1,100 million. It will be noted that the Canada Saving Bonds total has been maintained at approximately 39 per cent of the total government debt.

The ownership of the debt has changed slightly over the year. The chartered banks own about $100 million more, while the Bank of Canada has increased its holdings by $800 million. The public has purchased about $1 billion of marketable securities and treasury bills as well as $2.5 billion of Canada Savings Bonds.

The $4.6 billion we borrowed has been more than sufficient to meet our requirements. Our cash balances amounted to $3.2 billion at the beginning of the year and stood at $3.7 billion as of yesterday, an increase of $500 million. Thus our total financial requirements have amounted to $4 billion. Excluding foreign exchange transactions which have, on balance, been a source of funds, our financial requirements have been $4.3 billion.

● (2010)

We expect a substantial rundown in cash balances in the remaining few days of the fiscal year. A number of large payments will be made, and the volume of tax refunds is building. I cannot be precise about the final figure for the fiscal year but it seems likely that the total financial requirements will be at the lower end of the range of $5 billion to $6 billion.

I would remind hon. members that the books remain open for a period of time after the end of the fiscal year and thus some months will elapse before the detailed accounts showing the breakdown between budgetary and non-budgetary transactions will be prepared. I will provide the House with preliminary estimates in my budget in May.

Turning to the fiscal year 1976-77, my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, has indicated that total outlays for the fiscal year will be $42,150 million, an increase of a little less than 16 per cent. The main estimates have of course been tabled in the House and are being examined in detail by the standing committees. It seems likely that our revenues will grow by broadly similar amounts as our outlays, on the basis of the existing tax structure and the widespread expectation that real growth

in the economy will amount to about 5 per cent and the rate of inflation will decline.

On this basis, the total financial requirements will be of the same order of magnitude next year as in 1975-76. I will of course be providing more precise and detailed forecasts in my budget, taking into account the latest information available on the economy and any policy tax changes to be announced at that time.

As in 1975-76, we may be able to meet some of our requirements by running down cash balances, since they are likely to be at a comfortable level, even after the drain of the next few days. I can thus visualize a public debt program for 1976-77 of broadly similar magnitude and composition as in 1975-76.

The borrowing authority of $6 billion being sought by the government under this bill is the same as that obtained in 1975-76, and provides the necessary margin for contingencies. The financial requirements excluding foreign exchange transactions may be larger than can now be foreseen. Foreign exchange transactions are impossible to predict. If the Canadian dollar is strong in the exchange markets, our ongoing policy of intervention in order to maintain orderly market conditions can add significantly to our cash requirements as they have done recently. It is of course also the case that the sale of foreign exchange can provide a source of money for us when the value of the Canadian dollar is declining.

Finally, I would note that we cannot control with great precision the amounts of Canada Savings Bonds which the public will buy each year. Successful campaigns as in the past two years can exhaust the borrowing authority if no margin is provided.

That is a review of the use of the borrowing authority in the fiscal year just closing and some perspective on the borrowing authority now being sought on an interim basis in this bill.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell the House what the cumulative borrowing authority to the government is at the present time, bearing in mind the two appropriation bills he referred to which were both passed in 1975?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, in my remarks I just indicated that it came to an aggregate of $6 billion—$4 billion provided in Appropriation Act No. 2 of 1975, and a further $2 billion in the Supplementary Borrowing Authority Act of 1975.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister misunderstood my question. The wording of the two appropriation acts that I referred to is that the government has the authority to negotiate loans, etc. to the extent of the $6 billion that he refers to, but in addition they can also carry all the debt that is on the books. What I want is a figure of the total debt, plus the additional authority made available to the government.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the figure of the total outstanding debt was given in the standing committee. I do not have it with me this evening. Both the government's funded debt and other liabilities—as up to date figures as were then available—were given to the hon.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

member in the standing committee. I would have to check the debt review to give that exact figure. To repeat my answer, however, the authorization for 1975-76 was $6 billion.

Mr. Stevens: I take it the figure that the minister is referring to is the one given at the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on March 18.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Chairman. The last time the hon. member and I addressed this issue, and I am not sure of the exact date, my officials were there and made the calculation as near as one can do at the moment, on the outstanding debt. My recollection is it was as of March 31, 1975, and the more up to date figure of March 31, 1976 which was necessarily an estimate, and the estimated average between the two figures.

Mr. Stevens: Further on a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman, the debt figures given by the minister at that committee meeting are the debt figures in relation to interest bearing debt. Do I take it that clause 5 gives authorization only in reference to interest bearing debt and does not include the total gross debt of the country which at March 31, 1975, for example, was $62.6 billion?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Clause 5 provides authority to borrow on such terms either by interest or discount as may be arranged in the market by the Bank of Canada as agent for the Government of Canada. Other debts that the government may have under the Canada Pension Plan, armed forces superannuation and other plans are not included in this authority to borrow. This is authority to borrow for the purpose of government expenditures.

Mr. Stevens: May I take it from the minister's remarks that liabilities that are reflected on Canada's balance sheet in a liability and assets sense, liabilities that are not interest bearing, are not included in the gross debt figures that are contemplated in clause 5?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There are liabilities of various kinds in regard to various departments. What we have been talking about are the liabilities for which I am responsible as Minister of Finance under the Department of Finance. Other outstanding liabilities, either on current terms or otherwise, would have to be found from the various departments themselves.

For example, if the hon. member is referring to unliquidated claims that might be recovered against the Government of Canada under the Crown Liability Act in the Federal Court of Canada, of course one cannot make any estimate in advance of what damages the courts may award against the government for motor vehicle negligence or other liabilities. We are talking exclusively of authority to borrow funds for the purpose of the Crown meeting the expenditures of the Government of Canada in 1976-77.

Mr. Stevens: If I may refer again to the meeting of the standing committee to which the minister has referred and the figures given by the minister that day, as of March 31, 1976, the interest bearing debt of the nation was $53,667 million. To come back to my first question: assuming that is a correct estimate, $53,667 million, is it fair for the

committee to assume that upon the passage of this $6 billion authorization contemplated in clause 5, the total debt outstanding plus the additional authorization will be $59,667 million?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, as was indicated to the hon. member the amount involved is an estimate. I would have to check and see whether he has read the figures into the record correctly but, subject to that, that is the estimate of the liability in relation to outstanding treasury bills, Canada Savings Bonds, and funded debt of the Government of Canada. We are considering authority for $6 billion more. At this moment no part of the $6 billion has been issued. If it were issued the figure would be as estimated, or very close to it, plus the additional $6 billion, as indicated in the clause.

● (2020)

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, to be specific, I gave the minister a copy of the minutes of that finance committee meeting. He may check the $53,667 million figure. Am I correct in assuming that that $53,667 million, plus the $6 billion contemplated in clause 5, will be the total authorized debt outstanding?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr. Chairman. That is an estimate only as of March 31, 1976, which has not arrived yet. The officials were estimating the figures for the purpose of the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another specific question? If one assumes that the estimate is correct, is the government requesting authority, over all, with respect to $6 billion, plus $53,667 million?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr. Chairman. We are requesting authorization for $6 billion. There is already an outstanding, significant allocation with regard to treasury bills, funded debt, and Government of Canada Savings Bonds. No authority is being sought at this time for that $53 billion-odd, because authority already exists with respect to that money.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, the minister said that two appropriation bills were passed last year, one for $4 billion, another for $2 billion, for a total of $6 billion. On the basis of his own figures, given at the finance committee meeting, it appears that the government will have borrowed $6.156 million, or $156 million more than was authorized by the two appropriation bills to which he referred. Can the minister say why this over-run occurred?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, if I may refer again to the remarks I made when introducing the item for the benefit of the hon. gentlemen, section 36 of the Financial Administration Act requires that no money shall be borrowed or security issued by or on behalf of Her Majesty without the authority of parliament. The hon. member's reference is to new money, but there is continuing authority under the act for the government to borrow funds in order to repay maturing debt. You do not need fresh authority under the Financial Administration Act to pay maturing debt. That authority is already provided by the Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the minister misunderstood me again. I shall try to be more specific. According to his own figures, as of March 31, 1975, total federal government interest bearing borrowings stood at $47,511 million. The government's estimated borrowings, which must, by inference, mean new borrowing as well as existing borrowing, as of March 31, 1976, exactly the same year with which the two appropriation bills mentioned dealt, had risen to the figure of $53,667 million, which represents an increase of $6,156 million, or $156 million more than the $6 billion authorized. Could the minister comment?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, borrowings during the year did not quite equal the $6 billion figure, but the money would have been partly used for re-funding existing debt, as I suggested to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, according to public account figures, as of the end of March, 1975, the total, gross federal debt stood at $62,696 million. Yet this evening, and also during the finance committee meeting, it was mentioned that the total interest bearing debt of the nation stood at $47,511 million. Can the minister explain how the difference of $15,185 million arises? That is the difference between the figure respecting this country's gross debt as mentioned in the committee, and as mentioned in committee of the whole this evening.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the figures for the purpose of government borrowing on March 18 were estimates, of course. The estimate as of March 31, 1976, is for $53 billion. But here we are talking not about other liabilities; we are talking about the government's borrowing, pursuant to its borrowing authority, which is what this item is about. As I said to the hon. gentleman, I do not pretend to give all the other liabilities of the Government of Canada, only the liabilities on funded debt.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, to refer to the estimates, the minister is asking for an increase of $875 million in debt servicing costs. To be specific, I am referring to the estimate for the fiscal year 1977, item 8-16. The minister suggests that government spending to cover debt servicing charges, interest, etc., will rise from $3,775 million, to $4,650 million, an increase of $875 million. Why is this staggering amount required, if he proposes to borrow in the current year an additional $6 billion at the outside? Even if we adopt the highest interest figures the minister quoted in committee, if the government borrowed $6 billion extra at 8.2 per cent, it cannot justify a jump of $875 million in extra interest costs. Apparently the government is seeking authority for that amount under this bill.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that that is the estimate of liability which will occur. Of course the over-all interest cost to the Government of Canada will be averaged out as lower cost debt is retired and new debt issued.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Chairman, may I mention two things happening which are directly related to the subject we are debating and connected with the public accounts committee. It is important for the committee and the Canadian public to know of three important studies undertaken

during the last several months under the auspices of the public accounts committee. The first of these concerns the study of the independent review committee which, I understand, will lead to the introduction of a new auditor general act. The President of the Treasury Board has recently said he intends to introduce this bill fairly soon.

The second study dealt with the review of the public accounts of Canada. This was a particularly important study because it will lead ultimately to measures which will enable people to measure the year by year, or even month by month financial performance of the $40 billion corporation known as the Government of Canada. This important topic has been debated in the public accounts committee several times. Ultimately it will have far-reaching effects on the way in which the financial activities of the government can be measured, and the financial performance in one year will be compared with what has been suggested in the budget that year. One year's performance will also be compared with another year's.

I suggest that recommendations concerning the public accounts of Canada will result eventually in a system of accounts the significance of which will be recognized beyond the confines of Parliament Hill. In other words it will be a form of financial reporting that will be recognizable in terms of modern day financial management reporting. This is an extremely important matter. It is one to which the government has been anxious to address itself for a considerable time.

● (2030)

A study was conducted with the benefit of considerable outside expertise in the form of professional guidance. The study will, of course, be ongoing. We have been given assurance by the President of the Treasury Board that the 41 recommendations emanating from that study will indeed be implemented as quickly as possible. It is important to understand that some of these recommendations are far-reaching in terms of the accounting and financial reporting systems in use in the government, and it may take several years before they can be implemented in whole. The main thing is that a start has been made.

The other important point is that the Auditor General has assured us that each year from now on he will give an accounting to the Public Accounts Committee of the way in which of these recommendations have been implemented, how far they have been implemented, and what recommendations still remain to be implemented. In view of the extensive nature of these recommendations, this is an important point. Indeed we may cover one or more parliaments before all the recommendations can be implemented. This is very reassuring to a member of parliament, who after all has no particular tenure in the position he occupies in any particular parliament, to know that even if he should leave this House these kinds of important recommendations will come into force in due course.

The third report I would like to speak about tonight, and perhaps this is the most far-reaching of all these reports, has been labelled the financial management and control study. This particular report was the result of a study that was initiated by the present Auditor General, shortly after his appointment some two years ago, in conjunction with Treasury Board and the President of the Treasury Board to undertake the most comprehensive review of the financial management and control operations of the government that has been undertaken since the days of the Glassco Commission.

I am sure many of us will recall the excitement among the Canadian public that accompanied the appointment of the Glassco Commission some 15 years ago, and the excitement with which we reviewed its recommendations. I am happy to note that over the past 15 years the government has implemented many of those recommendations.

However, it is important to note that a number of the recommendations in the area of financial management and control have yet to be implemented in whole. I say this because they have been implemented in part. To some of us who were examining the current report, that part is not nearly adequate. In fact it is missing a great deal. This is the area to which this current financial management and control study has addressed itself.

I would also like to note that this particular study is only about half completed. The current report being reviewed in the public accounts committee deals principally with matters related to government departments as such. It is my understanding that there will be another part of this study which will result in another report, perhaps next year or in the foreseeable future, that will deal Crown corporations and the many agencies of government.

It is perhaps important to note some of the terms of reference given to this particular group when their study was to be undertaken. One of the key areas is the recommendations which came out of this study dealing with the manner in which estimates should be placed before parliament. This is a very key point. I wish to enumerate the directions given to the study committee when it was appointed.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but he will recall that it was unanimously agreed to discuss clause 5. When I recognized the hon. member I thought he was either going to speak or ask a question on clause 5 rather than engage in a general debate on clause 2. I have recognized the hon. member and I cannot ask him to yield the floor, but I suggest that he address himself to clause 5.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield the floor. However, I wish to reserve my right to speak on clause 2 at another point.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, if I may take another run at the minister, perhaps I can get an answer to my first question if I try again. I refer the minister to the actual wording of clause 5. It reads:

> The Governor in Council may, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by Parliament, by any Act—

My question is, how much is the amount remaining unborrowed and negotiable under previous authority which could be added to the $6 billion now being requested?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I already responded to the hon. member, both in committee and here. One cannot give an actual figure outstanding as of the

moment. An estimate was given as of March 31, 1976, by my officials in committee. The figure for that was $53,667 million. That is the amount they estimated as of March 31, 1976.

Mr. Stevens: I come back to my basic third question. Assuming the estimate the minister referred to, the $53,667 million, is a correct figure, is it correct to say that on April 1, coming into the new fiscal year of 1977, the government may then borrow the existing $53,667 million, plus another $6 billion, in short, almost $60 billion—$59,667 million? Am I correct?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr, Chairman, the hon. member is not correct. The government has borrowed an amount of approximately the estimate. The government is authorized to borrow, starting April 1, a further $6 billion and that is all.

Mr. Stevens: Assuming the minister's estimate given at committee is correct, that on March 31 the total government borrowing will be $53,667 million, is it correct to say that what the government is asking for is an additional $6 billion which, if it is utilized during the next fiscal year, will mean that its total borrowing will be $59,667 million?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That very much depends on redemptions, the extent to which the $53,667 million is reduced. One can only guess at it. I suppose one could say that the outside aggregate of both borrowing authority and outstanding, the debt would be the sum of two figures.

Mr. Stevens: Finally we got it; the sum of the two figures would be a total debt and authorization of $59,667 million.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked if the government is being authorized to borrow in the coming year $53,667 million, plus $6 billion, and my answer to that was no. The government is being authorized to borrow $6 billion only. There is an estimated $53 billion outstanding.

● (2040)

Mr. Stevens: If we could assume that we could return to April 1 of the current fiscal year, in other words, to April 1, 1975, is it not correct also to say that the figure the hon. gentleman has given us for total government borrowing of $57,511 million could only be increased by $6 billion as a result of the two appropriation bills to which we have referred, which allow a further authorized borrowing of $6 billion? In short, if one adds the estimated figure the minister has given us it appears we have gone $156 million over the authorizations in the two appropriation bills.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The figure given was as at March 31, 1975. I cannot be certain of the figure as at April 1 without inquiry. Perhaps I could refer again to my statement that there was net new money in the fiscal year of $4.6 billion and that a further $214 million would be obtained from the April 1st bond issue. So, if the same event had occurred in the previous year, of course the March 31 figure would have been exceeded by April 1.

Mr. Stevens: I shall not delay the proceedings. It appears the authorization has been exceeded and perhaps we shall have more to say about that later in the proceedings. May I ask the minister this question? In view of Governor Bouey's attempt to be a little more restrained as far as monetary growth is concerned, would the minister indicate whether his new financing plans have been discussed with Governor Bouey and has he indicated that the hon. gentleman's fiscal stance in connection with the federal government's cash needs is acceptable to him? Does the governor feel he can live with it and yet retain the relatively restrained monetary growth he has been suggesting?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The governor does not, of course, pass judgment on fiscal policy; that is the responsibility of the department. But I think I can refer to the statement of the governor in the annual report of the Bank of Canada indicating his approbation in general terms of the fiscal policies of the government and also of the anti-inflation policies we are pursuing.

Mr. Stevens: Bearing in mind the governor's statement that he felt government would have to be less demanding as far as cash requirements are concerned, has the minister specifically discussed with the governor the cash needs of the federal treasury in the coming year, and has the governor indicated that the monetary stance he is proposing is sufficient to cover the fiscal needs outlined by the minister?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We have not discussed any specific cash figure. We have talked about it on a broader economic basis. The governor shares the government's concern that a too tight fiscal or monetary policy could have the effect of retarding recovery and risking much higher rates of unemployment, and it is for this reason he has given his approval to the government's fiscal stance and to the economic policy we have followed with regard to the anti-inflation program. That is why we agree, of course, on the appropriateness of the monetary policy being followed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on clause two. I do not wish to interrupt the interesting line of questioning which the hon. member for York-Simcoe is carrying on, but in view of the fact that the Chairman this afternoon held everyone down to 20 minutes I should like to have some idea how long the hon. member is going to be.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Boulanger): The time allotted to the hon. member for York-Simcoe is very close to expiring. If the hon. member could wait a few minutes we might be able to carry clause 5. I will allow the hon. member for York-Simcoe one more question.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank hon. members also for their patience. My final question is this: of the $6 million which may be borrowed, does the minister contemplate any of this sum being placed outside Canada, in the United States, or in other foreign capital markets?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If I might correct the hon. member again, it is $6 billion which is to be borrowed, not $6 million. It is difficult to say where it will be placed. In all probability it will be placed in Canada. The Canada Savings Bond issue will, of course, be entirely confined to Canadians. It will depend very much on the state of the

market at the time. The great probability is that it will be placed here. It has been quite some time, a period of years, since the Government of Canada placed a bond issue outside the country.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Boulanger): Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

Clause 5 stood.

[*Translation*]

On Clause 2.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would like to point out an error in clause 2. We read $198,670,283.33 in the English text and $199,670,283.33 in the French translation. As you know, the French side is always more generous than the English side but this should not occur in this bill. Therefore I should like to inform the House, on a point of order, that on page 2, clause 2, subclause *g*), the French should read $198,670,283.33 instead of $199,670,283.33.

[*English*]

Mr. Towers: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I base my point of order on Standing Order 69 which states that "no bill may be introduced either in blank or in an imperfect shape." I wanted to bring that to your attention. Perhaps the President of the Treasury Board would tell the House what he was trying to do—whether he was trying to confuse the Auditor General or members of parliament, or whether he has joined the C.D. Howe club whose motto is "What's a million?" In any case, I raised this point on the basis of the provision clearly set out in Standing Order 69.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Boulanger): We are now on clause 2. The hon. member for Scarborough East.

On clause 2—*$4,970,732,370.57 granted for 1976-77.*

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Chairman, I realize time is running out so I shall be brief. During this discussion of the estimates of the President of the Treasury Board I wish to call attention to a pay practice which I consider to be unfair to those employees of the government known as casuals. I am addressing this point to the minister in his capacity as representing the government as employer. It is somewhat in the nature of a grievance felt by many people in my constituency, and undoubtedly by constituents of other members. The grievance arise from the regulations administered by Treasury Board relating to the retroactive pay of casuals. The problem can be simply stated.

First, as members well know, casuals are not included in the collective bargaining process nor do they enjoy certain other benefits available to permanent employees of the government. The question I want to raise for hon. members is this: should these differences in the status of casuals and other employees justify the present rule that casuals do not qualify for retroactive pay when, for example, they have worked during a period after a collective agreement has expired and before a new one is negotiated? I do not think they should be excluded from retroactive pay because of their different status.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

● (2050)

For example, let us assume that an agreement expired last November and that the new agreement was ratified in February, with a three-month period following termination of the agreement. Those who are classified as permanent employees, or even as term casuals, will receive retroactive pay for the three months' period after the agreement terminated. This is not the case with casuals unless a casual had worked in an uninterrupted fashion for the preceding six months.

It is this six-month formula or rule that I wish to raise as a grievance before we pass the estimates. I believe this produces an injustice, and what I am doing is making a representation to the President of the Treasury Board, asking him to consider changing the formula. Let us consider perhaps a typical case, and then I should like to suggest to the minister an amended formula.

Consider a casual during any given year who works for perhaps three weeks and is then laid off, comes back on the payroll for two months and is then laid off, comes back on the payroll for a few weeks and is laid off, and comes back on the payroll for six months and is laid off. That is a typical pattern under which casuals operate now.

These are valuable employees if only in that they give flexibility to the employment needs of the government. They assist the government in its work during peak periods and they are not employed at other periods but in effect are on standby. This is of benefit to the employees who wish to be in the casual category, and is of benefit to the government, particularly to certain departments which have seasonal loads, for example National Health and Welfare, the Post Office, the Unemployment Insurance Commission undoubtedly, as well as other departments where there is an unsteady rhythm of employment needs.

The pay for these casuals is in fact related to that of a permanent employee in a similar category. Let us say it is to the second level or the minimum level of a clerk, grade 1, 2 or 3, whatever the cross-reference is. When the pay of one of these permanent employees is raised and there is a retroactive feature, that permanent employee receives retroactive pay, but the casual employee who is linked in a pay fashion to that level does not receive the retroactive pay for the same period. This is a grievance. This is unfair, in my view. It is unjust, and it is more keenly felt during a period of inflation.

My suggestion to the minister would be that the six-month rule be changed. There may be various formulas for the change, but the one I should like to suggest for his consideration is that a casual employee be entitled to retroactivity if the casual employee has worked for a six-month period, whether or not interrupted, in the 12 months preceding the termination of the agreement.

That would be a definite improvement because it would mean that the casual could accumulate six months over the year preceding termination. The employee might accumulate three months, then break off, then three weeks, and so on. There may be other formulas but this is the principle I am seeking, that these people be entitled to retroactivity on a less restrictive and more just formula than the one now existing.

This is not a great change to ask. The principle of retroactivity is already granted for casuals provided they have six uninterrupted months. I am only suggesting that the formula be changed to broaden it in its reach to other employees. I will say no more. I put this as a representation to the minister, and I am sure there are other hon. members who would be glad to support it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: I wish to thank the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell) for bringing this problem to my attention. I was not aware of this apparent difference in the compensation methods of our casual employees. Obviously I cannot accept right away the hon. member's proposition because, first of all, there is a dogma in the relations between the government's employees and the government itself whereby we do not bring any changes without consulting the union representatives. So I take good note of these recommendations. There seems to be a discrepancy; the hon. member makes a concrete suggestion which I will be glad to consider with a view to finding a remedy to what seems to be an injustice.

[*English*]

While I am on my feet I should like to come back to a subject which was discussed at some length today regarding the Medical Research Council. I just want to say that this is a very difficult situation because there are a lot of good causes in the land. This is another illustration of the fact that the government's money is not always wasted. I would point out to the hon. member that the funds of the Medical Research Council have not been cut back, an not even frozen. The amount in 1974-75 was $42,860,000. The year after that we gave the council what I consider a substantial increase, to $47,434,000. In this fiscal year it will be $48,434,000 rather than $47,434,000, or an increase of $1 million. Of course I agree with everybody that this does not meet all the requirements of the council.

One hon. member tried to create the impression that I did not know anything about this at all. I must inform him that my own brother is a medical researcher and he gave me hell for this, even more than the hon. member. This is not my money but the money of all the taxpayers, and I have to do the best I can with it. We all know that there are pressures on members of the House; I always welcome suggestions from everyone, but we do have to make these difficult decisions. We hope that next year we will do better. I want to point out to the hon. member that there was no cutback at all, and not even a freeze. I must admit it was a very modest increase, but it is not a cutback when you give an extra $1 million. For me a million dollars is a very big amount of money.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I have been waiting for your ruling on my earlier point of order. I am wondering how you are going to correct the error in this bill. There are many members who are not here tonight and they will not be aware of the error.

The Chairman: Order, please. The Chair took notice of the point brought to the attention of the committee. The hon. member asked a question concerning the purpose of this mistake. However, a mistake is a mistake, and in the mind of the Chair this is the type of error which I think we should correct by unanimous consent. Is it agreed?

● (2100)

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Martin: Mr. Chairman, a short while ago I was in the middle of my speech in connection with matters relating to clause 2 when it was pointed out to me by the Chair at the time that we were actually dealing with a different clause. I asked that my position be preserved once we reached the discussion of clause 2. I would appreciate knowing where I stand now.

The Chairman: Order, please. I think the hon. member is just losing valuable time. We will come to him in due course. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Chairman, I consider it somewhat strange that the government should boast so loudly about the substantial cuts in expenditures in respect of its guidelines aimed at inflation.

Mr. Blais: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order, please. If the parliamentary secretary wishes to raise a point of order about the fact that the hon. member for Scarborough West has not been recognized, the decision has been rendered by the Chair. The only alternative is to challenge my ruling. The Chair has the authority to recognize members in turn. The hon. member for Scarborough West had yielded to another member, for whatever reason. It is not his choice when he will be recognized. It is a prerogative of the Chair. The parliamentary secretary knows that. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Chairman, before I was interrupted I was saying that the government should not be boasting about this. If we look at the facts, this is a very hollow boast. Let us look at the government expenditures over the past eight years, according to the figures in the book of estimates. In the 1968-69 fiscal year the estimates amounted to $10.8 billion while the current estimates stand at $38.4 billion. The figure has almost quadrupled in eight years.

Between 1975-76 and 1976-77 the figure increased from $28.2 billion to $38.4 billion. It was calculated about a year ago that if the government went on increasing its spending at the rate it was then, successive governments headed by the present Prime Minister would be spending by the end of this current year as much as was spent by all preceding Canadian governments combined. That is an example of restraint.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): No. I will accept a question at the end of my remarks.

This is a strange record on which to base such a boast. The $38.4 billion is the figure in the main estimates only

before any supplementaries have been added. When the supplementaries are added I am sure the figure will be over the quadruplicate. My prime interest, aside from deflating some of this inflationary talk or deflationary talk, is to concern myself with some of the defects in the planning over the last umpteen years by the government in the matter of air-sea rescue on the west coast.

Last year ten fishermen were lost during the herring-fishing season off the west coast. There were 14 vessels lost and six more seriously damaged. That was in March, 1975. With some prompting the Department of Transport set up an inquiry in mid-April. By July, after further prompting, a report was finally tabled in this House. It was a good report. It contained some excellent recommendations. Some were for immediate application, certainly before the next herring fishing season which began earlier this month.

Were these recommendations ever implemented before the fishing fleet set out to sea earlier this month, because four more lives already have been lost this season on the herring fishing grounds? Two of these lives were lost on Monday night this week. Against this background the following facts have a great relevance.

There are three service helicopters for air-sea rescue on the west coast, in addition to the one single coast guard helicopter. Of the three service helicopters, as of this morning only one was serviceable. In other words, two helicopters are in service at this moment to be available on call for the fishing fleet at sea composed of hundreds of small vessels spread up and down the coast.

What is more, the helicopter situation is not better this year than it was last year. This brings up the subject of today's debate—the lack of foresight by the government which places us in this perilous position of having too little in the way of air-sea rescue capability on the west coast. I am inclined to think the situation is not much better on the east coast, but we will hear about that shortly.

There is another element in this situation which deserves some comment. The three service helicopters, the three normally available at Comox, are by priority assigned to land search or to sea search for an aircraft downed at sea. They are not necessarily available for air-sea rescue for fishermen in distress. This means that on the west coast only one helicopter with hoist capacity is available, when serviceable, for the saving of life at sea in the Pacific in respect of the fishing fleet.

I should like to revert for a moment to the Fishing Boat Casualty Report which I mentioned earlier. In that report dated March, 1975, but not released to parliament until well on into July, and only then because of continual prodding by me, the officers of the Department of Transport inquiring into last year's accidents made a number of far-reaching recommendations. These recommendations related to training for skippers and mates, the publication of a fishermen's safety pamphlet for seamen generally, as well as weather forecasting, stability and load restrictions and arrangements.

I have had occasion to review these recommendations during the past few days because of the accidents that took place. I wonder how many of these recommendations were ever implemented. I found them all to be excellent and practical recommendations, but were they implemented? That is what I want to know. If they were not implemented, what was the reason. We lost 14 men and ten vessels last year, and four more men early this year, partly I suspect because these recommendations were not implemented.

Early in January the fishermen made representations to B.C. members of parliament about the forthcoming fishing season. I have a copy of those representations as conveyed to the Minister of Transport by my colleague, the hon. member for Victoria. Some of the recommendations made by the fishermen are identical to those made by the committee of enquiry. These include stability testing, loading arrangements and so on. Aside from this there was a call for improved air-sea rescue facilities for the fishing area. Was any heed paid to this call for help? How much heed was paid to the recommendations that were presented to the minister in January?

The first of the fishing boat disasters this year occurred off Cape Beale, the southern lip of Barclay Sound. Who came to the rescue? The United States Coast Guard. I believe one of their helicopters—and this I find distressing—crashed into the sea in its attempt to rescue some of our Canadian fishermen. We are fortunate in having neighbours of that kind. Two fishermen and the helicopter crew were saved as a result of the activities of a lifeboat crew which put out to sea. Most of the helicopter itself was eventually salvaged, but one seaman was lost and more would have been lost had it not been for the U.S. coastguard. Is there any better way of pointing out the deficiencies of the Canadian coastguard and the Canadian air-sea rescue facilities on the west coast?

● (2110)

I have said it before and I say it again now, hopefully for the last time, that we do not have an effective air-sea rescue on our coast. What is at issue here is a combination of the improper assignment of priorities in budgeting over the last eight or ten years, lack of foresight, and a confusion in the co-ordination of command. If these shortcomings had not been allowed to occur four, five or six years ago, we would not be in the position we are in today, that is, of asking the government to re-examine its priorities so that everything necessary is done to protect the lives of our fishermen.

Strengthening the air-sea rescue capability will cost a lot of money, but lives are at stake. Implementation of the recommendations of the Department of Transport will cost less money, but lives are still at stake, and the recommendations deserve to be implemented. This failure of the government to assign priorities properly adds to the growing fund of lack of confidence which marks the history of the government. Unfortunately this lack of confidence also reflects on parliament and on its members.

The government's credibility is in question, not only as a result of its failure to take the necessary steps in time vis-à-vis air-sea rescue. It has also been considerably shaken, I suggest, as a result of the failure of normal ethical standards of conduct to exercise their expected effect on all members of the cabinet, leading to the commission of what has come to be called impropriety. Now we have the sight of former senior public servants exercising

functions in the private sector which at least causes one to ask oneself whether some conflict of interest is not at issue.

The experiment in which we are engaged today as a means of re-examining the estimates is long overdue. It is not absolutely clear whether it will be effective, but something effective has to be worked out to restore the credibility of parliament and of governments in general.

Last evening, for example, as we were asked to approve supplementary estimates we found it absolutely impossible to amend in any way the sums proposed by the government. There was one sum in particular which did not need to be there at all, yet we could not remove it. We were told that we should have had it removed in committee and brought forward to the House as an amendment when reporting the estimates to the House. That had been tried, Mr. Chairman. An opposition motion was put in the committee aimed at dropping that particular sum from the estimates. It was a sum which a senior public servant said he would not need, a matter of some $186,000 to be dropped. What happened? The government members voted to a man to oppose that deletion. As a majority their will prevailed, and as a result we passed in the supplementaries last night a sum of $186,000 which will not be needed.

It was maintained at the time that the unused funds would be returned in the normal course of events to the consolidated revenue fund. This is not necessarily so because in another committee, one on which I sat, some $858,000 of funds voted by this parliament to cover capital costs were admitted to have been diverted to the payment of services. When we questioned this improper procedure we were told that permission to cover this diversion was actually being asked at that moment. But if you examined those supplementaries, those funds had already been spent. So we cannot be absolutely certain that the $186,000 which was overestimated would be returned to the consolidated revenue fund automatically. This is one of the reasons why we are having this particular experiment in procedure tonight.

We want to devise methods of improving control by parliament over expenditures by government of whatever kind. What we want to know is where the government places its priorities in relation to expenditures of public funds, and in particular in the case of which I spoke, in relation to the safety of life at sea. There has been no evidence over the past three or four years, even after the tragedies of last year, that priorities in this area have been adjusted to meet altering demands.

In the matter of co-ordination of effort to bring together the activities of all the departments concerned, such as the Department of Transport, the Department of the Environment, the Department of Fisheries, the Solicitor General's Department, the RCMP, the Department of National Defence, and even Customs, little has been done to meet these crying needs. I am disturbed that the government is so bankrupt in the matter of governing that it will permit this parliament and the whole democratic process to become so eroded that we will have to start again at the beginning to restore parliament and all its institutions to the respect and honour which an effective performance alone can produce.

Mr. Flynn: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that when the controversial bill came up "the government to a man . . .". I would like to correct him. It was "the government to a person".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Martin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to terminate my comments which I started a little earlier. I yielded my place to allow the discussion to continue on clause 5. I was discussing the terms of reference given some two years to the committee which appear in the report of the Auditor General on financial management and control practices within the government. I should like to read these terms of reference into the record because of their new application to the estimates process which we are now going through.

The committee was asked to examine:

(a) Statutes and Treasury Board regulations, policies, directives and guidelines relevant to financial management and control, and the extent of compliance therewith in departments and agencies;

(b) Financial systems and procedures in departments and agencies including budgetary controls, accounting for revenues, expenditures, assets, liabilities, commitments, and financial reporting systems;

(c) Integration of the departmental and agency accounting processes and systems with the central systems;

(d) Extent to which the financial systems and procedures are monitored and audited by internal or operational audit groups;

(e) Type, accuracy, timeliness, purpose and use of financial information and reports currently prepared;

(f) Extent of decentralization following on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Government Organization and its impact on over-all financial control, and

(g) Duties, responsibilities and functions of financial and accounting managers and staff with special reference to the system of financial and accounting control and the relationships of their function with central financial and accounting agencies.

I think it is important also that these terms of reference, as I mentioned earlier, were very encompassing and provided the largest investigation into financial management and control within government organization that has taken place since the Glassco Commission was appointed some 15 years ago.

● (2120)

In the time available to me tonight I should like to cover one or two of the major recommendations from that study, and I emphasize again that the study is only half completed. I will be brief because I know others want to participate in this debate. To the present time the study has only dealt with individual government departments. The next part of the study will deal with Crown corporations and their many agencies operated under the government.

One of the key recommendations from this study is that no longer is it recommended that three departments continue to hold the joint responsibility for the financing, management, and control of accounting procedures and procedures relating to preparation of estimates in the government. Indeed up until now it has been the practice that this responsibility has been shared by the Department of Supply and Services, the Treasury Board, and the Department of Finance.

In large industry—and government is a large organization—it is accepted that there must be centralization of

financial control at some point. This particular study in its report recommends that this responsibility pass entirely to the Treasury Board. In future—and this is the recommendation which the President of the Treasury Board has unequivocally indicated will certainly be accepted by the government—there will be one department in government, the Treasury Board, which will assume this central responsibility for financial management and control.

I think it is important also to note that there has been a recommendation by this committee that there be more consideration in the formation of estimates, starting at the top and working down. This is not intended to take away the incentive of the people working out in the field and at the lower levels of government to come up with the kinds of programs which they think it would be proper and desirable to implement. What it does say, however, is that at some point there is to be a cap put on. In other words, that cap will be put on at the top, and individual ideas being worked upon from the bottom up will have to be sifted at some point so that indeed they can fit into the over-all total which can be ascribed to that particular department. I think this is important because there has been a tendency in the past, in the massive growth of government bureaucracy we have seen, for programs to come up from the bottom, and it has been difficult to ascertain just what cap has been applied. This is an important recommendation.

Another important recommendation on which there may still be some difference in interpretation is the matter of the appointment of a chief financial officer with the government. I believe it is the idea of the study group that a person should be designated chief financial officer at some point, just as we find is done in large corporate undertakings. Regardless of the total number of people who have financial control, somewhere in a corporate entity there is one chief financial officer who ultimately must answer to the brass, as it were, for what is happening in terms of the financial operation of that undertaking.

I believe that at the moment the Treasury Board is of the opinion that the Treasury Board as a collective unit is the chief financial officer, and I think this is something which needs to be explored still further.

Of the three studies I mentioned earlier I think this study is being put before the Public Accounts Committee and is the most important in terms of over-all purview of government financial operations in years to come. It will take many years to implement in its entirety, and the understanding of those of us in the Public Accounts Committee at the present time is that there are only two recommendations with which the Treasury Board tends to disagree. There are perhaps seven or eight recommendations with which the Treasury Board agrees, and a number over which there is substantial agreement.

For the purposes of the record, the recommendations in the study are contained in chapter 10 of the report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1975. This particular chapter is so significant that I believe for the first time in recent years the Auditor General found it necessary to bring out a supplement of some 300 pages to back up strictly that one chapter of his report for the year ended March 31, 1975. This supplement deals completely with the many recommendations made to date by the financial management and control study group. I emphasize to date, because the importance of this matter is so great that indeed, it will be continued in the current year with relation to Crown corporations and their related agencies.

[Mr. Martin.]

There are many other recommendations I should have liked to talk about because I think they form a very essential part of the over-all role of parliamentarians in their review of estimates which are put before them. In the recommendations there is a real endeavour to give parliamentarians more concrete information which will enable them to do their job in committees and to make their examination of the various estimates put before them in a much more rational and meaningful method than is currently possible under the existing system.

Much more could be said about this very important subject, but I just wanted to put these points, in relation to chapter 10 of the report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1975, on the record at this time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes which are left I should like to ask the committee to give some thought to a matter which is of grave concern to quite a number of people in my constituency, to a large number of people on the coast of British Columbia, and to an even larger number of people who live in the Atlantic provinces. I am referring to the search and rescue service of the government.

The men who go down to the sea in ships and do business in deep waters deserve the very best kind of protection this country can provide. The men who sail our ships in the coastal trade, and the fishermen who go out to bring food back for the people of this country, are entitled to a very good, adequate, and efficient search and rescue operation. They are not getting it. The service has been both inadequate and inefficient. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich has given some of the figures, and there is no need to weary the committee with more.

The fact is that on the Pacific, coast when the herring season is on, some 1,600 fishing boats go out into deep water. Last year we lost 14 men and 13 ships, and already in this season, which has not by any means finished, we have lost four men and five ships. On the east coast there has been a steady series of losses of both ships and men.

I have in my hand the report of Mr. Justice P. Lloyd Soper, who made an inquiry into the loss of ships on the Atlantic coast and made his report to the Minister of Transport, and to the best of my knowledge not a single one of the recommendations made to that minister has been implemented.

What is the reason for the poor service which is being provided on both our coasts? I want to say that it does not lie with the men who man the coastguard or who are trying to provide the service. These men are doing the very best they can with inadequate equipment. and with a hopeless administrative structure. The main problem lies in the fact that we have divided jurisdiction. The Department of Transport, the Department of National Defence, and the Department of Fisheries are all in the picture; the RCMP also has some part in it, as has the coastguard. In addition, the United States coastguard comes to our rescue very frequently, thank heaven!

● (2130)

Mr. Richardson: We help them, too.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On March 18 as reported at page 11902 of *Hansard* I asked the Minister of National Defence about the serious losses we have suffered in the last few days both in men and boats on the Pacific coast. The minister replied:

I should point out also that maritime rescue is the responsibility of the Department of Transport. The Department of National Defence does not have a maritime rescue capability but we have a very effective air-search capability.

I asked the minister at that time how you could have a search and rescue operation in which the Department of Transport is responsible for the rescue function and the Department of National Defence is responsible for searching. That is exactly why we have had such serious losses. Moreover, we have to depend on the United States coast-guard service. The minister said:

We tend to assist the U.S. more on the east coast; they assist us more on the west coast.

This may be a very good arrangement on paper but the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, when the storm hits the coastline, east or west, it hits both the American coastline and the Canadian coastline. The result is that the United States has to look after its own people. We cannot expect them to neglect servicing their people in order to meet our needs.

It seems to me this is a hopeless situation. Not only have we got a divided jurisdiction but we have inadequate equipment. The rescue operation does not have night equipment. The search operation can go out and find the ship or men clinging to a life raft, but there is no way until daybreak that the rescue operation can be effected.

What needs to be done, Mr. Chairman? I suggest the first thing is to order equipment which would make it possible to carry on both search and rescue operations 24 hours a day. We need night lights on helicopters, proper landing facilities, ships that are able to go out in stormy seas and which can fire a life line, and are strong enough to tow a stricken ship back to port.

The other thing we need is a single agency which will be responsible for the entire search and rescue operation. This divided jurisdiction has created a monstrosity. It is for the government to decide which department such an agency should come under but there certainly ought to be one agency for search and rescue, maritime and aerial, with all the facilities it needs. It should be able to go into action on both coasts. We should not have to depend on the generosity of our American friends. The men in the coastal trade or those who go out to catch fish should know that, in the event of a serious storm or running on the rocks, they have a reasonable chance of being rescued.

The other thing that needs to be done is for the government to accept the recommendations made by the Department of Transport, by the Department of Fisheries, and by committees of inquiry like the Soper committee and put those recommendations into effect.

The Minister of Transport was asked about this matter yesterday. As reported at page 12095 of *Hansard* he admitted that he had received recommendations from his department that fundamental changes were needed in the regulations but these had not been made. This has been put off year after year. In the meantime brave men drown, good ships are wrecked, and ministers of the various departments pass the buck from one to the other.

The Minister of National Defence says his department is responsible for the search but the Department of Transport has to effect the rescue. The Minister of Transport told the House yesterday that these regulations are going to be promulgated later and then we will get around to doing something. Despite the fact that ministers have had the recommendations on their desks for several years nothing has been done.

It has always caused me some amusement that the Liberal party, while admitting it may not be the most innovative organization or the most imaginative in the world, has claimed to be the most competent. They believe they are the people who can be trusted to manage the affairs of Canada. But what do we see? Since the end of World War II the Liberal party has been in office for 36 out of 41 years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since the Tories left office the Liberal party has been in power for 13 years, eight of them in an administration headed by the present Prime Minister. Hon. members who pound their desks overlook the fact that those years will haunt them for their failure to do anything about the appalling search and rescue conditions in this country. With all those years behind them why have they not done something about this problem?

What has happened as we sit in this House has become more and more apparent. We listen to ministers say they are going to do something about the problem. They talk about appointing a task force or having a study or a report made. Then when they get the report they say the matter has to go to cabinet and that in the next six months the government will take a decision. Those are the phrases they use, Mr. Chairman.

Instead of living up to their claim as efficient administrators the government is increasingly becoming inefficient, is showing administrative incompetence. It is a bureaucracy that has grown bigger but not better, a bureaucracy that daily is becoming more insensitive to the needs of the people and less responsive to the requests of the Canadian people for action.

The President of the Treasury Board, who is a very hard working minister and a friendly person, has a duty to do more than watch the expenditures of the government. Surely he has a responsibility not just to audit the books but to audit the programs. How has it been possible that in the years he has sat on the Treasury benches nothing has been done about the divided authority and the hopelessly inefficient search and rescue operation?

● (2140)

For years the fishermen's union have asked for regulations which would provide for fish to be treated as cargo, so that it would be necessary to insert bulkheads in boats, to prevent fish from sliding, and ships capsizing during a storm. This was not done. They proposed to the Depart-

ment of Transport regulations concerning Plimsoll lines so that fishing boats cannot be overloaded. Nothing was done. They asked for regulations to stimulate standards for the construction of bulkheads, particularly in the stern, to make ships more seaworthy. Nothing was done.

I say that the government has a responsibility to listen and to act on the matter. The Prime Minister has a responsibility. Perhaps it is time for him to get rid of some of the extinct volcanoes on the treasury benches and replace them with young men and women—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —who might bring to cabinet, imagination, competence, and new ideas.

Mr. Andras: You are being mischievous, Tommy.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I urge either the President of the Treasury Board or the Prime Minister, since only they have real authority in the matter, or consider my representations, to institute new search and rescue operations, to do something with regard to equipment, and to establish a single agency with responsibilities in this area in place of the divided, hopeless monstrosity with which we are now saddled. Above all, they should implement recommendations their own civil servants have proposed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order, in order to clarify something briefly. I had some conversations with the hon. member for York-Simcoe. He was asking questions about estimated interest bearing debt as of March 31, 1976. We discussed the figure of $53 billion. That figure represents an aggregate of funded debt, plus other liabilities of the Government of Canada. The authority sought here is with regard to funded debt; therefore the question he raised earlier as to whether we had exceeded the $6 billion authorized for 1975-76 is explained by reason of the fact that the funded debt between the two periods he talked about, March 31, 1975, and the estimate as of March 31, 1976, is the difference between $33 billion and $37.6 billion, or the $4.6 billion mentioned in my earlier remarks. In other words, although the total interest bearing debt is $53.6 billion, that figure includes other liabilities such as pension contributions. We are talking here about funded debt only.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order, please. I do not think there ought to be debate at this point. The minister sought the floor to rectify an earlier statement. I do not think the matter ought to go beyond that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is true that according to the rules you ought to bring this debate to an end at 9.45. Since it is generally understood that no one will force a recorded vote—which is the purpose for the 15 minutes—I wonder if we could not agree to carry on for another ten minutes and let the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East contribute to what has been discussed.

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

The Chairman: Order, please. Of course the committee has no authority to do as the hon. member suggests, but the Chairman perhaps could not see the clock for another five minutes.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes. I thank my colleagues in the House, particularly the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, for extending this courtesy to me. I think the remarks I am about to make will reflect the thinking of the hon. member for South Shore, the hon. member for St. John's East—

Mr. McCleave: The member for Halifax-East Hants.

Mr. Forrestall: —the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants and, indeed, all hon. members coming from the Atlantic provinces who, time and again in recent weeks, indeed in the last ten or 15 years, have spoken in this House about the inadequacy of search and rescue operations on the east coast, Gulf of St. Lawrence, on our Great Lakes and other inland waters.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands described this service as inadequate. It is. I suggest to the President of the Treasury Board that not one of the points raised this evening in connection with search and rescue involves the spending of more money. This evening we talked about the better organization and utilization of the facilities available in the Canadian Armed Forces, Department of Transport, the marine branch of the RCMP, the Department of Fisheries, our oceanographic vessels, and so on.

The Canadian government has at its disposal the fourth or fifth largest navy in the world; yet we cannot adequately protect our fishermen, including our coastal fishermen. We cannot give to coastal seamen the protection they require. I shall allude to a long list of rescue operations to make clear the magnitude of the problem. Let me make clear once more that I am not talking about the spending of more money. I am talking about the need for a better organization of existing funds and of facilities already in being and at our disposal.

The four regional search and rescue control centres last year dealt with 6,349 incidents. These search and rescue operations were co-ordinated by the four centres, in Halifax, Trenton, Edmonton, and Vancouver. Of those 6,000-odd incidents, 2,538 involved air incidents, 3,120 marine incidents, 637 were what you might call humanitarian incidents, and 55 involved aid to the civil power.

Let me say a word about the Atlantic region covering 1.8 million square miles—half the Atlantic. It runs westward to a line approximately half way down the Quebec coast, covers all the maritime provinces and goes as far north as 70 degrees north, or about 350 miles north of Frobisher Bay. Last year alone in this area we dealt with some 1,525 incidents, of which 731 were air, 619 marine and 160 were medical evacuations, or so-called humanitarian operations. We saved 210 lives. If there had been slightly more efficiency, if the available facilities had been used better, we could have saved 231 lives. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about the lives that are lost.

Two men lost their lives 150 feet from the shore of Halifax harbour because no boat or helicopter could get to them to save them. Clearly there is something desperately wrong. In Halifax harbour there are fisheries vessels, oceanographic vessels, naval vessels. These two men drowned less than a mile and a quarter away from people who might have been watching from the side of a hill. The helicopter squadron in the area could not do anything; therefore the men drowned. We mourn the loss of our seamen.

We need operational helicopters on the east coast, but at present they are not capable of operating after dark. Why, Mr. Chairman? The government will not give the Canadian military enough money to buy enough fuel so that the men flying those helicopters can maintain a night flying proficiency. They need training. You cannot send an untrained man out at night and ask him to take somebody off a pitching, foundering boat. He must be proficient. He needs training. He must be safe at what he is doing. Our personnel cannot operate safely because they have not been trained. They do not have their night flying licences. These things could be achieved without the expenditure of additional money. It involves better co-operation and utilization of existing facilities.

I shall sit down with this comment, Mr. Chairman. This will not happen in this country until there is a single, paramount authority responsible for all search and rescue. We can no longer have a divided jurisdiction. It has not saved us money. It has cost us lives. Canadians cannot afford that when we have the facilities to avoid such loss of life. I suggest that the President of the Treasury Board should consult with his colleagues in Transport, Defence, Fisheries, the coast guard, and the RCMP. They should be forced to get together and choose among them what will be the paramount authority, assuming full responsibility for all search and rescue operations in Canada. Let that single authority pull together in the most efficient way our facilities, capacities, and capabilities so that our seamen and those involved in air indicents will have the type of search and rescue operations to which they are entitled. I appreciate Your Honour's indulgence.

● (2150)

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Order please. It being 9.45 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to the order passed on Wednesday, March 24, 1976, to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to adopt the said motion now under consideration.

[*English*]

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A, B, C, D, E, and F agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board) moved: That Bill C-91, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to order made Wednesday, March 24, 1976, Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Sharp, moves that the bill be now read a third time and do pass. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was going to rise earlier, but the rules do not provide it. All I would like to say is that we on this side of the House welcomed the opportunity of the debate today. It was by way of experiment. It may not have gone 100 per cent, but I think we have made some progress.

I hope that on other occasions when we have appropriation bills we can have a debate that is more open-ended without the ten o'clock rule so that all hon. members who wish to participate may do so. I know that members opposite were just bursting forth with inspiration, as were members on this side. I hope it will not be limited to that. However, we will see what progress can be made in the future.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I missed some of the proceedings of the last moment or so because of certain sounds. However, I believe there was a small amendment made in committee that, for technical reasons, should be concurred in at this stage before third reading is given.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the point is accomplished by the Chair making note of the fact that a figure in the text was changed during the course of the committee proceedings. That should be noted. It has been treated as an editorial change. In any event it is appropriate that it be brought to the attention of the House so that it can be properly noted as having taken place.

With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), there are occasions on which points of order raised by hon. members related to the procedures, particularly to supply procedures, cannot be accepted by the Chair. However, it is obvious that the spirit of those points has been recognized in the proceedings that were adopted by the House today. Indeed, much of the anguish experienced by hon. members who conscientiously endeavoured to participate in a meaningful examination of the supply process has been given effect to today. The point of order of the hon. member for Edmonton West is well taken.

It being ten o'clock, the House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, March 26, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

REQUEST FOR REINSTATEMENT OF CONTRACT WITH COMPUTING DEVICES IN CONNECTION WITH SAMSON PROJECT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 with respect to the matter of Computing Devices of Canada and the cancellation of the Samson contract and their participation in it. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald):

That a thorough investigation be undertaken by the Department of Supply and Services as to the fairness in the evaluation of the product of CDC in light of the conditions of unprecedented security that are the cause of the delays and were beyond the control of the company by reason of, first, lack of U.S. security information as promised; second, lack of Canadian government security information as promised; and third, the fact that this was therefore the first Canadian company to undertake the development and establishment of tempest technology.

Further, that pending the investigation, the Crown reinstate the contract on the basis that the company can meet the delivery requirement of September 1976 for the prearranged testing and implementation of the system.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the standing order, the motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DATA ON BRIBES RECEIVED FROM UNITED STATES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

In view of the fact that yesterday in the House the Minister of National Defence, in reference to the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, said that there was a full disclosure of the improper payments by that corporation in the Senate hearings in the United States, and Canada was not mentioned at any time in those full hearings, and in view of the fact that the deputy Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Robert Ingersoll, has announced that the State Department will supply the Lockheed data to other countries, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That the Minister of National Defence table the data received from Mr. Ingersoll in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43 such a motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MANPOWER

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with an important and urgent matter.

As unemployment is increasing at an alarming rate in Quebec, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House recommend that additional credits be allotted to LIP to promote a better use of our manpower through the creation of new jobs.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

* * *

● (1110)

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TRIBUTE TO MEMBER FOR PRINCE ALBERT ON THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF ELECTION AS MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: Before commencing the question period I know all hon. members of the House would want to join with me in taking just a moment to mark the significance

of this occasion in celebration of an anniversary of an event which took place on March 26, 1940, some 36 years ago. I refer, of course, to the first of an unbroken succession of elections to the House of Commons of the Right Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The incidence of an unbroken succession of elections to this House is a remarkable occurrence, appreciated perhaps no more clearly than by the other members of this chamber. In addition to the success the right hon. member has enjoyed during that time at the hands of the electors and the honours which have been heaped upon him by Canadians in every walk of life as well as from every corner of the country, perhaps the highest honour the Canadian citizenry can pay to any one of us is to elect a person to be Prime Minister and first citizen of our country, which is at the pinnacle of those great honours and distinctions.

However, to add to that achievement, and as a recognition which I think all of us share with immense pride, the right hon. gentleman will leave Canada tomorrow for the United Kingdom where he will be received by Her Majesty the Queen and recognized as a Companion of Honour, a recognition which is shared by only 65 members of the Commonwealth, and perhaps most significantly the motto of which is, "in action faithful, in honour clear". It is in that expression of the record of service of the right hon. gentleman that all of us, and I am sure all Canadians, share with great pride and wish him well on that journey, in receiving that honour, and in continued devotion and work on behalf of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am very deeply touched by your words and by the reception of my hon. colleagues. From the bottom of my heart I thank you all. Nothing honours one more than to be a person in the House of Commons who receives the warmth of reception which I always receive. Thank you, sir.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REQUEST FOR DETAILS AND TABLING OF CONTRACTS WITH REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: —my question is to the Prime Minister. On Wednesday the Prime Minister said that he would look in some detail at the consulting contracts involving Mr. Reisman and Mr. Grandy. I wonder if the Prime Minister is now in a position to provide the House with further information, whether he will as well give us now a clear commitment to table all of the contracts involving these gentlemen and also to table whatever additional correspondence or documentation there is which might spell out the terms of reference of these contracts.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I see no difficulty in the latter part of the question. Of course, it would be subject to the usual procedures and, presumably, the consent of the contractees at the other end, but I see no problem in that. I will look into the matter.

On the first part of the question, I have nothing to add. I think there was some misunderstanding which resulted in the belief that I had said that the Reisman and Grandy company had had contracts with the government. I reread *Hansard*, and I never said anything of the kind, although it seems to have been reported in that way. I did say the individuals had contracts, both of them in the early period after their resignations, merely to clear up the files in the transitional period. Both of them had it with their former departments as individuals. There was an additional contract with the Auditor General on the part of Mr. Grandy. That is what I had in mind the other day in saying that I did not have all the facts, but I have no knowledge of this third contract. I will see if it is within the rules to table these contracts Monday or Tuesday.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

GUIDELINES FOR ACTIVITIES OF RETIRED SENIOR EMPLOYEES—DATE OF PUBLICATION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Prime Minister can tell the House now whether guidelines are being prepared by his government which will have to do with the activities of retired senior public servants after leaving the public service, and if he can give us some indication when and in what form these guidelines will be presented to the House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I already gave that assurance. As to the time and form, I indicated that the subject is a difficult one and I cannot give any guarantees or assurances as to time and form. I would welcome suggestions from all parts of the House. At this point I think it would probably be by way of an enunciation of principle rather than a whole series of individual guidelines, Mr. Speaker, but I would make that statement with the hope that the House itself would see fit to improve upon it in any way. I repeat, it is a difficult area and one which has not been faced before in Canada except by custom. It will take some time to see the practices in other parliamentary or democratic governments and if we want to do a thorough job it might not be immediate. In the meantime, I repeat my statement of the other day; it does cause some uneasiness to the government and we will have to ensure there is no conflict which is a disservice to the government or to the people.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

SUGGESTED REGISTRATION OF ALL LOBBYISTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I take it from the Prime Minister that some action will be taken in the interim prior to the development of some sort of guidelines to ensure that no conflict exists. I wonder if the Prime Minister might also tell the House, in light of the fact that Canada has a mixed economy and an increasing number of agencies are being established by the government which involve an interface between the private and the public sectors, whether the government will give active consideration to a formal policy which would require the registration of all lobbyists or all persons whose occupation or profession involves attempting in a formal way to influence the decisions of government or activities of government agencies? Is there any present intention to give consideration to the registration of lobbyists in Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is no consideration of that policy and none of which I am aware. I think the difficulties of it are obvious as there are many forms of lobbying and some can be quite indirect. I am not sure how the registration of some of them would achieve the purpose which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has in mind. I will take note of the suggestion and perhaps in the studies that are being made I will bring that aspect of it into consideration.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—KNOWLEDGE OF NEGOTIATORS OF AMOUNT OF MONEY NATIONAL DEFENCE HAD AVAILABLE

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Supply and Services. The Minister of National Defence told the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence on Tuesday night that when these officials discussed the purchase of the LRPA with Lockheed, that company was aware of the fact that the Department of National Defence had only $30 million available for payments in the first year of production. Since most of the negotiations for the actual contract were conducted by officials of the Department of Supply and Services, was the minister aware, and were his officials aware, that when the contract was being negotiated DND had only $30 million available?

● (1120)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the financing is still under the responsibility of the customer department and not under mine.

[*English*]

Mr. McKenzie: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister was aware of this situation, since the contract which was negotiated between his department and Lockheed called for first year payments of more than $100 million, how did he expect production to get started?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, in effect, the contract has not been signed.

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR LACK OF WRITTEN UNDERTAKING FROM COMPANY TO PROVIDE INTERIM FINANCING

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If Lockheed gave a verbal undertaking to provide interim financing, why did the department not seek to have this commitment expressed in writing before it began to negotiate the contract?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, in such a negotiation I do not think that promises have any great value. I simply believe that negotiations ought to be written and it is on this understanding that it will be possible to determine whether or not the provisions of the contract were met.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR MISUNDERSTANDING IN CONNECTION WITH FINANCING

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence? The press quoted the minister a few months ago as saying that, at an earlier stage, the government had been misled by Lockheed Aircraft. Later he said that statement was not correct and there had been some misunderstanding. As it is obviously important to understand clearly the financial arrangements required—and we heard about the striking increase in the amount of total contract—can the minister explain exactly the nature of the misunderstanding, and how it came about?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have done that in this House and before the standing committee. There was a difference between the amount of funds available in the national defence budget and the progress payments required by Lockheed. We explained this and were told by Lockheed that the difference could be financed by them. Subsequently they told us they could not do it. That is all there is to the misunderstanding. It is serious, but easy to explain.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR CLAIM FOR DAMAGES IF CONTRACT CANCELLED

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At one stage the minister said that the agreement should not be cancelled, or he was not in favour of cancelling it because the government might be liable to damages. If there was no agreement but a misunderstanding between the government and the company,

how does the minister anticipate the possibility for a claim for damages if the contract were to be repudiated?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I expected a claim for damages. I said there might be costs which we should pay. I am not, however, at present trying to find ways of not completing the contract. We are trying to find ways to complete it. I wish hon. members opposite would realize that my objective is to obtain better equipment for the Canadian Armed Forces. That is what we are trying to do. I do not know what the hon. member's objective is in trying to raise all the difficulties rather than finding a solution.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to discover what happened. Does the minister not appreciate that when you are dealing with billions of dollars of Canadian taxpayers' money, you should look into these things carefully, not merely push them forward.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT FOR QUEBEC SOUTH SHORE—REPRESENTATIONS FROM REGION

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Considering that the Canada-Quebec agreement on eastern Quebec will expire on March 31, and that it has been announced another agreement would be signed shortly, would the minister advise whether a special agreement of the same nature will also be concluded concerning the south shore between Lévis and the Rimouski area east of Lévis?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, indeed the Ottawa-Quebec agreement concerning the lower St. Lawrence and Gaspé areas will come to an end within a few days. Discussions are being held between the two levels of government in view of reaching another agreement to replace the present one but it certainly will not be identical to the former. It will cover other much more specific areas. Within a few weeks or months, I expect to conclude the negotiations with the provincial government and my colleague, the minister in charge. As for the latter part of the question, I think the hon. member is referring to his own constituency and to that part of Quebec which lies between Quebec City or Lévis and what is commonly known as the Rivière-du-Loup or Gaspé area. I must admit there are no specific projects geared to that area in the programs which are now under discussion at the two levels of government. They will be included in the sectorial agreements which were signed and in others which are about to be signed and which necessarily affect the whole province generally. But there are no specific programs for the area mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question. Has the minister received representations from the municipal authorities of the south shore area and from agencies to ask specifically that a special agreement be concluded to enable the south shore area to develop more quickly and make further use of available manpower?

[Mr. Brewin.]

Mr. Lessard: Mr. Speaker, I understand the concern of the hon. member. Indeed the department has received not only recently but during the past months, not to mention previous years, some instances from public groups, more particularly from municipalities to have that area included within a special agreement. Up to now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that it has been impossible for both levels of government to answer affirmatively as expected to the representations of those municipalities or public groups. I hope, however, and I am sure, that avenues will not be closed and there will still be some opportunities for those areas during the months if not the years to come. There are some plans under consideration which, without being under a specific agreement, would surely have a beneficial effect on the area to which the hon. member referred.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF LEGISLATION TO PERMIT GUARANTEEING OF LOAN

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. The Department of National Defence is now approaching banks on behalf of Lockheed seeking a loan to enable the LRPA project to start, but to date it has met with little success. We hope they are successful. Since DND is prepared to pay the interest on this loan, which we understand amounts to $111 million over the term of the contract, does the minister intend to bring forward legislation authorizing the government of Canada to guarantee this loan to a foreign national?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken of just one of the options we are considering at the present time. However, we have not completed the financing arrangement. Until we do, the other parts of the question are hypothetical.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE OBJECTION FROM UNITED STATES IF FINANCED THROUGH CANADIAN BANKS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Bearing in mind that the minister at the Defence committee on Tuesday night said he did not anticipate any difficulties with the United States government if these funds were made available through Canadian banks, can the minister state that the United States government unequivocally would have no objection to such a move, bearing in mind the difficulties Lockheed are having?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, obviously the United States government and their officials must speak for themselves.

However, we will have written communication from them before the contract is completed.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

ALLEGED CURTAILMENT OF RIGHT OF EMPLOYEES TO INFORM PUBLIC OF CONDITIONS IN INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. On February 25, 1976, Dr. D. R. McGregor, Acting Regional Director, Pacific Region Canadian Penitentiary Service, sent a letter to the Pacific Regional Representative of the Public Service Alliance of Canada. The letter stated that an investigation would commence regarding statements about Dragon Cernetic given to the press by members of the PSAC and also that any further statements would lead to disciplinary action. Will the Solicitor General admit that this letter from his officials is curbing the civil rights of the individuals working within the Canadian Penitentiary Service to inform the public of the atrocious conditions that exist within the maximum security institution?

● (1130)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker. The report on the most recent incident at the B.C. Penitentiary will be made public shortly as well as the Farris Commission report on the earlier incident. As I mentioned on a previous occasion, we have been asked by the judge not to make the report public while proceedings were still under way against the three individuals involved in the hostage taking incident, but we are taking steps to make it public shortly.

Mr. Neil: Is this practice of censoring statements made by members of the PSAC implemented on a national basis and, if so, is it to continue?

Mr. Allmand: All I can say is that members of the PSAC frequently make very critical statements directed not only against the Commissioner of the Penitentiary Service but also against me. I am not aware of any hesitancy on their part.

* * *

INDUSTRY

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON MEASURES TO INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. As the Economic Council of Canada, in its latest reports, has stated that industrial productivity in Canada is the second worst of all industrialized nations and is decreasing steadily, I would ask the Prime Minister whether the government intends to introduce productivity incentives based on increases in productivity? Since the Prime Minister expressed great interest in this suggestion five months ago, when I first made it, and referred it to the Department of Finance and to the Privy Council for study, I am sure he must have had those reports back from the departments many weeks ago.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Then, I will ask the Prime Minister, since he is obviously not making the slightest attempt to get these reports which could have been in his hands a long time ago had he wanted them, whether he is content to satisfy himself by philosophical musings on this important matter, or whether he intends to do something to try to put this country back on its feet again?

* * *

IMMIGRATION

ELIGIBILITY OF ATHLETES FOR ADMISSION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Gus MacFarlane (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In the case of Stephen Badger I notice that as early as a week ago there was a remark by one of the hon. gentleman's departmental officials to the effect that Canadians were the most important people to swim in the Olympics. Today, an official comments that we do not consider who they are when they go into the Olympics and in the same article he mentions he received representations from Winnipeg saying that only Canadians should swim in the Olympics. Does, really, the fact a person is an athlete play any part in the immigration process or is the official in error in both cases in saying it would play any part in the person not being admitted and it might be effective in admitting him?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I have not seen the reported comment by an immigration official. The question of the Olympics is really not, in that sense, anything to do with immigration. We would judge applicants strictly on the basis of whether they were eligible to enter Canada under the immigration laws.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF SECURING FROM UNITED STATES AND TABLING DATA ON BRIBES

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of National Defence or to the Minister of Supply and Services. In view of the fact that the Deputy Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Robert Ingersoll, has announced that the State Department will supply the Lockheed data on bribery to individuals in other countries, will the hon. gentleman say whether Mr. Ingersoll has supplied to Canada information about the Lockheed bribes and, if so, will he table the information in this House?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No such data has been provided.

Mr. Hogan: Will the minister seek from the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Ingersoll, this information on the Lockheed bribes so that we may be sure no Canadian officials or intermediaries are involved?

Mr. Richardson: Canada has not been named and if there is any accusation, then it should be brought forward.

* * *

CUSTOMS

DATE OF APPOINTMENT OF OFFICER AT RIVERPORT, NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the fact that the minister's own statistical report on Riverport, Nova Scotia, dated March 15, 1976, indicates that last year some 300 vessels reported in and out of this port requiring 280 entries for exwarehouse deliveries plus long room entries, small collections, export entries and postal shipments, and since the position of customs officer at this port has been vacant for over a year, following the death of the resident officer, I should like to ask the minister when he intends to advertise for a full-time customs officer at Riverport instead of downgrading the port as an outport under a vessel clearing station officer with a proposed salary of only $600 a year.

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in one breath we are talking about saving money and in the next we are talking about spending it.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Cullen: The statistics which the hon. member quotes are, of course, all relative to vessel clearings which take place in other areas. It is true there has been no customs officer there for a year and a half; we have made the port a vessel clearing station and the salary of the individual who handles that post on a part-time basis is negotiated by the Treasury Board and the Public Service Commission. We have to look at the statistics here in the light of the availability of other ports. As the hon. member knows, Lunenburg is also available. They have been operating at Riverport without a customs officer for about a year and a half. I think the Lunenburg people have done a great job in this area. But in accordance with the hon. member's representations we will look at the proposal. I think his figures should be judged in conjunction with the other figures we have.

Mr. Crouse: The minister implies that we are not interested in saving money. I would point out to him that there are some 20 ships sailing from Riverport, vessels approximately 150 feet in length and costing in excess of $3 million, and that to delay a sailing for one day would cost more than the $6,000 or $7,000 that a customs officer would receive. So, when one is faced with a penny wise and pound foolish proposal, one must ask a supplementary, and it is simply this: in the light of the minister's program of restraint which is costing Nova Scotians dearly, will he assure the House that he will apply the same restraint to his entire department by offering to pay all his other employees a salary of $600 a year?

[Mr. Richardson.]

* * *

FINANCE

EFFECT OF RESTRAINT PROGRAM AND RISING INTEREST RATE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. As the budgetary deficit for February is higher than it was in the same month last year, and as the level of federal government spending shows no signs of moderating, to the extent we have a budgetary deficit of $3.3 billion in the first 11 months of this fiscal year as opposed to a surplus of $219 million at this time last year, can the minister tell the House when his much-publicized so-called restraint program will show any effect upon government spending and rising deficits?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Perhaps I could refer the hon. member to the last question which was asked.

An hon. Member: Cheap shot!

Mr. Stevens: Considering that chartered bank general loans increased by half a billion dollars in the week following the raising of the bank rate, perhaps the minister can tell us a little more explicitly than last time when we may hope to see the effect of the rising bank rate upon the expansion of our money system bearing in mind the half billion dollar increase immediately after the increase in the bank rate.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The governor has always pointed out to those who follow monetary policy that the changes to be effected by changes in the cash reserve system would not result in immediate responses but that they would be in effect over longer swings. The bank is of the opinion that the change in the reserve policy, which was signified by the change in the bank rate, will bring about a restriction in the growth of monetary aggregates in Canada but he does recognize that from week to week there may be intermediate swings.

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING ON RATE OF INFLATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Would the minister indicate whether a contributing factor to Canada's relatively high inflation rate is high government spending including the heavy borrowing required by the government, $6 billion being required last evening alone, bearing in mind that our inflation is now half as high again as it is in the United States where they are forecasting lower unemployment in the coming year and higher real growth than in this country?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about the level of government expenditures and that is precisely why we sought the co-operation of the hon. gentleman in measures such as

Bill C-68 in order to reduce the level of government spending.

* * *

● (1140)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CAMBODIA—POSSIBILITY OF SENDING SPECIAL ENVOY TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to put my supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but since it arises out of the communication from the acting minister alluded to by the minister on Monday I will direct it to the acting minister. I can understand the difficulties the government has in communicating through the normal channels with the Republic of Cambodia, but considering the history of special missions to the Indochina area during the decade of the Viet Nam war, would the acting minister consider sending a special envoy to Cambodia to ascertain the situation, if necessary to offer aid and plead for tolerance for human life?

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think that this question ought to be put directly to the minister. The situation has not changed and I am not in a position to give a positive answer.

[*English*]

CAMBODIA—POSSIBILITY CANADA ASKED TO TERMINATE AID PROGRAM

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which perhaps the parliamentary secretary or the minister may be able to answer. In the letter alluded to by the Secretary of State for External Affairs on Monday, the acting minister mentioned several international agencies which were asked to leave Cambodia. He made no mention of the small but growing contribution of CIDA to the Khmer Republic. Was Canada asked to terminate its aid program to that country?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Would the hon. member please repeat the last part of his question?

Mr. Johnston: There has been in the last three years a small but growing contribution through CIDA to the Khmer republic or Cambodia. Was Canada asked to terminate that aid program?

Miss Bégin: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I will ask the minister.

TRANSPORT

POSSIBLE ABANDONMENT OF RAIL SERVICE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO AVOID CRISIS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and relates to the report tabled this week by his colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in the Standing Committee on Regional Development, a report which comments on the economic situation in the various provinces. With respect to transportation in Prince Edward Island, the report stated that the problems involved in transporting commodities using existing facilities are expected to be extreme by 1977. In view of the comments yesterday in the provincial legislature by the minister of highways about the likely abandonment of rail service by Canadian National Railways and the difficulties this would obviously create, can the minister indicate what steps are being taken, either by himself or his officials, to head off this impending crisis referred to in the report I have just mentioned?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we always attempt to analyse trends in traffic and to look ahead to the steps that have to be taken to accommodate them, and this is what we are doing in this case.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am somewhat surprised because I understand that the minister had a meeting with the provincial highways minister about two week ago on this problem. Yesterday the minister of highways indicated that he did not know what steps would be taken. When will the minister be able to give the House a report, or can he tell the House whether a special committee has been struck? Because this involves the complex of transportation facilities in Prince Edward Island, not only rail but highways as well.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's first question was very general, but he now appears to be referring specifically to the question of highway strengthening, which was the issue in a meeting that I had with the highways ministers from the Atlantic region. I had a long brief from him on this subject and I did undertake to have a further look at the brief before responding to it. I have no further comment to make at this stage.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS BEFORE NIAGARA DESIGNATED BILINGUAL DISTRICT

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board and it deals with the designation of the Niagara region of Ontario as a bilingual district. In view of the minister's admission on Wednesday that the people of the Niagara district had not been sufficiently consulted by way of public hearings on this matter, would the minister give his assurance that such meetings will be held before his department proceeds to designate the Niagara region as a bilingual district?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I have been there myself. I met people who made objections. We had an excellent and very lively meeting. I think I cannot have better public hearings than those in which I take part myself. I said that before proceeding in this area I was going to consult the people's representatives of this area. We have already established a subcommittee of hon. members from the area and we hope that by the time we do proceed there will have been enough exchanges with the population.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ARGENTINA—SUGGESTION AGREEMENT ON NUCLEAR REACTOR BE DISCUSSED WITH NEW REGIME

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister and is based on the incredible response yesterday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs that he feels that the intergovernmental agreement regarding the CANDU reactor in Argentina is binding even though there has been a change in government. Given the terrifying implications for world security if nuclear agreements are not adhered to, does the government not feel it is necessary to discuss this agreement with the new regime and gain the firm assurance that at the very minimum the accord announced on January 30 of this year will be honoured?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I regret I did not hear the answer of the minister yesterday, but I see no likelihood that the new government would not also be looking at the contract which binds their country since the contract is ongoing. There may have been something I missed in the question or in the answer, but as to the desirability of the new government being conscious of that contractual arrangement, obviously the answer is yes.

Miss MacDonald: A supplementary question for the Prime Minister with regard to a Canadian initiative to undertake to achieve a reconfirmation of this agreement from the new regime. Can we have the Prime Minister's word that this initiative will be undertaken by the government?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this will call for a particular reconfirmation. We will want to make sure, even before recognizing the new government, that it undertakes to discharge its contractual and treaty obligations.

* * *

INDUSTRY

DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT, MALTON—MEASURES TO SAVE JOBS—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF AEROSPACE POLICY

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he would inform the House of any federal government proposal or solution to save the jobs of several hundred workers at the Douglas Aircraft plant in Malton, and when can we expect an announcement about a sound Canadian aerospace industry policy?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have been having some discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who in turn has been in close consultation with Douglas Aircraft (Canada) regarding some possible extension of work opportunities at the Malton plant. I am hopeful, as I know the hon. member is, that notwithstanding the drop in the international market for DC-9 and DC-8 aircraft, we can find some means whereby we can assure that this Canadian production will not only be kept at the present level but, indeed, increased.

* * *

ENERGY

MEASURES TO RELIEVE NOVA SCOTIANS OF HIGH COSTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister who will be well aware of the concern in Nova Scotia about the increase in power rates as a result of the heavy dependence of that province on oil in terms of power generation. May I ask the Prime Minister whether the premier of Nova Scotia has made any specific proposals to the government of Canada, either in respect to a global approach to the problem or a selective approach to ease the pressure of power rates in that province, particularly on certain industries and Nova Scotians of low income?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if I might answer that, I discussed this question again with the premier of Nova Scotia this morning and am looking forward to the participation of the minister of finance of that province, Mr. Nicholson, at the finance ministers meeting next week, at which meeting the question of the costs being assumed, particularly by Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, as a result of the oil price increase will be a specific agenda item. In other words, we would expect to have a rather intensive discussion of this question at the meeting next week.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE IN FORMULA FOR EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS TO PROVINCES

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. May I ask the minister whether the government has notified the provinces that the federal government will be changing some of the regulations under the equalization formula, specifically the income tax guarantee formula?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. gentleman for giving me notice of his question. I should explain that it is

not so much a change in the regulations as the fact that the fiscal arrangements act, which provides for equalization, the revenue guarantee, revenue stabilization and post-secondary education, will expire on March 31, 1977. There have already been discussions at the official level leading to the conference next week which I anticipate will be the first of a number for the purpose of indicating the federal government's intention with regard to equalization and the other programs and seeking to get provincial agreement on this. We have indicated we are proposing changes in a number of these programs and that is the subject for discussion next week.

● (1150)

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister can tell the House at this time in general what the intentions of the government are in this area so that the provinces will know ahead of time.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the provinces have been advised in general terms. We have indicated to them that the revenue guarantee proposal which arose out of the tax change in 1971-72 would not be continued beyond the present program and that indeed we would propose to them a change in the method of calculations. Our view is that we are now in a better position to determine the extent to which the revenue which we would have had under the old tax system has been affected by the new tax system, and with this greater precision we feel we can make it clear to them why the formula should be changed. As I indicated, these have been set out at the official level and we expect to discuss them at the ministerial level.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION NOT CHANGED

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, can we be assured that in any new formula the national responsibility for post-secondary education will not be allowed to be eroded.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I think, Mr. Speaker, in the most general sense, yes. The question is of course—and again we get back to the very important question of fiscal responsibility—as to who should bear these costs and how the system should be structured. On post-secondary education, my colleague the Secretary of State has been involved in more detailed discussion. Mine has been in relation to the formula itself and some of the financial consequences.

* * *

HEALTH

SWINE FLU—SOURCE OF VACCINE

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Yesterday he indicated that Canada has a maximum capacity to produce 300,000 doses of swine influenza vaccine by next fall and indicated that we should have to purchase large numbers of it from other countries. Could he clarify from which country he is expecting to obtain this vaccine?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): This would most likely be the United States, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of some concern to me. I do not know whether the minister is aware of the fact there is a possibility there will be no exports from the United States until November, and when one considers the time it takes to vaccinate the Canadian population this alternative would appear to be unsatisfactory. Would the minister indicate what else he plans to do.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, traditionally we have been able to obtain between 7 per cent and 9 per cent of the production of American companies for this type of situation. I have already been in touch with the American companies and the American federal authorities on the subject and discussions are taking place at the present time.

[*Translation*]

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON DISCUSSION WITH QUEBEC ON DONOHUE PROJECT

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I apologize for failing to send him notice, I did not have enough time.

It has to do with the Donohue project at Saint-Félicien, with which the minister is well acquainted Since the Quebec government has made it a priority matter, considering it as the project of the century, since private, provincial and federal sources of capital are grouped together, could the minister tell the House whether he considers this project in a specific agreement or in a general agreement, that is within the framework of a general agreement with Quebec? Further, where do the discussions now stand?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, it may very well be the project of the century for the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean region, but likely not for the whole of province. It is true, Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions for some time on this project, as the hon. member knows very well. If there is an agreement, it will be within the terms of the general development agreement which has been concluded with Quebec as well as with every other province, and it will be the subject matter of a special agreement, that is a subagreement. One cannot intervene in such an area in any other way than by subagreements. We do hope that our discussions will come off presently and that a decision one way or another could be announced eventually.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ALLEGED DENIAL BY UNIONS OF FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It is related to the discussions he recently had with labour leaders here in the capital, particularly that portion of the discussion that led the Prime Minister to suggest that serious adjustments will be necessary in our society before the anti-inflation program can be phased out. Would the Prime Minister tell us whether it is his intention to insist on that adjustment which would restore some of the basic freedoms of individuals such as the freedom of association which most trade unions, with the sanction of our government, have denied their members.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I can put this on the agenda if the hon. member wishes. I had not contemplated discussing this matter with the unions.

POSSIBILITY OF LEGISLATION GUARANTEEING RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my supplementary to the Minister of Labour. In light of some of the recent actions in the United States, has he considered the preparation of legislation which would restore the right to work for some people who feel they have had this right eroded as a result of some of the powers the unions have in our country?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, we have not given serious consideration to this because we have not perceived it as a major problem in any of our discussions between the unions and the government.

* * *

TRADE

PROPOSED GENERAL TARIFF CUT OF SIXTY PER CENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. What response has the Government of Canada given or is planning to give to the reported initiative on the part of the United States government in respect of the GATT agreement that tariffs should be cut on an average of approximately 60 per cent in world trade?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): If I might answer, Mr. Speaker, the initial response on behalf of the Government of Canada is that the United States' proposal does not in our view equitably meet the interests of Canada in this particular negotiation. We have sought a sector by sector approach, and there obviously will be some differences between the United States' position and that of Canada. We would seek from them greater precision on the position they will be taking, but prima facie this does not seem to meet the objectives we would have at the meeting, so we would hope that they might agree to modify the proposals.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the answer of the minister to mean that the government is moving away from the traditional position of a multilateral cut in tariffs to a bilateral arrangement among countries and by commodities?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Not so much bilateral because of course under the most favoured nation clause they would immediately under GATT be transferred to the benefit of others. We have, however, been advocating a sector by sector approach which would be of particular value to those areas in which Canada, either in the United States or in the European Economic Community, has had difficulty in getting market access.

* * *

WILDLIFE

BUFFALO—METHOD OF PREVENTING WOLVES FROM DEPLETING HERD

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development but since neither he nor his parliamentary secretary are here, might I direct my question to the right hon. gentleman. Wildlife officials have blamed wolves for the serious decline in the Fort Smith buffalo herd. The herd which numbered 2,000 head in 1971 is now down to about 900 head. A wildlife official said that about 100 wolves would be capable of eating 730 buffalo per year. Would the Prime Minister advise the House what method he plans for the control of the number of wolves or is he capable of giving the House an answer today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Selkirk.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSAL FOR ACQUISITION OF TANKS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. I should like first to compliment the minister for accepting the opposition's suggestion that Canada acquire tanks on the hire purchase plan. I wonder if the minister could now indicate to the House whether or not he would accept our suggestion as well to have an open-ended agreement until the Leopard Mark II tank is available.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker. At the present time we are negotiating with the Germans for the purchase of the Leopard I as one of the options, the other option being, of course, the refit of the Centurions.

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—INVITATION TO ONTARIO PLANT TO RELOCATE IN TUNISIA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which touches on the responsibilities of three different ministries. In the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, perhaps I could direct my question to the Prime Minister since it concerns government policy. Recently I received a letter from the president of a textile plant in Ontario who is concerned about an invitation he has received from the Tunisia Trade Commission, supported by promotional material from CIDA, inviting him to establish or relocate his plant in Tunisia. In view of the present adverse balance of trade situation, is this a policy that Canada is now advocating?

● (1200)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would have to look to see whether this particular case is an example of a general situation. There are obviously attempts by CIDA to enter into joint ventures with other countries so that Canadian industrialists can share with industrialists of other countries opportunities existing in developing nations.

* * *

MANPOWER

POSSIBILITY OF INDUSTRIES RELOCATING IN OTHER COUNTRIES—CONTINGENCY PLANS TO TAKE CARE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that CIDA has offered to pay part of the travel and other expenses for any industrialist who wishes to consider establishment in Tunisia, in view of the attractive labour rates which exist there, and in view of the potential dislocation of hundreds of workers in Canada, does the minister have contingency plans available to look after the situation in Canada if many people are left without jobs?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member when he raised this matter in the standing committee the other day, I have not been aware nor do I have any details as yet on the subject, but based on that comment I have requested my officials to check this out thoroughly to see what the facts are. If there was any displacement—and I rather suspect that there may be some variation in the approach from that which the hon. member's information would indicate—then most certainly we will take measures to help anyone displaced by such action. But I want to check it out before I give a definitive answer.

TRANSPORT

POSSIBLE MODIFICATION OF SYSTEM OF BOX CAR ALLOCATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board. It has to do with the review of box car allocations and the procedures and recommendations which were advanced by J. F. Monts, an economist from Agriculture Canada. Can the minister advise the House what action the government is contemplating with respect to the recommendations that have been advanced by Mr. Monts, and can we assume that arising from the report there may be some modification in the present system of box car allocation?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the steering committee, which was recommended in the second recommendation of the Monts Commission, has been set up after receiving general approval from all concerned. A number of other comments on the recommendations are coming in to me and will come in to me from the steering committee. I will propose a date in the not too distant future to indicate the nature of the implementation that will follow therefrom. I may say that two of the recommendations, particularly Nos. 8 and 9, are not being generally approved in the comments, and indeed do not sit favourably with me.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

METHOD OF COLLECTING USER FEES AT AIRPORTS NOT STAFFED BY DEPARTMENT

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Transport. I should like to ask him whether or not it is the policy of the Department of Transport to collect user fees at MOT airstrips where there is no staff looking after those airstrips at present and, if so, what would be the method of collection, and would the collection take place even if the department had to hire staff specifically for collection purposes?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): We would certainly want to avoid any additional administrative expense in the course of the collection. Together with the association, we are looking at such questions as this and in order to have more time for the consideration of these matters we have temporarily delayed the implementation of landing fees.

* * *

POST OFFICE

PROPORTION OF PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF OLYMPIC STAMPS GIVEN TO AID ATHLETES

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Postmaster General. It concerns the $12 million of $1 and $2 commemorative Olympic stamps issued two weeks ago. In view of the Postmaster

General's statement released on February 12 in which he said:

We need to show our young Canadian athletes that we care about them—that we are aware of the tremendous effort and the sacrifice they are making for Canada. One way you can give your support is by buying this commemorative stamp issue for your collection at philatelic outlets.

What portion of the procedures from the sales of the new $1 and $2 stamps will be given as aid to our Canadian athletes?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, my answer was quite ambiguous and I appreciate the opportunity to be more specific. There are two types of Olympic stamps: the surcharge stamps where the surcharge goes directly to the Olympics, and the commemorative stamps where the net proceeds, after cost of production, are turned over to COJO. But the arrangement we have in writing with that organization is that 3 per cent of all moneys turned over are turned over to the Canadian Olympic Association which in turn distributes that money, as it does the 3 per cent of the money turned over from the Olympic coins, among various organizations responsible for amateur sport in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Because of the interest shown by several members on both sides of the House, I am happy to say that the Minister of the Environment yesterday swam, non-stop, 100 lengths of an Olympic swimming pool—which is the equivalent of over 1½ miles—in one hour and ten minutes, using the crawl stroke. The money earned for the Canadian Amateur Swimming Association was over $2,000. The instructor was Aimé R. Brazeau.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT OF CORRECTIONAL INVESTIGATOR

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the correctional investigator, better known as the correctional ombudsman, for the year 1974-1975.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Ontario (Mr. Cafik), Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas), Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier), Welland (Mr. Railton), Scarborough West (Mr. Martin), Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin), Renfrew North-Nipissing (Mr. Hopkins), Trinity (Miss Nicholson), York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), and Essex-Windsor (Mr. Whelan) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, Chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

[Mr. Clarke (Vancouver Quadra).]

If the House agrees, may we append these objections to today's *Votes and Proceedings*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Similarly, an objection signed by the hon. members for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier), Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin), Trinity (Miss Nicholson), Scarborough West (Mr. Martin), Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas), Fort William (Mr. McRae), Renfrew North-Nipissing East (Mr. Hopkins), Nipissing (Mr. Blais), Welland (Mr. Railton), and Ontario (Mr. Cafik) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, RSC 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for province of Ontario.

Again, may we agree that these objections be made an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTION ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: 4,601.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM FUNDS

Question No. 4,601—**Mr. Whittaker:**

1. Was money returned to the Local Initiatives Programme from persons across Canada and, if so, what are their names?

2. Did other persons receive additional funds and, if so (a) what are their names (b) what was the (i) total (ii) individual amount?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. No.

2. No.

NOTE: See reply to question 4,125 referring to the allocation process. Funds were redistributed on the basis of constituencies, not on the basis of persons.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO ADD NEW DEFINITIONS

The House resumed, from Monday, March 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to speak on second reading of this bill. I hope that Your Honour will hear me out, because I am raising a point of order. It is a rather detailed point of order for which I ask Your Honour's indulgence for about five minutes so that I can put it before you. I am satisfied that Your Honour will have to reserve opinion on it, but here it is. It comes back, basically, to the point I have raised time and time again with regard to bills, and that is that some bills go beyond any recommendation made. In this instance, to come down to a nub, there is in this bill, as there was in Bill C-73 which Bill C-89 attempts to amend, provision, under sections 20 and following in Bill C-73 and in clause 6 of this particular bill, for the government of Canada to enter into an agreement with the provinces with respect to the enforcement of the guidelines and all the consequent provisions.

● (1210)

On January 9, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) filed a model agreement and in paragraph 9 of that model agreement there are the following words:

"Payments to the province". Canada hereby agrees, with respect to the aggregate amount paid to Her Majesty in right of Canada pursuant to any order made by the national administrator under sections 20 and 22 of the federal act—

That is now chapter 75 of the statutes of 1974-75-76.

—against a person in the provincial public sector, to pay to the province an amount equal to such part of that amount as may be determined on the basis of a formula to be agreed upon between Canada and the province.

That provision was incorporated as paragraph 9 in an agreement made January 13, 1976, between the government of Canada and the province of Ontario. Basically, there is a situation where revenues resulting from orders of the administrator are paid into the consolidated revenue fund of Canada. Then there is an agreement by the minister, with the approval of the governor in council, to pay moneys out of the consolidated revenue fund to the province, calculated on a proportion of an amount paid into the fund. But under our constitutional and procedural requirements there are two conditions which apply to such payment out of the consolidated revenue fund. First, His Excellency the Governor General must recommend the payment for that purpose in his message to this House. Second, the legislation based upon the message must authorize the payment. We already have had one amendment to the recommendation preceding Bill C-73, and neither the original recommendation nor the amended recommendation says anything about payment of such funds to the provinces. The recommendation is limited to administrative expenses.

Bill C-89, which amends the appropriate clauses of Bill C-73 with regard to these agreements, has no recommendation. I should like to refer Your Honour to clause 6, subclauses (1) (2) and (3) of Bill C-89, and it is my submission that these subclauses, relating directly to payments to Her Majesty in the right of Canada, put this constitutional and procedural defect right at issue. I will summarize briefly. It is a combination of Bill C-73, which has no provision for payment of funds from Canada to the provinces, and the model agreement tabled by the minister and entered into by some minister, on the part of the government of Canada, with the province of Ontario—and, strangely enough, to show that the government is conscious of this fact, in the agreement with the province of Quebec there is no mention of payments from the government of Canada to the province of Quebec, because Quebec does its own administering.

In the case of New Brunswick, the money the administrator directed that the Irving Paper Company pay to the government of Canada is subject to an agreement and is shared between the government of Canada and the government of the province in question. However, there is no authority for that sharing in any recommendation or in Bill C-73, which we have passed, and there was no model agreement. The model agreement followed the passage of Bill C-73 and, as I say, Bill C-89, clause 6, refers directly to these agreements and to the payments thereunder. Since there is no recommendation, it is my view that the bill as prepared is defective, imperfect and requires an amendment by the bringing in of an appropriate recommendation that this House will authorize the payment or the sharing of these moneys paid under the order of the administrator with a province.

I am not going to hold up the legislation, but in my submission this will have to be done. That is my submission to Your Honour for this purpose at this time.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have had no notice of this objection, so obviously I have not been able to consider it in detail. I do not know whether it is well-founded, and I would very much like to take advice from the advisers of the Crown and also to ascertain the position of the Law Clerk of the House on this question. I do not know whether we can continue, therefore, with this bill, or what the suggestion should be. Obviously, I cannot respond now, but I would like to do so in due course.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I should like to consider this matter. I should like to make representations with reference thereto. I welcome the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton West to the effect that he does not want to delay this legislation. He is fully aware that in the event there should have to be an amendment to the royal recommendation, and in the event that his point is accepted by the Chair, such recommendation could be obtained. Perhaps it might be in order to proceed with the legislation, with the understanding—

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): With no second reading.

Mr. Blais: —that the debate is to be continued until such time as the question is ready to be put, but the question would not be put until this point has been disposed of.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the hon. member for Edmonton West indicated that he was rising to correct a procedural error.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It goes much farther than that.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Of course, it goes to the root of the matter, but it ought not in any way to impede the business of the House. I think that is our feeling, and the feeling expressed by the hon. member for Nipissing, and I think it would be in order for us to proceed on that basis. However, as the hon. member for Edmonton West has said, I think it would be inappropriate for us to give second reading, in a formal sense, to the bill until the point has been cleared by Your Honour. With that in mind, I think the business of the House could carry on. I hope that suggestion is acceptable to the government House leader.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We had some assurance that there would be second reading today. If, however, we have to keep talking until a ruling can be made on this point, it seems to me rather unconstructive to keep talking just for the sake of expending time. I put myself in the hands of the House leader, but it seems to me that because of this objection we will probably be compelled to move to other business, which seems a more sensible use of the time of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question raised by the Minister of Finance, could we not have an understanding that if the debate on second reading comes to a conclusion, it will at that point be adjourned until there has been a ruling? The minister does not want the House just to talk until four o'clock to keep it going. Can we not have an understanding to that effect?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Why not?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is all I want.

● (1220)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair was under the impression that there was an indication that debate on second reading would likely conclude some time later today and that in any case the second reading vote would not come until Monday. If that is the situation, it might be appropriate for the House to proceed to finalize discussion at second reading stage on this measure and then withhold the putting of the question until such time as the Chair has had an opportunity to rule on the point of order.

At the moment there is nothing, it would seem to me, that would prevent the discussion coming to a conclusion at second reading stage and then, before the question is put, the debate would have to be adjourned in order to hold the matter open until such time as further argument can be heard from both sides and until the Chair has had an opportunity to consider the matter and make a definitive ruling in the circumstances. If that is agreeable, the House might proceed on that basis.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as government House leader, I might say that that procedure is quite agreeable to us.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was not clear whether the hon. member for Edmonton West was seeking the floor to intervene on a point of order, or to speak on the bill.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my point was purely a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Dauphin.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this bill and to add my comments to what I think is a very important problem. There is a growing number of people and organizations in Canada who are joining in the chorus that wage and price controls are essentially wrong, and that they should be removed as soon as possible before too much harm is done for the future. Last Monday morning, the cabinet listened to the highly-selective and well-prepared brief of the Canadian Labour Congress which feels that the bill deals unfairly with organized labour. Page 9 of that brief gives an indication of what they think:

> Your government's program was supposed to be equitable. Canadians were told that the same degree of sacrifice would be required from all sectors of the community. The legislation and the regulations have made a mockery of this principle for we fail to find adequate controls on dividends, interest rates, professional fees and land speculators. The removal of the special levy on export profits is a clear demonstration that workers in these industries will not benefit from the profits which they worked to produce. Neither is there any guarantee that these profits will be reinvested in Canada to create badly needed jobs. The inequities are becoming clearer with the passage of each day.

While I do not agree that things are as bad for organized labour as this brief states, I do think the inequities are there. Certainly, when the leaders for large numbers of well-organized unions make presentations, we cannot dismiss them and the anti-inflation program must be looked at carefully. The congress listed injustices that they feel were perpetrated in this country by the Anti-Inflation Board. I think it is significant that they have carried out their threat to withdraw from the Canada Labour Relations Council, amongst other bodies. When I consider how the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) for a long time was seeking ways to reduce labour strikes and increase consultation between government, labour and business, I am concerned about this withdrawal. Now we are back to square one as far as concerns the government's attempts to bring peace to labour-management problems in this country. Other voices are being heard. Last Monday, the Ottawa *Journal* reported that the Canadian Economic Policy Committee of the C. D. Howe Institute had this to say:

> Forecasts indicating little if any improvement in the rate of inflation, a further rise in unemployment and only modest gains in over-all productivity do not constitute an outlook for the Canadian economy in 1976 that can be viewed with equanimity.
>
> They stand in sharp contrast to the performance expected in a number of other major industrial economies, particularly the United States economy where the need for greater discipline in its policies was recognized sooner and implemented faster than in Canada.

I think it is important to note that the government has backed off the export tax. In effect, what they have said is that we will now have a two-price system for Canadian

goods—what the company can get in Canada, and what they can get in the export market. Almost certainly, the export market price will be higher, which means that shortages will develop if the controls are allowed to continue. That raises the possibility of an attempt by the government to direct into the domestic market a portion of the production of the various companies.

The C.D. Howe Institute went on to say that at present the government has an opportunity to implement sound economic policies. They recommended that the growth of money supply be limited to 10 per cent, and that government spending be restrained while import barriers and government subsidies are reduced. They also urged the government to remove its wage and price controls at the earliest possible date, and said that in their view, any long continuance of the controls increases the risk that government will delay the adoption of a sound package of basic economic measures. The real crisis lies in inadequate leadership and a failure to make full use of the market system, they claim.

The government is faced with the possibility of keeping controls on too long and using them as a means of dealing with inflation rather than getting the economy into shape. We will get the worst of both worlds. As has been pointed out many times, during the election campaign of 1974 the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated that wage and price controls did not work and he would not use them. The Prime Minister is quoted as having stated on February 28, 1974:

> Income controls risk hurting the small and the poor more than they do the big and the rich; and while that may be of minor concern to the more conservative governments and political parties, it is of great and fundamental concern to this government.

The Canadian Labour Congress brief aptly pointed out that the government had degraded the political process in Canada and spread cynicism in the public about government and politics in general. This turnabout by the Prime Minister stands as one of the greatest political turnabouts in the history of Canadian politics. Also, in this bill the government indicates that it is merely tinkering with the process of the functioning of the Anti-Inflation Board without making it in reality any more effective than it was before. The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) put it very succinctly when he said that Canada and Canadians are living through an economic experiment. Even with all the wage and price controls being tried in other countries with economies somewhat similar to Canada, such as the United Kingdom and the United States, controls were shown up to be only superficial in attempting to cope with inflation. Speaking on November 14, 1975, on the New Democratic Party motion, I had this to say:

> What about inflation? The latest consumer index showing inflation at just over 10 per cent does not come into the category of "good tidings of great joy" but neither is it runaway inflation. It is down from last year. The declining rates of inflation in wholesale prices and commodity prices can be expected to work their way down through the grocery shelves. For instance, the wholesale price index for September announced this week was 6.1 per cent up over a year earlier and the price of raw and partially finished goods was up only 2.5 per cent in the year. The enormous and bumper crops in the United States of grain have pushed down the basic price of corn, wheat, oil seeds so that at the present price the farmer is producing the level of return of 1972 before the devaluation of the American dollar.

I think this indicates that the stage was set long before the anti-inflation bill was brought in to have a reduction in the price of many goods. We were saying that Canadian wage settlements were being reduced. I think we have to remember that with the devaluation of the American dollar by 40 per cent two years ago, much of the increase in wages can be attributed to the readjustment that this would inevitably bring. In the third quarter of last year, before the government decided on wage and price controls, wage settlements in the commercial industry averaged only 13 per cent over the life of the contract. This is certainly not far behind the 12 per cent allowed under the guidelines for workers who have fallen behind because of inflation.

The government can point out that the consumer price index, whatever its value as an index of inflation, has dropped considerably. The rate of increase of the money stock has slowed, and the average rate of increase in major wage settlements improved in the fourth quarter of 1975. This might indicate that these key economic indicators have all shown substantial improvement, but the link between the improvement and the controls is almost nonexistent. The consumer price index is down because of declines since October in the price of beef, pork, poultry, fresh fruit, cereal and bakery products, fats, oils, and airline fares. Of all these, only air fares come under the Anti-Inflation Board's purview. Further, the board has only just begun monitoring price and profit margins in a formal way.

● (1230)

On January 28, the board took its first formal step requiring 6,500 companies to provide information by February 27 on prices, profit margins, dividends and compensation. In March, the net was extended to cover a further 9,500 companies in construction, shipping and other industries where small firms conduct joint bargaining with their employees. It will probably take a considerable time for the true effects of the guidelines on prices to become apparent, although the board relatively soon may identify and publicly punish firms which contravene the guidelines.

Although some of the moderation in wage rates during the fourth quarter is attributable to the operation of the guidelines, I am of the opinion that most of the decline would have taken place in any case. The guidelines do not apply to settlements below 10 per cent, or 12 per cent in special cases. In cases where the board has intervened, many of the settlements allowed were only marginally below the previously negotiated increases. Since its first decision of November 27, the board has ruled only on about 160 settlements: another 340 await approval. Of the 160 settlements dealt with, 26 were rolled back an average of 3.9 per cent. The average first-year increase allowed in these settlements was 16.2 per cent. The average wage increase in all approved settlements so far has equalled about 14 per cent.

Wage settlements in this period have moderated, primarily because of high unemployment, falling inflation rates and mounting employer resistance to high claims. This could have been forecast last March, long before the controls were initiated. The controls program very likely will have little effect on the average rate of increase in

wage settlements as the months go by. The controls program will have some effect, but only through supervision of price increases which in any event would have come about through stable or rising profit margins in current economic expansion. In other words, in the long run, the board may depress allowable profits and there will be considerable trouble down the road.

The deliberate sacrifice of profit margins cannot be allowed to continue for long without causing undesirable distortions in the economy. A restraining monetary policy, together with a move away from net stimulus in fiscal policy, is now evident. Together, these policies will be responsible in large part for preventing a price explosion when the controls are softened or lifted. The government will not find it easy to manage the period of transition. There will be a tendency for prices to rise when the controls are lifted. Some companies are not raising prices at present because they are not sure exactly what the guidelines allow. Most people want to remain within the guidelines; few want to break the law. Once people know how much extra they can charge under the anti-inflation guidelines, they will charge as much as they can. I am afraid that the minimum increase will be the maximum allowed under the guidelines.

In summary, at this stage it seems as if the country will meet the government's inflation targets for 1976 and 1977, December to December increases in the consumer price index of 8 per cent and 6 per cent respectively. To date, the effect of the controls program has probably been minimal, but its effects will cumulatively be more important as time goes on. It will be necessary for fiscal and monetary policies to be sufficiently restraining during and after the controls period to make certain that no price explosion occurs when the distortions caused by controls are worked out in freer bargaining after the program's end.

It is increasingly evident that the problems of our controls are just beginning. Mr. Pepin, head of the Anti-Inflation Board, has warned that prices will rise as soon as business people realize what they are entitled to charge under the plan. Actually, the controls program indexes inflation at around 10 per cent. It is quite likely that inflation will rise at this rate and the program will make things worse rather than better. The period of control obviously will be extremely unsettling. The longer decontrols stay on, the worse the period of decontrol will be, and the stronger will be the desire of certain groups—perhaps the government included—to see permanent controls remain. These could further distort the economy. Undoubtedly the government has made poor decisions in the past few years; the results of these are going to show up. In our major markets, the United States in particular, there has been a greater tendency to allow market forces to make their way. These economies will be the stronger for it.

I find one aspect of this bill unsettling, namely, the attempt to bring into the ambit of the AIB many small companies which have hitherto been exempt, especially construction companies. There is no obvious reason for this. There has been no public demand for it and no evidence that these people were upsetting the balance which the controls were designed to achieve. This aspect of the bill seems to be based solely on a recommendation of the former prices and incomes commission. The worthy chairman of that commission advanced no reasons for his recommendation. Frankly, I think it is a mistake to do this. After all, it is in direct conflict with the Prime Minister's theory of government, the Galbraithian theory, which holds that small firms cannot be monopolies and cannot create distortions in the marketplace because they are too small. In other words, small companies respond to the discipline of the marketplace and competition holds down undue gains. Perhaps the moral is that once you start controlling, you must control everything.

May I now deal with the Anti-Inflation Board's decision relating to bilingual civil servants. The Anti-Inflation Board has ruled that bilingualism bonuses for civil servants are not compensation increases subject to wage and salary guidelines. According to newspaper reports, these will cost the federal government $60 million or more in the next year or two. It has been argued that provision was made for such compensation before the controls program was instituted.

I point out that the board did not hesitate to criticize the government's wage settlement with the postal workers. It seems to me that it ought to have rolled back the proposed bilingual increases. Of course, it is up to the government to decide if such roll-back is fair, if the extra $60 million should be paid under government policy. If the government were to so decide, well and good. I submit that the government was responsible for making a decision with regard to bilingual employees, not the Anti-Inflation Board. I raise this matter since it is apparent that we are operating under a double standard. The Anti-Inflation Board has favoured public employees over private employees. If it is to function effectively, it must be objective. It is the government's responsibility to decide what policies it wishes to implement with respect to the bilingual program, or what it wants to pay postal workers.

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-89, an act to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, because I did not participate in the debate on the original bill, C-73, passed on December 3 last. Although I attended nearly every meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs during the consideration of the original bill and was prepared to contribute to the debate, I thought it was better to defer to my colleagues on this side of the House who had not been able to put their views on record before the government imposed closure once more.

● (1240)

I was greatly surprised, however, that less than four months after the passage of Bill C-73 the government proposed an amending bill. Already, through the regulations, the minister had effected certain changes; for example, dividends for small companies, although the public companies still have their dividends frozen. Under the original rules, one area of inequity was that dealing with dividends. Recognizing the effects of inflation, wages were to be allowed to increase 8, 10 or 12 per cent in certain circumstances. However, dividends were frozen at the levels paid in 1974 or those declared in 1975. Furthermore, this not only applied to the largest companies, but to all companies, including small businesses which rely on their dividend policy as part of their remuneration plan. Excep-

tions, the minister says, were to be allowed if they could get through the Anti-Inflation Board line-up of cases of corporations needing higher dividends to attract new capital or those for which the base rate was unusually low. It is not hard to imagine the effect this policy had on investors. Many of them probably went to United States markets in the meantime.

The government attack apparently ignored the fact that many retired Canadians rely to a greater or lesser degree on dividend income. These thrifty Canadians who are now to have their dividend income frozen are the very ones the government should be encouraging so that more and more Canadians will want to save and invest instead of spending every last nickel today.

The minister was unable to explain, during the committee hearings, how the pensioner was to get along with a frozen income at the same time that wages were to be allowed to rise. You may say, yes, but government pensions are indexed and that will take care of the pensioner. Although most government pensions are indexed, the private schemes with which they are often co-ordinated usually offset the government increase with a reduction of the private portion, so that the number of dollars paid remains constant. This, of course, works a great hardship on pensioners in these days of high inflation rates.

The government has also overlooked the plight of the ordinary pension funds, the mutual funds and insurance companies. These companies invest the hard-earned savings of low and middle income Canadians, giving nearly every working Canadian some kind of interest in dividends. Every little guy who has an insurance policy, pension plan or any kind of savings has an interest in the dividends of Canadian corporations. But look at the financial attacks being made on the ordinary pension fund today. For one thing, pensioners are living longer and therefore are making greater demands than were predicted when these funds were set up. Of course, the drop in value of the dollar means that more demands are being made on pension funds for increased pensions. In the period since 1965, wages have gone up 126 per cent, but dividends have gone up only 32 per cent, further curtailing the pension funds and stimulating demand for higher pensions. Falling markets have in many cases resulted in capital losses for these pension funds. The government proposes to continue this freeze on dividends. Many pension funds are having great difficulty remaining actuarially sound as a result of all these forces. I suspect that more serious trouble will lie ahead.

I often refer, in my remarks, to the little guy, the little investor and the widows and orphans who have substantial interests in Canadian corporations. Others, particularly those to my left, make frequent reference, with scorn, to the corporate welfare bums. It is significant to see how far into the Canadian corporate structure the individual shareholder has penetrated. To give an example, I point to the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, which has 55,000 registered shareholders in Canada. Undoubtedly, there are many more who are beneficial owners through trusts and other vehicles. This 55,000 is three times the total number of hourly workers employed by the International Nickel Company of Canada, Limited. These 55,000 shareholders have had their dividends frozen, while the wages of one-third that number of hourly workers are allowed to rise 8, 10 or 12 per cent in certain cases.

Before government members say to me that we in the official opposition proposed this kind of a plan, I wish to refer to one or two statements that have been made by government people and others. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), in the House on October 17, 1975, denied that there was any relationship between his plan and our plan. He said:

> As I anticipated, the leader of the opposition could not resist the temptation to characterize the program now being put forward by the government as a vindication of the mandatory, comprehensive prices and incomes control program he advocated during the last election campaign and for 15 months before that. It is, of course, nothing of the kind.

I wish to refer as follows to the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) given to the accountability session of the Liberal party in Ottawa on November 9 last year:

> And we are not the Tories, for instance, who say in one breath that we are stealing their program against inflation and who say in the next, it can't work because we did not follow their program on inflation. We are not following their program on inflation.

During the committee hearings there was another reference that tended to show there was no similarity between the programs. I wish to refer to a question I directed to Mr. Hughes, the executor director of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. I asked:

> Do you see any major differences between this program and the program that was proposed by the Progressive Conservative Party in 1974?

Mr. Hughes replied:

> Yes, sir.

He went on to explain the differences that he saw.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question on that point.

Mr. Clarke: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member might be expected to know whether, in the program he advocated in 1974, dividends would have been exempted from restriction under the controls.

Mr. Clarke: My recollection was that there was nothing in the program put forth by our leader that would have had a direct effect on dividends.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Exempting them.

Mr. Clarke: I do not believe there was any mention of it, Mr. Speaker. Long before this bill was introduced certain changes were announced by the minister. The changes were to include, as I remember, 41,000 new companies or firms that would be covered by the guidelines. They were to include all firms in the construction, trucking, grain handling, longshoring and shipping industries. Just last week the minister also said he was considering including the insurance industry in the control program.

● (1250)

Originally, the bill was only to apply to large companies. A number of organizations appeared before the committee.

At that time the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which claims a membership of 4,500 companies and 9,000 individual members, stated that only 350 of their 4,500 companies would be covered and that none of their individual members would be covered. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce estimated that of its 125,000 members in Canada, some 1,500 would be covered—just over 1 per cent.

Then we heard from the Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen that probably none of its 30,000 members would be covered. The Canadian Construction Association made an estimate that close to 10 per cent of the firms engaged in the construction industry would be made subject to the guidelines. In the labour sector, the CLC indicated that although the proportion in their case would be higher, less than half their members would be covered by the guidelines. It is interesting to note that the Employers' Council of British Columbia, a noted organization in the field, was refused the opportunity to appear before the standing committee to present its views and ideas.

Then, of course, before the amending bill was presented we were able to hear the Prime Minister's year-end address delivered only a few weeks after the passage of the original bill. Even though the opposition had mounted a vigorous attack on the length of the control period, the Prime Minister indicated in his address that our society was not working to his satisfaction and that we might be faced with a permanent variety of controls. Last week, after all this, the minister took more than 30 minutes to explain the amendments to the three-months' old bill, C-73. The most significant, he told us, were those related to the appeals system. He also proposed the broadening of the right to appeal, and changes in the rules regarding increases in compensation in excess of the guidelines. Then, of course, the all-powerful administrator would have his power broadened in compensation and dividend cases.

The minister also claimed that significant progress was being made in slowing the rate of inflation. As to that, I can only echo my hon. friend from York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) who quoted the report of the conference board which stated that the recent moderation in the rate of inflation was due almost entirely to a decline in the food component, and that it would be erroneous to give credit to the control measures. Certainly, the Liberal government does nothing to help when it introduces a so-called cutback budget showing estimates 16 per cent higher than those of last year. These proposed amendments do nothing to relieve the plight of the pensioner who relies on dividend income, or to ease the raising of capital so as to encourage investment by Canadians in Canadian enterprise. Nor do they solve the problem of raiding or transfers between companies with the object of circumventing the rules. Still awaited, also, is some relief from the mountain of forms and interminable extra work required to be done by the business community. These are all reflected in pass-through costs, and it is the taxpayer who pays in the end.

Some firms are still trying to understand why they are not entitled to the protection, as they perceive it, which is being given to the larger firms. It is obvious to me that the scheme is never likely to be accepted readily by the Canadian people, principally because it is so confusing to the community at large and because the government cannot make it appear to work equitably. I suppose we shall be looking for more amendments to the legislation as the days go by.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle).

Some hon. Members: One o'clock.

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

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my words on this occasion will be relatively brief, but I should like to cover a few points that concern me about this bill. My original understanding was that the Anti-Inflation Board rulings would apply to some 1,500 firms. This has now been extended to cover some 20,000 firms. The number of people employed to perform this function appears to me to have been increased by about 2½ times the original number. I find this somewhat inconsistent with the original philosophy of the Anti-Inflation Board and I hope that in his concluding remarks the minister will deal a little more fully with this particular point than has been the case up to now.

One favourable feature of the legislation is the expansion of the right of appeal to unions. Originally, the appeal structure was limited to the party that considered itself aggrieved, the government and the party being privy to the ruling. The paying party, the payer of the salary or wages, originally was the only party that could launch an appeal against the ruling of the board. This right has now been extended to the unions, and this is as it should be since a person who receives a salary or wage is as much interested as the person who pays. Wherever possible, it is most undesirable to interfere with freely negotiated agreements as to wages arrived at between employers and employees, but in cases that do exceed the guidelines it is extremely important that both parties to the agreement have the right to appeal the board's ruling to a superior tribunal. I think this is a very good feature of the bill.

Significantly, Mr. Speaker, this change seems to have been brought about as a result of a ruling affecting the Irving enterprises and the paperworkers in New Brunswick. In his concluding remarks, I hope that the minister will have the opportunity of dealing with this particular case. The woodsworkers of New Brunswick too, are in a very difficult position. Our forests, particularly in the northeastern part of the province, are in a very high state of irreversible decay. When these trees are cut, some go to the sawmill and others go to the pulp and paper factories. The original concept of the sawmills was an extremely good one and flowed from our forest products royal commission study and report. The report recommended, among other things, that we use the best part of the tree for quality products. For example, we use the trunk of the

tree, the best wood, to make finished lumber, furniture or hardwood components, whereas the balance of the tree could be turned into porridge and possibly commercial paper or a more finished form of paper. This recommendation is one that I strongly support. As a result of DREE participation a pilot project sawmill was erected in New Brunswick to perform this very valuable function.

A great deal of difficulty has been encountered with this lumber due to the high degree of decay. One of the major reasons for this decay is that the spruce budworm attacks our forests in New Brunswick and over $5 million of federal money has been allocated to deal with the problem. Indeed, the province has put up even more money than that, as have the industries of the province. So that although we have a three-pronged attack on the budworm, all that our attack on the budworm can do at this point is to control the damage it does. Scientists, particularly in agencies of the federal government, are working on the ultimate solution.

To return to these woodworkers, with this high degree of rot an extensive amount of sorting has to be done in New Brunswick which is not the case with woodsworkers elsewhere. I hope that full weight was given to this fact when the decision affecting the Irving company was taken: Irving is the only firm in New Brunswick that made it a requirement that after the trees are cut, reforestation should take place. They are one of the leaders in North America in this field, and I give them full credit for it. I hope this point was taken into consideration in the wage settlement arrived at between the Irving company and its employees and that it was looked at from a regional point of view.

I should also like to refer to a rumour I have heard from New Brunswick which I hope the minister will be able to shoot down. I understand that in granting the wage increase that was disallowed, the Irving firm, in effect, brought its wage earners up to the national level. I would be very unhappy if I felt that this government has in any way impaired the opportunity of anyone in Atlantic Canada reaching wage parity with Canadians in the central provinces.

● (1410)

Much hard work has been done in this House to reverse the trend whereby not all but some people in Atlantic Canada are paid two-thirds the national wage rate. I would hope this board would not be allowed to operate in such a way as to bring about a freeze in respect of New Brunswickers, maritimers and the people in Quebec because of the disparity in which they find themselves. The minister partly dealt with this matter in committee. I hope he will have an opportunity to do so again. I would appreciate it if he would deal with it again.

Another thing which concerns me is whether this program can be terminated by resolution of the House. If I read the regulations correctly, the resolution would also have to be dealt with by the other place, as my learned friend to the left refers to it. I should like to reflect on that a little further. Perhaps we might conclude that a limit should be placed on the amount of debate in the other place so that this program could be very quickly brought to an end if that should be the decision of parliament.

Another thing we should realize, in dealing with this matter—and perhaps the board should realize it in dealing with applications from New Brunswick—is that there are great problems in that province in respect of transportation. Transportation rates have been increasing in respect of our primary products. This has caused very considerable concern. The province came up with a very dramatic, far-reaching and enlightened program of highway construction over a period of four years. Regrettably, the federal government has not seen fit to join the province in this $400 million undertaking. It has approved some badly needed road construction with regard to arterial highways in northern New Brunswick, but has completely deleted the program for southern New Brunswick.

In answer to my question which appeared on the order paper, it is suggested that no specific request was made for any particular project. However, the whole proposal was before the DREE people and only part of it was approved. I do not know what the Premier of New Brunswick must do in order to ask his federal counterparts to deal with this problem. I know he was here in Ottawa in December, at which time he did everything possible to bring it to the attention of the people concerned. If New Brunswick workers must travel on less favourable roads, or on a less favourable transportation system, then surely wage considerations should involve such concepts. This is in line with what the Irving firm did in dealing most favourably with the matter of wages. This seems to be a move in the direction of what I hoped would be encouragement rather than discouragement, as has been the case in respect of this policy. I am not sure the board has adequate regional representation in order to take into account regional problems.

I shall conclude my remarks by saying I certainly do not expect the minister to deal with all the points I have raised, but I must say he certainly made an effort to deal with all the points I raised previously. If he has an opportunity, I hope he will give some consideration to these points also.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I will not indulge in reiterating what some of my colleagues have said during this debate. They went back to before the last election and indicated how the government brought in a program which it had so vigorously opposed before the 1974 election campaign.

I should like to refer to this in another way. When the government finally structured its anti-inflation program, it was no surprise to me that there was a system of wage and price controls in Canada. I said this to my Liberal opponent during the election campaign. I felt sorry that he had to tell political untruths to the people during the campaign. We both knew that our economy was in trouble and that something would have to happen in tune with what other countries have done to bring the flood and spiral of inflation under control. What I am upset about is that when the government finally decided enough time had expired since the last election campaign, and that it was safe to go to the Canadian people and say, "While this was not a good program in July, it is a good program now," the government also applied, for the first time, this innocuous thing we have heard throughout the debate, that the program is substantially different. In other words, the anti-inflation

program with which the Minister of Finance burdened the people had to be substantially different from the well thought-out plan of the former leader of the opposition.

What did the members of the government do? They sat in the backrooms and went through the Conservative anti-inflation program. They must have told themselves, first of all, that they could not have a 90-day freeze because that would look too much like the Conservative program. They decided not to have a time limit of 18 months or 12 months, because that was what the Conservatives discussed during the 1974 election. So they ended up with a program that was substantially different from that worked out and thought out by some people who worked on the problem over a long period. They did not bring in an anti-inflation program that would have worked, a program which indeed did work in the United States and a program that has worked and has helped to bring the economy under control in other parts of the world.

I do not wish to give too much credit to our friends in the fifth estate, but recently a reporter for a local paper said that a government shows its decay never more clearly than when it begins to spend more of its time saving face than fulfilling its mandate. Truer words have never been spoken about this government. This anti-inflation program has been nothing but an effort to save face. It is nothing more than a program that is substantially different to something that might have worked in Canada. At no time did we say that our program was a cure-all or a solution to all the economic problems we face in Canada. We did say, however, that it was a program that was needed to combat the inflationary cycle and bring it under control.

A short while ago the minister asked permission to ask a question of one of my colleagues who spoke about this matter before we recessed for lunch. He asked what the Conservative program would have been. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can save myself the trouble of responding, if the minister should feel the urge to ask me the question, because I would tell him to ask the former minister of finance who in Toronto recently laid out exactly what he thought the anti-inflation wage and price control program should be like. He said that the open-ended program in effect now could lead to totalitarian government. This is the minister who has just left the cabinet, the former minister of finance. He was also involved in the 1974 election campaign, when he said that the program should have started with a 90-day freeze. I wonder where he got that from, and I wonder why he left the cabinet.

● (1420)

This program is doomed to failure even if the amendments are brought in. When the minister first introduced the program in the House of Commons, and his colleagues spoke on it, great care was taken because it was being said that he would build a monstrous bureaucracy. We were under the same attack in the 1974 election campaign. With regard to the anti-inflation program, we were told that only 200 people in total would administer the program throughout the country and that it would be a kind of self-liquidating program. I invite anyone to travel throughout the country to see how many adjudicators, arbitrators, communicators and instigators are travelling around trying to make this program work, trying to earn the respect of labour and the business community, and trying to explain the inexplicable; in other words, trying to explain something for which there is no explanation.

My colleagues have spoken about the monstrous forms which small firms have to hire armies of consultants, lawyers and accountants to fulfil the new requirements which the government has placed upon them. What about this business of the jurisdiction of the anti-inflation program? When the program was introduced, my colleagues will recall that the minister said—and I made an issue of this in the House—that basically certain sections of the Income Tax Act would be used by the Anti-Inflation Board in exercising their power to intervene. Generally speaking, anyone who falls under the jurisdiction of the Income Tax Act would fall also under the jurisdiction of the Anti-Inflation Act. We know that that did not work out the way it was intended, because none of the current operations of the federal government or of the provincial governments—and those are the ones affected by the Income Tax Act and considered different from ordinary departments of the government—is attuned to the anti-inflation program.

The provinces did not fall over themselves to rush to Ottawa and sign the agreements provided for under the act, because first they had to get their own house in order. They wanted to be the first to introduce increased rates for hydro and increased insurance rates such as in British Columbia, which has increased these rates by 120 per cent and 150 per cent in some cases, and all the other costs which make up the cost of living of Canadians. Some provinces found themselves in a pinch with regard to the professional salaries of nurses, teachers, and so on, so they decided it was time to go to the federal minister to sign the program and to refuse to grant the increases which some of these professional groups are demanding.

With a program like this, how can you ask a private sector, the Canadian Labour Congress or the man on the street to practice restraint, to fall in line? These agreements with the provinces have not worked out, and the reason they have not worked out is that the federal government should have shown some restraint. As a matter of fact, we are faced in this House with a 20 per cent increase in federal spending at a time when everybody is being asked to restrain their demands to 10 per cent. On top of that, the government saw fit to shift some of its own responsibilities to the provinces by announcing the phasing out of its participation in certain health programs and the curtailment of some of its contributions to health care over a number of years. Recently, the provinces were faced with the decision of the federal government, reached without any consultation with them, to slow down spending when it comes to policing. The formula is being adjusted, without consultation. The provinces were told they had to accept the greater share in the cost of monitoring the program.

The Unemployment Insurance Act is a perfect example of this. I am referring to the recent adjustments to the Unemployment Insurance Act whereby a qualifying period of six weeks was brought in under the legislation. I challenge any member of the House to show me one working person in our country who could live for six weeks without income. What has been achieved by that change is that the burden to maintain families with no income is now shifted from the federal government to the provincial govern-

ments. So why should the provinces be so excited about the anti-inflation program, and why should they act in a different way from the federal government? The provinces had every justification to do what they did through their Crown corporations, to increase hydro rates, the cost of energy, the cost of transportation and all the other essential components in the budget of the average Canadian, particularly those Canadians who can least afford these increases.

When he goes to the bargaining table, the first thing the employer tells the working Canadian is, "We understand you have fallen behind, but you must understand that we are bargaining under some restraints. After all, we want to be responsible Canadians and we do not want to exceed the guidelines that have been set by the federal government." This is the main topic of discussion across the bargaining table today. Unions are charging that no one else is living by the guidelines. Corporations are not following the guidelines, particularly those exporting their goods and who are being paid on international markets.

The minister has announced that their profits, which may be in excess of the guidelines, are allowed under the program. I do not argue with him. I am part owner of a small company which exports all its productive capacity to another part of the world, and I welcome the minister's decision. But I should like to hear from him how he will monitor these excess profits and ensure that they will be funnelled back to the company to be reflected in the increased capacity of the individual plant. It is an exercise in futility. It is impossible to have that kind of transfer of money.

One of my big objections to the program is that it will do nothing in the first year but guarantee us a 10 per cent inflation rate. I can substantiate that argument with the experience we have gained in monitoring the cost of houses and rents in the two major metropolitan centres of Toronto and Vancouver. My colleagues will recall that in British Columbia the socialist government there in 1973 and 1974 had a rent control program: landlords were not allowed to increase rents by more than 10.6 per cent a year. Everyone in the House knows that the cost of housing and rents is the highest in the country in Toronto and Vancouver. The effects of the rent control program in British Columbia were monitored in this way and resulted in rents in Vancouver increasing 3 per cent more in that one year than they did in Toronto. Everyone asked how that was possible, because there was a ceiling on rent and no one was allowed to increase it by more than 10.6 per cent.

● (1430)

The answer is very simple and obvious. Every landlord in the city of Vancouver, whether he wanted to or not—or needed to or not—would have been a damned fool had he not increased his rent by 10.6 per cent, because he did not know what was coming the next year. So every landlord and everyone who rented anything to anyone increased his rent by 10.6 per cent. In the city of Toronto there were some people who did not need an increase that year and they did not operate under those restraints. They knew that if they needed an increase the next year, they could increase rents by 6 per cent, 8 per cent or 15 per cent. The result was a 3 per cent differential.

I have operated several small businesses in my business career. If I was in business right now—and there are thousands of small businessmen throughout this country—every time I would walk through my plant I would look at this and that and make little notes. The Anti-Inflation Board tells me I cannot increase prices more than four times a year, so every three months I would automatically increase my prices. Every day I would look very closely for what I could find to demonstrate to the Anti-Inflation Board a legitimate cost increase as a result of which I could increase my prices. So the effect is this: instead of increasing one's prices once a year or not at all, which was the practice before, one now increases prices four times a year. The effect will be monstrous. Unions will also bargain for the maximum. They will have to, knowing how the anti-inflation program applies to the business sector and the public sector, and knowing how the intrusion of the anti-inflation program into the private enterprise system has affected the economy. Private enterprise will also have to bargain for the maximum in order to protect its skin.

We have not broken the inflationary cycle; we have accelerated the process. Unions will have to try to achieve the maximum because their employers will try to keep them down, and the Anti-Inflation Board will probably roll them back. Recently we have seen settlements in excess of 20 per cent. Unions are shopping all over for these historical relationships. Nobody seems to be able to explain this thing. Some have it, some do not. If you have it, do not fight it. What is an historical relationship? What do you have to catch up to historically? These are some of the questions unions and business people ask themselves, and until some almighty administrator tells them whether they have it or not, nobody will know.

This program does nothing to battle the problems we are facing in our industrial relations. The government is stimulating industrial warfare: the labour movement is more divided today than it ever was as a result of this massive intervention, and the adversary system which exists in labour negotiations is more prevalent today than it was before the program was introduced. We hear voices from every corner and from every sector of our society—and every knowledgeable economist has offered his views on this matter. The C.D. Howe Institute recently published a little booklet which was distributed amongst all my colleagues: it laid out, in no uncertain terms, what the effects of this anti-inflation program would be, even after the amendments are discussed and implemented—if they are implemented as a result of this debate.

As I mentioned before, the former minister of finance has finally broken the silence and entered the public debate, warning the government where the program will lead. This is why we are getting the reaction we are to some of the other legislation that is now before the House. There is an uproar among honest, hard working citizens throughout the country. There is reaction to some of the peace and security legislation, and so on, because people are beginning to think that the great intellect which is within the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has a master plan and that the anti-inflation program might lead us to a destination for which we have not bought our ticket. We are concerned about the recent announcement of the Prime Minister respecting dealing with unions, and his talk about the massive intervention which is required to decontrol

and phase out the anti-inflation program, if indeed that will be possible after a three-year or four-year period.

I hope the former minister of finance will be more vocal and will tell us just how this program came about and why it was necessary for him to leave the cabinet and disassociate himself from the obvious dilemma which was being cooked up in the back room by people who obviously had not given any thought to the problem at hand.

The Prime Minister met with the labour unions just recently, as my colleagues know, and told them that their meeting here—there were only about 15,000 of them marching up and down in front of this building—really would be of no consequence because they would be naive to think that the government would reconsider its program, and that it would be naive for them to think that the government would reconsider the duration of time over which the program should operate. So they went away peacefully and they have embarked upon certain actions.

The Prime Minister has indicated that he is prepared to sit down with labour and talk about the new society and the adjustments which will have to be made in our society before the program can be phased out. We all know about the year-end message of the Prime Minister which caused so much anxiety amongst Liberal backbenchers. They found it necessary to sit down with their leader over a whole weekend and have him explain to them what he meant by this new society and this massive intervention in business and labour and the Prime Minister now says to labour that he is prepared to sit down with them, but with them only. He is not prepared to sit down with them and business people to talk about the the anti-inflation program, about further changes which need to be made, or about the decontrol period; however, he is willing to sit down with labour and talk about how it will be affected by the new society and what kind of intervention into labour he will be planning before he considers this society prepared to live without these controls.

Then I assume he will tell the corporations, chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations and the people who come to Ottawa to lobby and consult with him, that he will be prepared to carry on this consultation process with them as well, and perhaps he will share with them his views about the new society and how the intervention will affect them.

However, we can rest assured—I know my hon. colleagues will agree with me—that the Prime Minister will never get all these groups into the same room, because that could be dangerous. That would be a departure from his tradition to divide and conquer and to do away with this consultation process where everyone gets into the same room and tries to reach agreement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oberle: That is not the method our Prime Minister will use in bringing the previous imbalances within our society under control. I fear what the outcome of this program will be. Unless the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacDonald) responds to the request of people in every part of society and makes the controls program more equitable, makes it apply equally to all, the Prime Minister's prediction may prove right: the system may well be doomed. Our time-honoured, free enterprise system as we have known it, the system which has worked so well for Canadians for so long, will indeed be doomed.

● (1440)

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). Incidentally, I was sorry to see the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) leave the chamber. The government must feel relieved at his departure this afternoon because in the last election campaign he told the country what we must do to put our economy right. He was farsighted enough to see what needed to be done to put right our economic difficulties and inflation.

I congratulate the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River on what he said. He spoke excellently. I join him in indicating to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), who is present in the House, my concern about the operation of the controls program. As I have said, my former leader had the courage to tell Canadians during the last election campaign what needed to be done. We would have done it if this party had formed the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Frankly, the program suffers because the government lacks credibility. Its difficulties began when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced it in his famous message on Friday, October 14, and gave us all great indigestion on Thanksgiving eve. It would not have mattered so much if the government had brought forward a reasoned, reasonable program of wage and price controls. Unfortunately, that was not the case. The government adopted our program. Unfortunately, it ignored its best features and adopted instead some of the worst features of the program we brought forward in the last election campaign. I am under the impression that the present controls program constitutes the sole attack upon inflation. Ignoring action long overdue for curbing inflation, the government has failed to implement concurrent fiscal and monetary policies for slowing down and halting inflation. The controls program, as I say, is the sum and substance of the government's attack on inflation. As the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River has said, this government has reneged on its responsibilities with respect to certain programs, medicare being an example. On the whole, the government has adopted a slapdash approach in its attack on inflation.

Some people question the constitutionality of important parts of the program, and belatedly the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has said that he may seek direction from the Supreme Court. He, too, wants to know if certain aspects of the program, particularly agreements with the provinces, are constitutionally valid. If the Supreme Court finds that parts of the program, agreements with the provinces especially, are not constitutionally valid, there will be chaos piled upon chaos in this country. Various groups in society, teachers included, will make salary demands the like of which we have not seen for a long time. As I say, this government's approach to the whole question has been slapdash. It patches here, fixes there, and introduces an amending bill only weeks after this House passed the original bill. Although the government was thinking of controls before October 14, it had no clear idea where it

was going. Now it will take the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada for judicial decision on the constitutionality of the agreements with the provinces.

Controls are disrupting our lives. Let me give a personal example which no doubt could be repeated many times. A couple of weeks ago, late one Sunday night when I returned to my apartment after visiting my constituency I was surprised to find attached to my door a pamphlet on which was printed, so to speak, the modern-day equivalent of Martin Luther's thesis. In so many words, the pamphlet told me that the landlord wanted to apply to the rent review board for a substantial rent increase made necessary by increased costs. I can tell you, at one o'clock in the morning that was a shock to my system.

I discovered, after asking questions, that many landlords in Ottawa—indeed, landlords all over Ontario—are asking for rent increases. Rent increases are to be limited; hence they are asking for the maximum rent allowed. Part of the problem is that the government's control program was without a termination date, and according to all indications, restrictions will be in force for a long time. People were putting pressure on provincial governments to control rents even before the government introduced its anti-inflation program. The matter was made worse when the federal government introduced its wage and price control program but without a termination date. Landlords say to themselves, "We must protect our investment and apply for the maximum rent increase or we shall be left out in the cold. We will apply for it and pass on as much as possible the cost of the increase to the unfortunate consumer." I know that in my province of Saskatchewan there is concern because of the pressure placed upon the availability of rental accommodation. More and more owners of apartment buildings are making application under the provincial condominium act to turn existing apartment buildings into condominiums. Rather than renting space within the building, they will be able to sell each apartment.

● (1450)

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It is a shame, for the reason that if this practice continues and is widespread there will be a very great shortage of rental accommodation. People who have the resources will buy accommodation to protect themselves from increases in rent brought about by pressure being placed upon them by landlords. Unfortunately, with the rent control plan in effect there is a natural discouragement to people investing in building new rental accommodation. Therefore, a person seeking rental accommodation is being squeezed from both ends.

The question is whether this government is going to give us any indication within the reasonably near future as to the direction it proposes to take us down this road of wage and price controls. It is not sufficient for the Minister of Finance to bring in this bill to amend existing legislation, Bill C-73 that was just passed by this House a few weeks ago, without making a major statement on the aims and goals of this government with respect to wage and price control and the anti-inflation program. I ask the minister to give serious consideration to giving a candid assessment in the very near future so that the people of Canada will understand and be able to make specific plans. They should know the duration of the plan, rather than each and every one of us speculating on it, compounded from time to time by the philosophic musings of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) over television.

As I said earlier, this government has not taken the best, but the worst parts of the plan put forward by our party at the time of the last election, advanced at that time and alluded to by the leadership of our party over a period of years as being an essential attack that must be embarked upon with regard to the problems of inflation.

As has been pointed out by many of my colleagues, the Hon. John Turner, recently departed from the cabinet and now in private life, acknowledges that one of the problems of this plan is that there is not a hiatus during which there is an absolute freeze on wages and prices to allow the federal government to come in on a more orderly basis. However, the program was evolved in the minds of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and those involved in financial matters within the cabinet in a matter of hours or days. They came forward with a quickly-conceived plan without the kind of consideration that we ought to expect in our country as far as economic matters are concerned. The minister and the Prime Minister have spent a great deal of time trying to justify the success of this program. I do not think they have been successful. I say, sincerely, that I do not wish them any bad luck. In fact, I wish them all the luck in the world so that they will in fact be able to deal with the problem of inflation in an effective way.

I canvassed my constituents on the question of wage and price controls. The result probably applies across this country. The people of Canada are concerned about the economy and the future. They are concerned about it to the extent that they support in principle an anti-inflation program. However, once you get that acknowledgement from them, they express the same sort of apprehension that has been expressed by my colleagues throughout this debate and which we will continue to express with regard to the effectiveness of the plan. The government is really not sincere in its anti-inflation program. This is evidenced by the fact that they themselves have not given the leadership with regard to government expenditures to which we in this country are entitled. Therefore, when we have an announcement by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) that he is going to make gigantic cuts in government spending—

Mr. Nystrom: You are ragging the puck; you are repetitive.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I am sorry, I did not get the hon. member's remark. Let me put it this way: if it is sentimental, I will be glad to look at it in due course.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The fact is that we have this great pizzazz and fanfare announced by the President of the Treasury Board about the cuts to be made in government spending, and then we find that a very large portion are really paper cuts. It is paper doll time in the affairs of our country. To categorize the situation I will make the analogy that I will reduce my spending next year by $5,000 because I am not going to buy a new Ford automobile. That is the kind of cut announced by the President of the

Treasury Board. We were not told of any effective cuts. We were not given an analysis of spending in this country. Rather, we were given a con job to give the impression that the government is really serious about exercising restraint as far as its own expenditures are concerned.

There is concern about the effectiveness of this anti-inflation program that has been with us now for some five months. On the basis of my observations, there is a general feeling across the country that there should be an accounting, not in some informal television interview with the Prime Minister, but a candid accounting on the part of the Minister of Finance with regard to where we are now and where we will be headed in the following months or years. Is there any hope of this program being terminated within a reasonable period of time, so that we can get back to our affairs and away from the prospects of a system in which there is massive and continuous government intervention in the everyday affairs of the average citizen?

I indicated earlier that when this bill was brought in I was concerned about the size of the administration and the cost to be involved in giving it effective control and monitoring anti-inflation and wage and price controls such as the government has involved us in. I stated that there seemed to be danger signs on the horizon. Already there are increases in the number of people involved in this operation. Parkinson's law started to operate within a very short period of time. Not only do we have the Anti-Inflation Board involved here, but other departments and people seconded from other departments. We are looking not only at the 200 or so employees directly involved in the program, we are looking at people in other departments such as the Department of National Revenue, who are spending substantial amounts of time and effort trying to put this program over.

● (1500)

Unless we see, in a reasonably short time, the end of the policy now being followed we shall find ourselves locked into a permanent system of government intervention and control from which it will be difficult to extricate ourselves.

As far as government spending is concerned, I have lately detected during the question period a tendency on the part of government spokesmen, whenever a member on this side suggests some money should be spent, to say, "You members on the opposition side have been asking for restraint in government spending, so we do not intend to spend any money carrying out whatever suggestions you may make." It is not responsible to answer our inquiries in these terms. It is true that members of my party are deeply interested in having the government exercise restraint, but we are also interested in getting the government to carry out a basic review of its spending priorities. This has not been done.

Treasury Board is chopping away at the funds of various departments and agencies, directing its efforts particularly toward programs with a high profile, actions which produce press coverage for a few days. Information Canada, everybody's scapegoat, has been suspended. They say, "Look, we have cut out the CYC." But in terms of the total amount of dollars spent, cuts such as these are not significant. They have not involved a basic re-examination of spending priorities or a new view as to the direction in which the country is going. I am suggesting that the people of Canada are becoming impatient with the government and impatient with the course it is following.

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I wanted to say much more—

Mr. Hees: Carry on.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I appreciate that invitation, Mr. Speaker, but I am satisfied to have expressed in these terms some of the concern I feel with respect to the operation of the program we are discussing.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, for altogether, too long, Canada has been under the direction of a Liberal government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: It is a government which has been extremely slow to acknowledge realities and devise its programs accordingly. Some of us have the questionable privilege of having spent a fair portion of our three score years and ten. I am envious of those who have not spent so much. But having spent those years one does develop the power of recollection, the ability to draw from the past an element of personal experience in the way some of the younger members cannot do. We can remember, for instance, that there was a time when a Canadian considered it virtually a right in the economic structure to own a home of his own, or to look forward to the day when he would do so. And he could justifiably entertain such an ambition as part of his expectations in life.

Mr. Drury: You are talking about the homesteaders, are you?

Mr. McCain: We would only be going back to the years when there was a division of government between Liberals and Conservatives, when Liberal administrations did not dominate and did not sell this country's heritage for a mess of potage.

An hon. Member: Heady stuff!

Mr. McCain: The opportunity for the individual to own his own home probably reached its peak immediately after the second world war. The government recognized that to compensate for the diversion of the activities of citizens who had enlisted to protect their country the provision of "something extra" was in order. Various programs were accordingly enacted, designed specifically for veterans but oriented, in some instances, toward people with low incomes generally. This stimulated a great many people who, although they did not have the rights of veterans and were living on low incomes, to build their own homes, sometimes with the help of a loan from friends or, maybe, from a bank—to build them, possibly as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) has suggested, in the fashion of the homesteaders, with the help of co-operative community loans.

In the little business I operated for some time there were four individuals in that crew who bought or constructed

and owned their own homes, though at that time they were receiving little more than the minimum wage as their source of income.

Under Liberal leadership we have gone from one economic catastrophe to another.

Mr. Hees: Throw the rascals out!

Mr. Paproski: Resign!

Mr. McCain: In the Diefenbaker years at least there was incentive, there was a promise of business opportunity, there was a promise for the well being of the individual, and a recognition of the welfare requirements of the nation, while at all times keeping the long term interests of the nation at heart. This cannot be claimed by those on your right today, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Remember the Arrow!

Mr. McCain: I suppose the Liberal government dumped money down the aeronautical drain for years during its administration, and having proceeded along a comparable course it has yet to demonstrate that it can run an airline.

Mr. Crouse: They can't run anything. They cannot even run the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. McCain: We find ourselves now, after a long period which has certainly not been characterized by leadership, in a position in which it has been suggested through various sources that there should be a wage and price control program. Mr. Speaker, this is a sorry reflection upon the administration of the Liberals over the past decade. They have brought us to a position in which our leader recognized, during the election of 1974, that such a policy was essential. The Liberals denied it was called for, yet today, without a mandate from the electorate to do so, they have brought in a hodge-podge program purporting to control wages and prices. This has created a very unjust burden for a great many people in Canada.

● (1510)

I would ask Your Honour to bear in mind that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), our then leader, said that there should be a 90 day freeze. As has been mentioned before in this House, the man who was then the minister of finance for Canada has since said that if wage and price controls were to be brought in there must be a 90 day freeze. Is this why he left the cabinet, Mr. Speaker? Or did he leave the cabinet because of some of the other ulterior, behavioural patterns existing in cabinet at the time with which he must have been familiar? It must have been one of the two.

We now find ourselves with a program that began by making many exceptions and which—I think this is quite justifiable criticism on the part of the labour sector of our society—has not been effective in controlling prices, and cannot be effective in controlling prices as the program presently operates. The government has created, perhaps intentionally—and that is what alarms me—friction within our society by allowing exceptions to be made to the program, and by exercising no active control over prices other than in cases legislated to the provinces by agreement. As the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) said, the program does control rents.

Was it intended to stir up a furore? Was the plan intended to be criticized by those who said it would not work? Because if that were intentional the government could have devised no better way to engender criticism of the government and doubt among the people of Canada.

Let me give the House an example of how one person feels who has felt the brunt of this program. I want to read to the House a letter addressed to me:

Dear Sir:

I am writing to you to express my disapproval to the present anti-inflation program. Being a proud Canadian I would be the first to agree something had to be done to stem the tide of economic disaster that our country is headed for. Wage and price control I am not against, but I am definitely against the present system where our present government freezes the income of the wage earner (not the prices) and segregates one Canadian from the other, because one is from the east and one from the west, when they say the west has always been ahead of the east. Is this democracy? They didn't do this to us when world war II started; when we were mixed up in the forces at that time we all had one common denominator, our love for Canada.

We tradesmen at Irving Pulp and Paper were given a 25 cent increase to adjust our wages to come closer to our western paper workers. We lost that. We fought for our COLA clause. We lost that. We negotiated for N.B. day as most New Brunswickers now enjoy. We lost that. Other things we lost, along with a large per cent of our wages, but most of all we lost our bargaining rights. I love Canada and I love freedom. That is why I am writing you, appalled at the dictatorial tactics taken by Mr. Trudeau and his cabinet.

The really significant thing about that letter, Mr. Speaker, is that the writer, who is prepared to accept wage and price controls, is a union member and a victim of the administration of the Anti-Inflation Board. Yet he is still prepared to accept wage and price control because of the economic situation that he recognizes is Canada's mess of pottage today. It is not that labour is against wage and price control as such; it is against the plan as conceived and administered by the government.

It is incredible that before people can appeal a government decision they must first break the law. This is precisely what happened in the city of Saint John to people who had bargained so long and so well in good faith, and who historically have had such excellent relations with their employer, with a minimum of strikes interrupting the progress of business.

I think one has to recognize the way in which both the company and the union were prepared to face the situation. Both parties, law-abiding groups, agreed that the law had to be broken after a fine had been assessed in order to appeal the decision. How they feel about the situation has been pretty clearly stated in their presentation to the cabinet. For instance, one point they made was that they felt they should remain in the same relative earning position as their fellow workers, the woodlands workers. The agreement signed by the paper workers and the paper mill would have brought the wages of the paper workers up to those of the woodlands workers. An historic relationship had existed between them for years, and historic relationships were to be recognized in Anti-Inflation Board decisions.

When the decision was made these workers got one third of their historic entitlement, which I suggest is a very poor recognition of historic relationships. After the white paper

was issued and after the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had said that wage and price control would be enacted into law, there were 60 days during which there was no regulation or legislation. The Anti-Inflation Board called for and obtained documentation of and representations on the CPU-Irving agreement before the regulations were published. In fact the decision of the board on the CPU-Irving agreement was handed down on the same day that the regulations were announced. What were the guidelines upon which the decision was based?

Needless to say, the paper workers were shocked and dismayed at the ruling of the board. And well they should have been since it was a breach of faith as well as a breach of the philosophy supposedly part of the program. As I have already said, they were alarmed that there was no way in which they could appeal. Secondly, if they had wanted to initiate proceedings and appeal the decision on December 19, the day after the board's ruling, they had nowhere to go since the government had not bothered to appoint the administrator to whom the appeal would be directed. When finally they had an opportunity to meet with the administrator, they stressed the point it was not their wish to violate the law, but in terms of the pursuit of justice there really was no alternative.

This goes on, Mr. Speaker, like a Cinderella story; it has to be a fairy tale. Surely the Liberal government would not have created a situation such as this unless it had intended to engender criticism and prove the failure of the program that it had derided so severely in the 1974 election campaign. I do not believe that the government wants the program to succeed. I believe it wants to keep Canadians in a state of confusion, indecision and anger, so as to prove prior to the next election that wage and price controls will not work. I believe it wants to prove to Canada that one can bungle, disturb, incite, that one does not have to govern well; that you need only keep the people stirred up but that you try to keep them on your side.

I mentioned that these workers received only one third of what they should have received in order to preserve the historic relationship. They got a very dirty deal. I say that on two grounds; first, because historically they were not receiving equal pay vis-à-vis their western counterparts; secondly, because historically they did not retain the relative position of one group of workers compared with another. Both these things should have been allowed in respect of the ceilings under the program of the government. Yet they were not allowed.

● (1520)

When we couple that with the justifiable complaint of labour that the effectiveness of the control of prices has been virtually negligible, then I think we understand why very many people in the union structure of Canada would say, as this man said to me in his letter, that he is not against wage and price controls in the economic chaos in which we find ourselves, but he is against the inequitable and relatively disgraceful pattern of administration that has been applied to a program in which the government has no heart.

An illustration of the fact that the government has no heart in the program is that it cannot live within its own spending guidelines. The areas in which it chooses to make

[Mr. McCain.]

cuts are the productive areas. There is no expansion in agricultural research or in fisheries research. There is a reduction in the research expenditures in respect of medicine. I submit these are the productive and necessary expenditures of the country today. There is no expansion in research for energy. These are the areas in which research moneys could be spent for the increased productivity of all Canadians, but they are the areas in which we are pinching pennies.

I do not believe the government is sincere in its approach to wage and price controls or economic guidelines. It certainly cannot be other than hypocritical when it says to the provinces, to labour and to industry, that they must observe these guidelines but that the government will not. This is a sad illustration of the sterility of economic capability as far as the government is concerned.

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion on which I have participated in any debate in respect of the government's anti-inflation program. However, I welcome this opportunity this afternoon to say a few words in this regard.

My memory is very clear concerning the election campaign of June and July of 1974. I remember particularly the impassioned speeches made by my Liberal opponent during the campaign when, on platform after platform, and at candidate forums he equated controls with every aspect that was foreign to Canadian life. He equated freedom, particularly the brand that was to be provided by the Liberal government, with everything that was true and equal to Canadian life. Had he been elected in that campaign and sitting in this House last Thanksgiving Day he would have had to resign the next day because there would have been no possibility of his living with the moves being made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet ministers.

It amazes me still how this program we are debating today could have been set at play at any point without mass resignations from the other side. I will never be able to understand how it could have passed through caucus, through cabinet, and into parliament after the campaign of the summer of 1974. I and millions of other Canadians watched breathlessly as the grab bag of goodies was unloaded across the country. One day there would be reference to a transportation bill, and another day to a housing bill involving billions of dollars. This gave the people a hope for expansion in the future. Unfortunately for the country those promises were taken as being true. That assumption has been shattered.

In this debate I should like to pay tribute to my colleague, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), because he saw the situation as it was developing. He sounded a warning, well in advance of Thanksgiving Day, because he knew what was coming. The hon. member is not in the House and I know he is too modest to regard himself as even a minor prophet, but I am sure his judgment as to what was coming out of government offices was solidly on the line.

It was interesting this afternoon to hear the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) use the word "terminated". During his address it occurred to me that the program of the government has been "Turner-rat-

ed" in the last week. The former minister of finance rated it a solid zero and indicated what should have been done.

It might be some solace to the official opposition, and certainly to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) to know that what they proposed was what the former minister of finance sees now as what should have been, and was, the only possible road to follow in entering this delicate and important question of controls. That must have been quite a cabinet meeting at which he told his colleagues the only way they could go was to follow the plan suggested by the leader of the opposition. Obviously that was not possible for the government opposite, so that minister of finance resigned and is no longer in this House. Instead of accepting what was not palatable to the Liberals, the government embarked upon a policy of wage and price controls which must by its very nature tighten down, tighten down, and tighten down.

The possibility of easing up becomes more remote every day. The inequities that have been introduced, which this bill attempts in some way to overcome, grow larger and larger day by day. There have been some statements in the press suggesting that the rate of inflation has slowed and that the scheme is working. I suggest seriously that those figures are illusory, and that if there has been any slowing down it has been at the expense of the farmers who receive lower prices for their produce, and at the expense of the companies that are going out of business at fire sale prices across this country because of the program put in place by the government, and because there are very few areas of the Canadian economy that are allowed to fluctuate freely any longer. There will be an even lower percentage of the economy that will be able to fluctuate in any way. The program that is before us will not assist very much in that regard.

● (1530)

I would like to bring to the attention of the minister one example of the kind of frustrations that have been brought to my notice. I have here an invoice from a hospital in my constituency. On January 19, 1976, it had an invoice for a shipment of Macbick flasks, 3,000 ml. 12 at $87.90. On February 19, 1976, it had an invoice for Macbick flasks, 3,000 ml. 12 at $182. It is at that point that it raised the matter with the Anti-Inflation Review Board. The reply was that the company employed fewer than 500 people and therefore does not come under the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board, so nothing can be done about this.

One hopes that possibly what we are doing under Bill C-89 will provide the Anti-Inflation Review Board with an opportunity to bring some equity here because this is the missing element in the approach taken by the government. I am not an economist, but when the program was announced I heard it would be restricted to those corporations that employ 500 employees or more and it struck me then that there was not a shred of hope that the program could succeed on that basis. I believed that it would only be a matter of time until we were presented with the bill that is before us today because nothing as inequitable as that can hope to succeed.

But the government in all its efforts has endeavoured to make the suggestion that it was really going after big business, even though it has been in the hands of big business for a long time. There was a hope in the announcement that some popularity could be bought at the expense of the larger corporations, but in these days of automation a great deal of manufacturing can be done with far fewer than 500 employees.

There was a false hope that the government was really going to take some firm action and do something about inflation. We know that initially the response across the country was good, and that in the year during which the former minister of finance endeavoured to persuade the various sectors of the Canadian economy to get together and form a consensus, public opinion began to harden on the whole question, and there was a growing realization that the program presented by the official opposition would have been the wiser choice in 1974. It is regrettable that the prime minister of this country was not the hon. member for Halifax, as he should have been.

I am concerned about the decision recently taken by the representatives of labour who were consulted during that search for consensus. I wonder if the former minister of finance had set up an all encompassing board—I do not know what power it would have had because of course it would not have had any power until some legislation had been presented to parliament—a board where all the sectors of the economy met and talked together, whether the representatives of labour would have taken the chair that was reserved for them at such a board.

I regret the intransigence and the separation of that very important part of the Canadian economy from various boards, because certainly if the scheme which has been presented to us—with all its errors and shortcomings, its inequities and confusions, with a board that does not know what it is doing and is not likely to know for many months ahead, with the emphasis on wage controls and the apparent inability to do anything about prices—is to be successful, it will require the co-operation of every sector of the Canadian economy. Only then can the inflation rate in Canada be slowed down.

I know how many institutions in this land, which are absolutely vital to the country, are bedeviled at present by inflation. All kinds of voluntary and church organizations, schools and hospitals, almost every institution that holds together the fabric of this country, are threatened now as they never have been since the great depression of the 1930's.

It is important that an equitable incomes policy be arrived at, but I do not see any hope that this method of approaching case by case individually will ever produce anything like a recognizable policy, and even as the cases are decided one after another a feeling will be left that justice has not been done. The situation will grow darker rather than lighter even if we pass Bill C-89.

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to follow my colleague, the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston), because if you compare his delivery with that of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) you find that the Prime Minister is often found sniffing at thin air surrounding the metaphysics of political intellectualism, always dealing with peripheral issues, and never getting down to the centricity of conceptual thought. If you compare that to my colleague, the hon.

member for Okanagan-Kootenay, you find that his speech is steeped in honesty and delivered with humility and conviction.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: I want to say to my colleague this, that although there were very few if any on the government side who were listening, there were many of us here who heard and who took heed of his speech and who took his thoughts to heart. When we are on the other side we will implement some of those truths and suggestions offered by him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: Here we are on a Friday afternoon. An hon. member across the way was calculating the other day the cost per minute of running the House of Commons. I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) should have been the first one to count the cost of debating this amendment in Bill C-89. So far as I am concerned it has been a waste of time.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It sure is.

Mr. Whiteway: Oh, the whip on the other side has just woken up. My colleague, the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), speaks well in both languages but says nothing in either.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The only thing that I want to bring to your attention, in view of the comments made by the hon. member, is the fact that he is never here to hear us, and that is why he does not know whether we speak or not.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whiteway: That remark is a reflection on the hon. member's attendance in the House.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I never missed a day yet.

● (1540)

Mr. Whiteway: The hon. members' tongue flaps around more than a hundred pollack just out of the water. There is a little proverb which the people who process fish in the hon. member's riding use and which the hon. member ought to take to heart, "Even a fish would not find himself on the hook if he kept his mouth shut.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: To get down to the matter at hand, Bill C-89, as many of my hon. colleagues have pointed out many times inside this House and outside, and during the last election campaign—and particularly my former leader—any anti-inflation program, any wage and price control program is designed for one purpose only, and that is to provide a period during which other policies can be put into place which will fight inflation and which will have an effect on the rate of inflation.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Oh, oh!

[Mr. Whiteway.]

An hon. Member: Have some manners, Joe.

Mr. Nystrom: Who is speaking here anyway?

Mr. Whiteway: If the hon. member wants a debate, I challenge him to a debate in any forum outside this House which he wants to choose, but until then I will speak, and if he has something to say I will sit down at three minutes to four and give him a chance to give his two cents worth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Sit down.

Mr. Whiteway: I will not sit down as long as I have the mandate of the people of Selkirk, and I will meet the hon. member's candidate head on in the next election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: The hon. member is the whip for the other side of the House, not this side.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Nice to see you in the House for a change.

An hon. Member: Have some manners, Joe Guay.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whiteway: If the whip on the other side will give me an opportunity, I will go on to more important things than his rudeness.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You wouldn't know the difference.

Mr. Whiteway: I was saying that any wage and price control program should only be designed to give a chance to the government to get into place real programs which will actually get at the root of inflation. It has been pointed out by some of my hon. colleagues on this side of the House that we need a new fiscal policy. If Milton Friedman has anything to say about inflation which is worth while, it is his dictum that inflation is always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon, and that the money supply must be put in order if there is to be any other program of validity and credibility in place. There must be a responsible monetary policy. Notwithstanding the effects of an over supply of money which will cause in international trade an inverted J curve, we need a new fiscal policy.

Rather than reiterate the kinds of arguments we hear from this side of the Chamber so often it might be interesting to note why this debate is a waste of time. There sits the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) fretting and fuming that we on this side of the House are holding up Bill C-89, the amendments to Bill C-73, the anti-inflation program. Yet it was his own party which held up procedures for the amendments we proposed.

When Bill C-73 was in committee witnesses were not allowed. My party wanted to bring in public input and witnesses from all sectors of the economy, from labour, business, and small business. That was denied by the majority Liberal members on that committee. There was no advertisement or soliciting from the minister for public

input. There were unusually long sessions voted on, not by this side but by the majority government side. The committee would not adjourn until the bill was railroaded through committee. Had the Liberal members taken their time and listened to what we were saying they would not have to be back in this Chamber with these amendments today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: You cannot on one hand stifle the opposition and on the other hand say that you want co-operation when you find out in the end that the opposition really had something to say and was right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: However, the thrust of my remarks is to centre on the morality of the anti-inflation program and these amendments. Why is it that by legislation Canadians have to adhere to a guideline of 8 per cent or 10 per cent with reference to their incomes? Why is it that wages are controlled and yet the services offered by all levels of government are not within the confines of this legislation? It is morally wrong to lock in the incomes of Canadians and on the other hand to let all levels of government, particularly the federal government, remain free of controls. We are talking about the expenditures of the federal government. Hon. members opposite stand in their places bursting with pride and announce that this year the spending of the federal government will be up only between 16 per cent and 20 per cent, yet the costs at all levels of government, particularly the federal government, are passed on to every taxpayer in this country and are at least double the increase allowed the average income for the average Canadian.

Why is it that Manitoba Hydro is allowed to go up 20 per cent, school taxes by 20 per cent, all property taxes by 20 per cent, gas by 25 per cent, and yet incomes are allowed to increase only 10 per cent, and that is supposed to be enough money to pay for all these things?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: Where is the morality of the government when it expects this kind of schoolboy arithmetic to make any sense to ordinary Canadians in Manitoba? If I had one single criticism written to me more than any other by people in my riding and all over Manitoba it was that they cannot understand how they can make ends meet when the government passes on all these costs and yet their incomes are locked in by legislation at the 10 per cent level.

I want to allow some time for others to wrap up the debate, and we have only ten minutes left. Out of courtesy—which is something the whip on the other side does not understand—I will wind up my remarks by saying that if I asked the Minister of Finance or the government to resign, I would not expect them to do so, but I can tell the minister one thing, and that is that the people of this country not only want inflation wrestled to the ground but they want him wrestled right out of office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway) in cutting his remarks short so I might say just a word in this important debate.

It is not astonishing that the matter is back before the House because the need for an amendment asking for an extension of the coverage of this operation was quite clear from the time the government first brought in controls because it brought them in in an incorrect fashion. Everyone said that an incomes policy should cover everyone. It should be universal, fair, and should have started with a 90-day freeze. We now have the statement of a former minister who, presumably, was responsible for some of this program, saying in retrospect that that is the way it should have been started. The fact that it did not happen that way means we are back with the kind of amendment we are talking about today. I expect that as time goes by we will find there will be further amendments as the government finds that the way in which it has approached this program is not working.

● (1550)

A couple of days ago the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), speaking in this debate, seemed to suggest that controls will be instrumental in curbing rising expectations and that they are capable of solving this country's inflationary difficulties. I say to him, as many others have said—and this should be repeated constantly—that controls will not solve inflation. They cause distortions in the economy and inequities, and we are reaping the results today of some of those inequities in terms of the response of the labour movement of this country to the way in which the controls program has been operating.

If the government had followed the advice of the opposition, and of most economists who have spoken on the subject, and adopted an across-the-board freeze, many of the problems we are seeing at present would have been avoided. I rather hoped, when the present Minister of Finance was appointed, to see an improvement in the country's economic policies. I thought no one could be as bad as the previous minister of finance. However, having heard the present minister speak, and read his speeches, it seems to me that we are not yet out of the woods.

I find it absolutely astonishing that the Minister of Finance should have spent considerable time accusing the opposition of lacking consistency in its approach to the controls program. Does the government not realize that controls, like any other economic policy, must be designed to solve a specific problem? In some circumstances controls are not proper and correct; in some circumstances they are. The position of the Minister of Finance that, regardless of economic circumstances, we shall face controls for another one and a half or two years, is fraught with difficulty.

I am also worried because the minister is still talking about a trace-off between inflation and unemployment. Surely if one thing has become clear in the last two or three years in the developed countries of the world it is this: the trade-off between unemployment and inflation does not exist within reasonable limits.

We know that Canada's economic policies have been bad. Nobody can be proud of a no-growth year, double digit inflation—it is getting slightly better now—and 7 per cent

unemployment. When you say that there is less inflation in the United States and hear the minister respond, "Yes, but their unemployment rate is up," you know the Government of Canada still believes in the old trade-off principle, a principle rejected all over the world because it is not valid.

It was also startling to hear the Minister of Finance say that we should cavalierly adopt an expansionary policy and not worry about deficits. If there is one thing that is certain and on which there is almost total agreement, it is that the cause of inflation in western industrialized democracies is the enormous deficits governments have continued to run. The Minister of Finance seems to suggest that when members of my party, and economists, say that our long term goal should be a balanced budget, without which there will be no recovery, our approach is reactionary. Unless the government realizes that it must balance expenditures against revenues, we are in for a lot of inflation for a long time.

We have 50 per cent more inflation than the United States because we have not introduced the right monetary policies and have done nothing about our deficit. That is why we suffer from our present inflation. The view that we shall solve the country's inflation with this ill-conceived, poorly run incomes policy, and not with the proper fiscal and monetary policies, is most discouraging.

In his last speech the minister quoted the Governor of the Bank of Canada. That governor came before the parliamentary committee in the spring of 1973 saying that we do not need any sort of incomes policy to restrain our economy. That same governor was in favour of an expansionary policy, when everybody said we needed a policy of contraction. That same Governor of the Bank of Canada today is talking about a roughly 10 per cent expansion in our money supply, when the United States is talking about a 2 per cent expansion of its money supply. It is regrettable that the Minister of Finance should depend at this time on advice of that sort.

It is apparent that the economic outlook for Canada in the next year or so is dismal because the government is again saying, as it always has said, that what happens here depends on what happens in other countries.

As we approach four o'clock let me say this: the remarks of the Minister of Finance made the day before yesterday reveal that there is no change in the way the Government of Canada is approaching economic policy, no change in its understanding of the fundamental causes of inflation in the country. There is no evidence that it recognizes that high interest rates are no solution to inflation. We are still clinging to the old trade-off idea, to the theory that you can trade off inflation against unemployment. Therefore the economic prospects of the country in the immediate future are dim indeed—unless we can reduce our deficits, borrow less through the public treasury and introduce sound fiscal policy. Otherwise inflation will continue. We may be pleased at the recent drop in inflation rates, caused by what happened recently in the agricultural food industry, but the point is that it was an aberration. Statistics show that we shall face a difficult time for the balance of the fiscal year.

Many hon. members were discouraged last Thursday when they heard the Minister of Finance speak on this bill. We had hoped for something better, for more understanding. We lived through the difficult times of the former minister of finance, and thought there would be some improvement. But what the minister said on Thursday was most discouraging. May I call it four o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[Mr. Gillies.]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier when we discussed procedure with respect to the bill we are debating there was some indication from the opposition of an agreement to complete debating this bill today and vote on it on Monday, subject of course to disposing of the argument raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) called it four o'clock; apparently he received no communication from the opposition House leader.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order too. According to my understanding, House leaders today discussed the length of the debate. I understand that the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) raised a point of order. The Chair reserved decision on the point of order until this first day of next week. We therefore undertook not to debate this matter beyond four o'clock. I cannot presume what the Chair will decide with respect to the point of order. At any rate that was the understanding, and the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) called it four o'clock in accordance with the undertaking.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, with respect, that is not my understanding of the exchange which took place. It took place in the House and will be recorded in today's *Hansard*, which hon. members can consult. If there is to be some adjustment in the terminology used by the opposition House leader, perhaps he may wish to make that adjustment.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I do not think the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) should press so hard and be indiscreet in the matter. Thus far matters between House leaders have gone along well. I want to maintain that relationship. I suggest the hon. member is doing nothing to help it.

● (1600)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin), York South (Mrs. Appolloni), York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), Trinity (Miss Nicholson), Welland (Mr. Railton), York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury), Ontario (Mr. Cafik), Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), Mississauga (Mr. Abbott) and York West (Mr. Fleming), has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2,

R.S.C., 1970, to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario.

It is also my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), Ontario (Mr. Cafik), Nipissing (Mr. Blais), Welland (Mr. Railton), Scarborough West (Mr. Martin), Port Arthur (Mr. Andras), Lincoln (Mr. Andres), Fort William (Mr. McRae), Essex-Windsor (Mr. Whelan), and Algoma (Mr. Foster), has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario.

[*Translation*]

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is also my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Laval (Mr. Roy), Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe), Lévis (Mr. Guay), Matane (Mr. De Bané), Portneuf (Mr. Bussières), Chambly (Mr. Loiselle), LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul (Mr. Campbell), Labelle (Mr. Dupras), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) and Lincoln (Mr. Andres) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec.

Another objection signed by the hon. members for Westmount (Mr. Drury), Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker), Verdun (Mr. Mackasey), Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal), LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul (Mr. Campbell), Laval (Mr. Roy), Dollard (Mr. Goyer), Saint-Jean (Mr. Smith), Saint-Michel (Miss Bégin) and Portneuf (Mr. Bussières) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec.

Another objection signed by the hon. members for Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe), Portneuf (Mr. Bussières), Laval (Mr. Roy), Matane (Mr. De Bané), Lévis (Mr. Guay), Chambly (Mr. Loiselle), Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier), Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Fox), York West (Mr. Fleming) and Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec.

Another objection signed by the hon. members for Berthier-Maskinongé (Mr. Yanakis), Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel), Saint-Boniface (Mr. Guay), Nipissing (Mr. Blais), La Salle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul (Mr. Campbell), Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal), Matane (Mr. De Bané), Chambly (Mr. Loiselle), Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe) and Labelle (Mr. Dupras) has been filed with me pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec.

Emergency Telephone Number

[*English*]

If the House agrees, I suggest we follow past practice and print the text of these six objections as appendices to this day's Votes and Proceedings. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all of these objections being filed, I should like, with the support of the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), to indicate that we in Manitoba are registering no objections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being four o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private member's business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills, private bills.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Agreement has been reached through the usual channels to deal with order No. 52 on page 32 of Monday's order paper, Bill C-252, standing in the name of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson).

Mr. Paproski: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that all bills preceding Bill C-52, appearing in the name of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), be stood at the request of the government and that we proceed with that bill immediately?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[*English*]

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore) moved that Bill C-252, to establish a universal emergency telephone number, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the National Transportation Act by adding immediately after Section 22(1)(i) the following:

(j) provide for the establishment by all Canadian telephone companies of a universal emergency reporting telephone number.

My purpose for proceeding with Bill C-252 this afternoon is not so much in the expectation that the bill will be passed, a rare occurrence in this House for legislation initiated by private members, but rather in the hope that hon. members will see fit to allow the subject matter of the bill to proceed to committee for detailed study and discussion.

Such discussion, I believe, would serve useful purpose in arousing public interest at the local community and municipal level, which is virtually a prerequisite if a universal

emergency telephone number system is to be successful. Indeed this was the goal of the former member for Surrey-White Rock, Barry Mather, who for many years introduced the same type of bill we are debating today. He was known as a member who introduced legislation not so much in the expectation that it would be adopted, but as a prod to the appropriate officials through debate in the House of Commons to move more quickly. On the subject of a universal emergency telephone number, more prodding is needed and, in this regard, I am pleased to take up where the former member left off.

The establishment of a single emergency number through which people can summon police, fire or ambulance help in any city, not only in Canada but in all of North America, and progress in the United States has been very impressive, would be a very important step in the field of public safety. The idea is not new.

An article in the New York *Times* of Saturday, January 13, 1968, by David Burnham, entitled "U.S. Code Planned for Phoning Help" reads in part as follows:

A plan to establish a national emergency telephone number—911—with which police, fire and ambulance services could be summoned from any telephone in the United States was announced yesterday by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Under the plan, a person needing emergency help would dial 911. His call would be switched to a unified dispatching office established in each community by the police, fire and other emergency services, such as hospitals, and appropriate help would be sent.

The establishment of such a number was recommended last year by the President's Crime Commission.

At least one other country, Britain, already has a simple three-digit number—999—with which to summon emergency help.

Almost since its inception, the telephone has been the primary means for reporting an emergency. For years, people have been either dialing the number of a required safety agency or going through an operator for help. Of course, such methods have had inherent disadvantages.

In an emergency, dialing "zero" for the operator or finding the number of a particular agency involves several steps. A call to a telephone company operator requires a second call by the operator to an emergency agency, and this involves time. Fluctuations in the volume of traffic handled by operators sometimes can delay the immediate response to a call. Also, unless one has a keen memory or a handy reference, there is an unavoidable delay in finding the number for an agency.

To anyone who has required emergency assistance, the number of minor problems and nuisances which can make the situation very agonizing are well known. Perhaps just finding a telephone book can be difficult. Often attempting to pick out which police or fire number should be used, in a list of many, requires an in-depth knowledge of municipal boundaries, something many long time residents do not have, let alone visitors. Of course, there is the problem of the pay phone, difficult enough when the person trying to call first had to find a ten cent coin, doubly so now when you need two such coins. Finally, there are the numbers themselves each with a different mind-cracking combination of seven digits, almost guaranteeing that nobody will be able to remember them when they need them most.

I believe the value of one emergency telephone number is obvious. The existence of a single emergency telephone number makes it quicker and easier for anyone to acquire

[Mr. Robinson.]

emergency assistance. The three digit code "911" was chosen because it is a brief and easily remembered number, and because it is compatible with the long range numbering plans and switching configurations of the telephone companies. It has now been reserved as a universal emergency number so that there will be one standard North American emergency service code.

The 911 number is designed to be used, at no charge to the calling party, for direct reporting of emergencies to an answering bureau serving a given area. The answering bureau is staffed and controlled by the major emergency agencies in the community—fire, police, and ambulance services.

The 911 service provides for a faster response to time. The centralized answering bureau where 911 calls are handled, is staffed by specialized personnel who know how to react. Priority calls can be identified and the proper agency sent out on call. An additional and often overlooked benefit is that by co-ordinating all emergency services in the one bureau a community can collect data and analyse the effectiveness of its emergency services and take immediate steps to correct any deficiencies.

● (1610)

The successful implementation of the single emergency telephone number systems has produced a growing awareness of 911 by many communities in North America. I mentioned the great progress which has been made in this regard south of the border. There are now more than 900 "911" systems operating in the United States, ranging in size from 2,000 to 8,000,000 telephones and estimated to be serving more than 30,000,000 people in all.

As for Canada, progress has been steady if not so noticeable. In 1959 Winnipeg became the first North American city with a three-digit emergency reporting system when it cut over to 999. Brandon has a similar service also utilizing the 999 code. Both of these communities have plans under way to convert to 911. Now there are eight operational 911 systems in the communities of Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge and Red Deer in Alberta; London and Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario; Fredericton, New Brunswick, and St. John's, Newfoundland.

I do not feel that a single emergency telephone number system is the be-all and end-all in the field of public safety. It is only one part, and there are a number of problems which still must be resolved. Perhaps the most important of these problems relates to municipal responsibility.

The concept of 911 is a new idea for most local governments. For the first time, the total emergency resources of a community must be coordinated into a total communications network. This is not achieved by simply changing over to a new telephone number. When a municipality considers 911 it must evaluate the existing procedures and systems for handling emergency calls and be prepared to tackle two basic problems.

First, jurisdictional boundaries of emergency agencies seldom coincide with either telephone exchange boundaries or municipal boundaries, but to avoid confusion agencies must be prepared to serve all those within an individual exchange, or in exchanges having local calling with a core exchange where they may not have jurisdiction. Second, all three major emergency services should be

included—police, fire, ambulance. Sometimes individual agencies are reluctant to change their autonomous status because agency administrators may consider command and control of their field resources as a process too important to be shared or delegated to another agency. But regardless of individual agency reluctance to cooperate, an agreement has to be reached at the local level on the establishment of a common answering arrangement.

Free emergency calling and 911 are naturally associated since both provide the public with improved telephone service in time of emergency. The 911 system in London, Ontario, has 73 yellow call boxes located strategically around the city. The call box caller picks up the receiver and gets the answering bureau immediately. No dialing is necessary.

Bell Canada is converting coin telephones across Quebec and Ontario to allow free emergency calling. "Dial-tone first" for coin telephones will enable the user to have access to the operator without a coin in case of an emergency.

In a community offering 911 service the calling party will be able to dial 911 without the deposit when "dial-tone first" is provided. The time-saving advantage is obvious; it will make every public pay telephone a signal box.

Technical innovations and the concentration of sophisticated telephone equipment can greatly enhance emergency services. Techniques are available on order like, "call-hold-and-trace" which holds up the line, the 911 caller uses; the line is frozen and there is a "ring-back" which allows the emergency bureau to ring back a caller. With these features, false alarms and errors can be virtually eliminated thereby increasing public confidence and respect.

I know some will argue that because of jurisdictional and technical problems the subject matter of this bill would best be left with a particular department which has the appropriate expertise to study this subject, rather than to a committee of the House composed of laymen. However, I believe this is an important public matter, one in which the public should have some input. All too often services and programs are structured and designed behind closed doors, and the intended beneficiaries have no say until the services or programs are operational.

There are a number of questions, such as the role of the telephone company and the role of the federal government in the implementation of a universal emergency telephone number, which a committee of the House could and should look into. It may be suggested that this legislation should more properly be an amendment to the Railway Act. However, regardless of this argument the subject matter could still be sent to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

I therefore urge hon. members to allow the subject matter of the bill to proceed to committee.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) for bringing this bill forward. In my own view the House could well give the bill second reading and send it to the standing committee. Its sponsor seems to have some perception, however, that this is not likely to happen, so if there is a motion to send the subject matter to the committee that motion would have our support.

I would also like to thank the hon. member for giving credit to my former colleague, Mr. Barry Mather, who was the member for Surrey-White Rock, for having made this proposal among a number of imaginative ideas he presented to the House from time to time. Since I am in a grateful mood I thank the hon. member also for drawing attention to the fact for some years we have had a 999 system in Winnipeg and also in Brandon. The hon. member is correct in saying the Manitoba telephone system is prepared to make the change to 911 if the proposal can be accepted universally throughout Canada.

As the hon. member pointed out, this is not the be all and end all of public safety, but it is a move in the right direction. I think the proposal he makes does create a situation in which something could be done to establish this universal emergency telephone number. I commend him for the part he has played, I have given him our support, and we hope that during this hour either the bill or the subject matter will be sent to the standing committee.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this debate, as I did back on September 14, 1973, when the then member for Surrey-White Rock, Mr. Mather, advanced his bill for consideration by the House. At that time I said something to the effect that the principle of the bill was so sound in terms of public safety that it ought not to founder on the rocks of any technological difficulty.

I understand there are some jurisdictional difficulties with respect to the measure in terms of the interface of the government with the regional municipalities, and perhaps provincial authorities in the laying out of areas. That is my recollection of some correspondence I have had. This is not to say parliament ought not to take action with respect to the bill, and along with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) I believe that if the bill does not go to the committee then the subject matter should go before the committee for discussion.

I want to say something else with respect to my old friend the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), who advanced the bill today. I have known him for many years. I trust his friends on that side of the House will not hold that against him, and I do not want my hon. friends to hold it against me, either.

● (1620)

If this bill goes to committee today, then perhaps the hon. member will have established a record for himself in that he will have been successful with two bills in the same session of parliament, under a government that has not been known to allow such bills to proceed.

In any event, I think the principle of the bill is sound. The technology is available. There may be some jurisdictional difficulty in terms of the telephone system, but I am informed that the difficulty is not insurmountable. I think the bill ought to go to committee and I commend the hon. member for advancing the principle of the bill. It is a bill which, by the way, has been advanced on other occasions

by members of the opposition, but without the same success that I hope he will enjoy today.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other members in commending the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) on bringing the question of the adoption across Canada of a universal telephone number before the House. I believe it was Bell Canada that in 1968 took the initiative and chose a number to be set aside to serve the whole of North America for emergency use only, the number 911. The value of such a number is obvious. In an emergency people sometimes have difficulty finding the proper number to call. The idea of a central switchboard that would direct calls to the police, firefighting services, drug intervention centres, and poison control centres is a very good one.

Any legislation that we would pass would primarily apply to Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia in view of the jurisdiction we have over the principal telephone systems in those three provinces. Naturally legislation would have to be passed relating to other provinces that have their own telephone systems. I understand that most telephone companies in Canada are co-operating completely in establishing such a system. For example, Bell has new equipment in place to accommodate this single number emergency call.

There is one area in my riding where I hope within the next 12 months new equipment will be put in place to handle not only emergency calls but regular telephone calls. I refer to the Silver Water exchange at the west end of Manitoulin Island where, when equipment is out of service, a person has to drive 25 or 30 miles to re-establish contact, let alone call someone such as a doctor in cases of emergency. I am glad to know that Bell Canada is co-operating, and I hope they will continue to co-operate to the extent of establishing good, workable equipment in all areas, but especially in those rural areas of Canada that still lack proper telephone service.

I understand there is a problem with the bill as presently framed in that it should be an amendment to the Railway Act rather than the National Transportation Act. At the hon. member's suggestion perhaps the subject matter of the bill could be sent to committee rather than the bill itself, if it be the case that the provisions of the National Transportation Act are inappropriate.

To make adoption of this number successful the co-operation of the municipalities and regional governments would be required. It is not merely a case of passing federal legislation approving adoption of this number; there would have to be co-operation with the various municipal agencies such as fire departments, police, drug and poison control centres, and so on. However, any leadership that we would give at the federal level would surely only expedite matters.

I understand that the city of Vancouver has already ordered equipment to handle this universal emergency number, and installation of such equipment is also under consideration in the Cranbrook area. In Alberta, Calgary, Edmonton and Red Deer already have this kind of service under consideration. There are no cities in Saskatchewan that have this service available, but the Saskatchewan telephone system is prepared to offer the service if the municipalities will make a commitment. Negotiations were under way to serve Regina and Saskatoon in 1973.

The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore mentioned that in Winnipeg and Brandon this emergency service is available. In the province of Ontario it has been available in London and Kitchener, covering the services of the fire department, police, poison control centre, ambulance dispatch and so on. So some progress is being made, and any leadership given at the federal level would only speed the process across the country. It would also clear away any additional legislative red tape that might be holding things up. I conclude with those few comments. The hon. member has my support in bringing the matter before parliament so that it can be fully aired.

Mr. Rod Blaker (Lachine-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, may I commence my remarks by saying that the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) has, in my view, introduced an excellent bill. I disagree with some of the criticisms of it made in various documents made available to us.

What interests me most about this bill is that we have reached a point where a good idea is being lost because of the way our system works. Virtually every Friday afternoon we go through this ritual. The hon. member who proposed the bill has rather limited hopes of it ever reaching the transport committee. He is not quite sure whether it will be a member of the opposition or a member of this party who will contribute to talking it out. I am not quite sure of that either, but possibly we might devolve that duty upon the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fleming) whom I see returning to his seat in a fit of panic lest he is called upon to stand up within the next few minutes to speak to the bill.

The point I want to make is that we have gone beyond common sense in terms of this ritual we use to dispose of private members' bills. Unless we can be assured through the means of the Procedure and Organization Committee that this type of destruction of a good idea is stopped and an end is put to the abuse of the proceedings of this House in this way, I suspect at least in my own case this will be one of the last times I will ever again contribute to the disposal of a private members' bill by talking it out or even using up the available time.

● (1630)

I want to point out for the benefit of hon. members, who may have some interest in how we deal with this system, precisely what happens. Every session something like 150 or 200 private members' bills are put down by members. About 50 of these are drawn out of a barrel in the Clerk's office. Those 50 bills are put forward in the order drawn and are brought forward for first reading. Of the 50 I do not recall the actual number but I would doubt that more than three or four ever reach committee. Right from the start no distinction is made between bills that are improperly drawn and perfectly good bills.

If one looks at the British system one will see the contrast. What happens there is that when a member's name comes up or is drawn, he is entitled to go to the government and look for such legislation as might be supported by the government. Then he can go to the com-

munity and invite the community or the country to put forward ideas which he might be able to incorporate in that particular piece of legislation. What happens at the end of the process is that he has access to the government and the departments thereof in the preparation of his bill, instead of what we have today.

The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore has put down a perfectly worthy bill. I would refer to the fact that a similar bill was brought forward a few years ago by Mr. Mather of the New Democratic Party. Instead of the government being of any assistance to the hon. member we find that the government, both in the departmental sense and in the conduct of its members in this House, does everything possible, including the provision of argument against this bill, to stop it.

An hon. Member: They do not have to.

Mr. Blaker: The hon. member says that they do not have to. The difficulty we are faced with is that naturally for the opposition it has become an amusing tradition to suggest that all such bills go to committee. The committee system and the House are already so jammed with legislation, because of the terrific slowing down of the pace by the opposition, that additional legislation cannot be handled.

An hon. Member: That is not the reason.

Mr. Blaker: I do not intend to instruct the hon. member, but this is common knowledge. The hon. member knows full well that the function of the opposition is to delay legislation. I would suggest to him that he not shake his head, because that is precisely what he is here for.

Let us look at some of the benefits of this piece of legislation we have before us, and some of its history. This 911 system was made the subject of an executive decision of Bell Telephone throughout North America and of British Columbia Telephone back in 1968.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Matane on a point of order.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is drinking a glass of milk, and I think he is not giving a good example. It is not the place for it.

An hon. Member: He just hid it in the drawer. He has to withdraw behind the curtains.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is only tea and I am halfway out of the Chamber.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the point of order is valid. Really the hon. member whose name was mentioned should withdraw a little further behind the curtains.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, on this same point of order, I would like to point out to you that there is not any representative from the NDP in the House at the present time.

[*English*]

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to your attention the fact that even though the hon. member might have been drinking something other than water, he is in this House all day every day, and he is also a Manitoban and a good parliamentarian, so I side with him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must say to hon. members that it is not the responsibility of the Chair to take a roll call of the House. I recognize again the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker).

Mr. Blaker: That was a very interesting interlude, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has been so heavily attacked for drinking tea in the House when we all know that not too long ago in the days of Sir John A. Macdonald it was the habit to replace the water in the glass with another fluid equally clear, but more powerful than tea. However, those days are gone.

I want to stress what I said earlier about the validity of this bill. One of the first arguments we get against the bill is that it is redundant in that the principal telephone carriers that are subject to federal jurisdiction, Bell Canada and B.C. Telephone, already have expressed willingness to co-operate with the municipalities in this regard. That kind of argument further suggests that if we were to pass legislation in the face of their willingness this would somehow irk the two telephone companies and that it would be better if we did not pass the legislation because we would get the 911 system faster. I do not think it is very difficult to point out not only the fallaciousness but the absolute naiveté of such a silly argument. The argument that these two companies are prepared to go into this business and therefore we ought not to pass the legislation is a completely useless argument.

The next argument we get against the bill is that there are jurisdictional or constitutional difficulties. Well, we cannot pass any piece of legislation in Canada without some kind of jurisdictional difficulties. I think the citizens are fed up listening to that argument, and as a member of parliament I am getting fed up with that argument.

The 911 system is a perfectly valid idea. There are 45 million Americans being served in that way now. I think a red herring is being dragged across the face of the hon. member's bill. At the very least it can be argued that the bill should be referred to the Transport Committee so that the jurisdictional aspects could be considered and reviewed. Instead of that we have this attack in which no one makes any valid representations.

The final argument I have heard—and I should mention that these arguments appeared three years ago—is that it should be under the Railway Act rather than under the National Transportation Act. That is neither here nor there. The hon. member has pointed out that nothing under the procedures of this House prevents us sending the subject matter to the relevant committee. That argument, rather interestingly, goes on to suggest that in any event the governor in council may soon be authorized by regula-

tion to put in a 911 system. This is another insanity. If the governor in council may be authorized to put in that type of system then obviously the 911 system is valid, and obviously a solution will be found to the constitutional and jurisdictional difficulties.

What we get during the private members' hour is a situation in which a particularly good suggestion made by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore now must be dealt with through a lot of circular and fallacious arguments, to the effect that the tradition has grown up that a private member's bill will not be allowed to go to committee.

● (1640)

Members may or may not be aware that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization has recently established a sub-committee, headed I believe by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane), on this subject of private members' bills. I would point out to hon. members my hope that we will adopt the British system according to which, when members come in with a good idea, instead of their own party and hon. members opposite fighting the idea, we all get together, agree it is a good idea, and send the bill in question to committee.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Go ahead and tell your colleague that.

Mr. Blaker: I just did. We have spent three years on this emergency No. 911. Going back, we find the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker)—who left the House for a moment, I suppose—spoke three years ago on September 14 on this subject. Mr. Barry Mather, who was the member for Surrey-White Rock, spoke on the same subject. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McRae) spoke on the subject. He raised arguments about constitutional problems.

The hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen), now Minister of National Revenue, spoke on the subject and expressed concern about a universal emergency telephone system not being feasible without the co-operation of municipalities that must agree to consolidate in emergency services. We are hearing all this again today.

The hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) also spoke on the subject. He said that this should be put under the Railway Act rather than the Transportation Act. We are hearing the same arguments today.

The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) spoke on the subject. He did not spend too much time on the No. 911 issue but he spent a fair amount of time trying to define what emergency is. We are hearing that again today.

None of these arguments validate the practice we have developed in the private members' hour of rejecting a bill which, on the face of it, every member who has yet spoken, has suggested we should send to committee. In the normal process, we hear members speak for 20 minutes—I did not notice the time at which I started. This means that after I conclude speaking some other member of the House will have to rise and face the unpleasant duty of having to repeat the same arguments. Than, when we come to five o'clock, if things go as they usually do 99 times out of 100, the bill will be talked out.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): How about letting it go to committee? Move the motion right now.

Mr. Blaker: That may be a good idea. The hon. member knows as I do, that the moment I sit down, another member will get to his feet and will go through the same procedure; possibly it will even be the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications who has been the object of some of my needling in that regard this afternoon.

I would like to conclude by saying that I think this process could change. I am hopeful that hon. members the parliamentary secretaries, as well as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) who I know takes a great deal of interest in procedural matters, will hear what I am saying and give us a reform of procedures so that ideas such as the one in the bill of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore can be sent to committee and will no longer be talked out in this improper and completely silly fashion.

Some hon. Members: Question!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I will try not to be the one to which my hon. colleague from Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker) has alluded when he spoke before me, and not to be responsible, as we say in the usual parliamentary language, for "killing" the bill, that is to try to make the discussion last till five o'clock with the result that unfortunately, the bill would be put off undefinitely.

I simply want to make some remarks and warmly congratulate my hon. colleague and friend, the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), the representative of this beautiful and great City of Toronto which, as we know, is going through a tremendous expansion in the social and economic field as well in the culinary and artistic ones. I am proud, as a Montreal representative, to take every opportunity which comes my way to consolidate a little more the friendship between the City of Montreal, one of whose riding I represent, and the City of Toronto he is representing with such dignity.

Mr. Speaker, needless to say that, Toronto—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: Of course my hon. colleague applauds with some delay because he has just heard my remarks, since with interpretation you have to wait a little and not talk too fast so that the nice compliments I made to the beautiful city of Toronto can arrive to the other end of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak for a long time about Toronto which, as everyone knows, is certainly one of the most progressive—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must remind the hon. member that the bill before us proposes the installation of a universal telephone number which Canadians could use in emergencies and, in my opinion, the moment is not appropriate to praise the city of Toronto or talk about the Olympics in Montreal.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that I am at fault and accept your call to order. You, who know me so

well, know that I take every possible opportunity I am given in the House to try, through my remarks, whatever the subject, to show that people from another part of the country, who speak another tongue, also like to take advantage of those opportunities to indicate that there can be unity in our country. I therefore did not hesitate to go slightly beyond the subject before the House and take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I do thank you for having called me to order. It is your duty to do so and you do it with so much spirit. This is one opportunity of saying so because we know presiding over this House, especially during Friday's private members' hour, is no simple task. I see nothing out of order in congratulating you in passing, while we are studying this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is really serious. Unfortunately, my hon. colleague for Lachine-Lakeshore—I do not know whether there is a connotation between Lachine-Lakeshore and Toronto-Lakeshore—but he is right in saying that hon. members can take this opportunity to use it ill-advisedly, frivolously, in thoughtless remarks that have nothing to do with the subject before the House.

But as long as we will persist in this House in refusing to change the orders, and I regret that my good friend the President of the Privy Council is not in the House at the moment because I wish he could hear this, as long as we will persist, and more particularly the opposition, in refusing to change the orders of the House, we will unfortunately always be forced to study legislation such as this—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that everybody in the House is for the bill because they realize it is an important bill, I wonder if we could not have unanimous agreement to have the bill sent to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Fleming: I simply want to point out that I said "no" in case there is any question as to unanimous consent, and I hope later on to have the opportunity to address myself to the reasons why.

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the other official language of this country to reassure my friend, the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore, that I do not intend to kill the bill. There are still a few minutes left and if the bill is killed it will not be by the hon. member for Saint-Denis.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): You are not giving it the guillotine treatment.

Emergency Telephone Number

● (1650)

[*English*]

Mr. Prud'homme: If the hon. member from the great, beautiful island of Victoria has anything to say, I am ready at any time to sit down and listen to his views, but if he does not want to participate I do not see why he should interrupt me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: It is obvious that time after time we come back with good proposals which we either suggest be sent to committee or which we kill here during these private members' hours. I was saying that as long as we refuse to change the rules of this House, I intend to use them to show, perhaps by not being too serious, how important it is now to change the rules of the House so that the House can be more productive. There is no way—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Prud'homme: I will go back to the subject matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The House was very understanding when the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker) spoke about this aspect of the problem, but in all his comments he did succeed in expressing at least one valid opinion about the bill. I hope that the hon. member will also have the opportunity to speak about the subject of the bill before closing.

Mr. Prud'homme: I shall do so immediately, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we have all recognized the speeches that were made in 1973 on this same subject, and especially that made on September 14, 1973 by our distinguished colleague, Mr. Barry Mather, former member for Surrey-White Rock, who unfortunately no longer sits in this House. As the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore said, we could use nearly the same arguments today.

However, I would like to tell my hon. friend from Toronto-Lakeshore not to get discouraged. I have myself introduced the same bills for several years before the government accepted the facts and decided to enact them. I am speaking about Bill C-20, amending the Citizenship Act, which will soon be enacted, and which will, I hope, reduce from five to three years the period of residency required before becoming a Canadian citizen.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that among the major arguments that have been used today, there is one which is more striking, that is the one stating that we shall need the co-operation of municipal authorities. By saying municipal authorities, we mean the creatures of the provincial governments, which means that we shall therefore need the co-operation of provincial governments.

I therefore wonder why we could not deal with the provincial authorities which, in fact, are constitutionally responsible for municipalities, so that they may together find an effective way to act as quickly as possible on this excellent idea of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore.

When one considers the number of bills which are at present involved as a result of the hon. member's suggestion, one realizes, for example, that the city of Calgary and the city of Edmonton, those large metropolises of the Canadian West, Lethbridge in southern Alberta, an extraordinary city which I urge all hon. members to visit some day, Red Deer in Alberta, Toronto and London in Ontario, this bastion of the great other Canadian culture—I emphasize those words—Kitchener, Waterloo, in Ontario, Fredericton in New Brunswick, St. John, all could benefit by this, which means the hon. member should not be discouraged, since the idea which had been brought to the consideration of the House in 1973 by our good and distinguished colleague from Surrey-White Rock has been gradually making its way and we are now moving in that direction.

But I would not like this initiative to be exclusively federal. I would like my hon. colleague . . . I will not say any more after that, Mr. Speaker, I would like all of us to realize that we are dealing primarily and above all with an issue under another political jurisdiction and a marvellous idea such as this one could become the centre of idle controversies. Therefore I urge him to keep fighting to broadcast this idea, which is intrinsically good, while remembering to seek federal and provincial participation. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, since everyone seems to be for this bill but there are one or two more who want to speak, could we not have unanimous consent to sit until 5:30?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Mr. Paproski: Who said no?

Mr. Jim Fleming (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, in the events of the last few moments I am not sure who said no and who said yes to what, and where, and when. I recall saying no several times and yes several times, and I will try to sort it out later and let hon. members know on which side I was yes and on which side I was no.

I hope in the several minutes remaining that I can make it clear, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications, that while I too commend the spirit of this private member's bill, and I understand the point made by the hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker) about the system, the fact of the matter is that I am not convinced that it would be practical to refer the subject matter, much less the actual material, to committee. I say that for reasons which I think to some degree have already come out in debate, but principally because too often people look to the Government of Canada, the senior level of government, as the cure all for their problems.

Here is a proposal to do something which would be of real benefit to all Canadians, to establish by passage of this legislation, as put forward, an emergency number for all Canadians in Centres across our country which is not only a common number across Canada but which would be common to all North America. We have great numbers of tourists coming back and forth, but the fact is that passing this law will not mean a blamed thing as far as carrying it out and making it effective is concerned, whether we pass this on in spirit or in fact, because we have jursidiction over only four of the ten provinces in Canada, and therefore we cannot force the telephone companies in six of our ten provinces to do a blamed thing about it.

For practical purposes, discussion and bringing this subject forward are worth while. I can appreciate the frustration of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) in not seeing something developed more quickly because of the very nature of Canada and the division of authority, but I would be very disappointed if hon. members on all sides really believed, when we have so many problems day to day in trying to explain to our constituents the misunderstanding of where authority lies for what problem, that today on this issue we would try to convince them that we can solve it through simply passing this off to committee. Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. It being five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 2 p.m.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, March 29, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF REPORT OF LAW REFORM COMMISSION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the latest report of the Law Reform Commission which recommends the abolition from the Criminal Code of such offences as incest, abortion, drug offences, obscenity, pornography and acts of indecency, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander):

That this report on our criminal law be referred immediately for study to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs due to the ramifications of these proposals and the fact that the Minister of Justice has stated that he intends to introduce legislation to implement some of the Law Reform Commission's recommendations.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

SUGGESTED PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO COMPANY'S OBJECTIVES IN NEWFOUNDLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. The evidence of a deterioration in rail freight and express service in the province of Newfoundland prompts the need for an investigation into the terms of union between Canada and that province.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House order a public inquiry be initiated into the CNR's future objectives to ensure adequate service in that province and to allow for the province's participation in over-all transportation policy for Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED SETTLEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH AIRCRAFT SAFETY INSPECTORS AND CHECKING OF PILOTS' LICENCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on an important matter of pressing necessity.

In view of the fact that aircraft safety inspectors walked out at major airports in Ontario and Quebec last Friday as a result of a breakdown in wage negotiations and that this is a possible first step toward a nationwide work stoppage which could affect airline service, and furthermore, since the Department of Transport is aware that 11 Air Canada pilots are flying with invalid licences as a result of unauthorized company check flights, which not only contravenes section 400 of the air regulations but also creates a safety hazard, and in light of the fact that commercial airline licences are expiring at the rate of 100 per day, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn):

That the President of the Treasury Board become personally involved in the negotiations between the aircraft safety inspectors and the Ministry of Transport, that the Minister of Transport take the necessary action to guarantee that no pilots are flying with invalid licences as a result of unauthorized checks and that section 400 of the air regulations is strictly enforced with no extensions.

Mr. Speaker: Before presentation of such a motion the provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

● (1410)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. REISMAN AND DEPUTY MINISTER

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. In the

telephone conversation concerning the LRPA financing which was held between the Deputy Minister of National Defence and Mr. Reisman, did Mr. Reisman suggest to Mr. Nixon how financing could be arranged?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the conversation on the telephone between the deputy minister and Mr. Reisman did concern ways in which the financing could be achieved. That was its purpose, but I do not have the details of that conversation. I expect that they discussed more than one option.

Mr. Paproski: I guess so.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, it is rather surprising the minister would know now, when formerly he was in ignorance about it, that they did discuss financing. I would have thought the first question he would have put to his deputy minister would have concerned the details of the conversation. Could the minister tell us if the deal suggested by Mr. Reisman is substantially the same as the arrangements the minister has proposed or is proposing to the cabinet?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister has made clear to me that there were no representations made on behalf of Lockheed and that there was no attempt to persuade him to take any particular course of action. They were both looking at the matter in a very constructive way in an attempt to find a solution to the problem and achieve the purchase of the aircraft so badly required by the Canadian armed forces.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, could the minister in his next answer tell us who initiated the conversation between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Reisman and perhaps at that time he would clarify how he can consider a conversation, suggesting how Mr. Reisman's employer could close a contract with the government, could be anything but a representation from Mr. Reisman?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously in the House the deputy minister is not certain. He cannot recall in his own mind whether he instituted the call or whether it came from Mr. Reisman.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Richardson: But there were altogether three telephone conversations. However, I cannot confirm whether Mr. Reisman called Mr. Nixon or whether Mr. Nixon first called Mr. Reisman.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to seek an interview with his own deputy to find out what he and Mr. Reisman talked about and whether it was very similar to his findings?

Mr. Richardson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have done that. I will have further conversations with the deputy minister, but I think the conversations he had with Mr. Reisman were essentially constructive. As I tried to say, they were attempting to solve a difficult problem.

[Mr. McKinnon.]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—TERMS AND DATE OF CONTRACT WITH REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, again this question is addressed to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the answers he has just given with regard to his own lack of knowledge and, laying those answers against his statement to the House a few days ago that there was no impropriety in respect of the contract, I think at least his earlier statement implied that he had made a thorough review of the contract and his statements today indicate that he really does not know the answer with regard to any arrangements. Could the minister inform the House at what date Lockheed retained Reisman and Grandy Limited, and the terms and conditions of their employment by Lockheed, particularly the size and the terms or particulars of any retainer that was paid to them and the financial arrangements that may have been made between Lockheed and Reisman and Grandy in view of the importance of these representations of which the minister is not now so sure?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, with respect may I say that I think those are questions which should be asked either of Lockheed or Reisman and Grandy. I do not ask the Lockheed Company who their lawyers are or what arrangements they have with a lawyer or any other professional.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The minister is quite right. That should be asked of the company. I suggest he should ask them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In view of the ongoing relationship between this government and Reisman and Grandy, this House is entitled to know when the firm of Reisman and Grandy was established, and when it was retained by Lockheed. Was it before or after the date on which the government announced its decision to buy the LRPA. I submit that the government ought to answer these questions.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I have already made it clear that the government's decisions in principle to purchased the long-range patrol aircraft was made in November. To the best of my knowledge, the telephone conversations between my deputy minister and Mr. Reisman, all took place in the new year, in January.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The extent of the minister's knowledge about this contract disturbs the House, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister review in *Hansard* my previous supplementary question to him, in which I asked when the firm of Reisman and Grandy was established, and when it was first retained by Lockheed. I asked this because there are many unanswered questions concerning relations between the firm and the government.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF OBTAINING DETAILS FROM UNITED STATES CONCERNING BRIBES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I, too, address my question to the Minister of National Defence. Last Thursday, when I questioned him about pay-offs by Lockheed connected with the purchase of aircraft, he suggested I was inviting him to engage in a kind of witch hunt and that there ought to be no investigation until there is something definite to investigate. I understand that the minister is seeking information in writing from Washington. Can we now assume that there is something definite to investigate?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, of course, we are holding conversations with senior officials of the United States government. As indicated previously, we want their assurances about the financial stability of the Lockheed company. We are also talking about industrial benefits to Canada and about moving production tooling and equipment to this country. We want assurances on those things. As I said only last week, I wanted written confirmation from the United States government before proceeding with this contract, but I did not say that, in those discussions, we were trying to find out if improper payments had been made. We are dealing with at least three departments of the United States government and if improper payments have been made, or there is something about which they want to tell us, I am sure they will tell us. But that is not the basis on which we are approaching them, and not the kind of information for which we are asking.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister follow the procedures suggested by the American authorities, namely, apply to the Department of Justice for full information about this matter, including, if there is such information, information relating to any impropriety in Canada. Will he ask for all documents to be made available to the Canadian Department of Justice, so that after they have been studied the Canadian people can be assured there is nothing to be concerned about? I suggest that is important.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it might help if I were to quote from a press article, something I do not do often. It might be helpful in these circumstances. According to the Toronto *Star:*

> A legislative aide to Senator Frank Church, whose Senate subcommittee is investigating the Lockheed bribery scandals, has been kept busy lately dealing with queries from foreign correspondents anxious to know if their countries were involved in bribe attempts.
>
> 'There is no evidence,' the aide said yesterday, 'that Canada was the subject of any bribe attempts to sell airplanes. Or Australia. Or any Commonwealth country, for that matter.'

● (1420)

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING COST BY PURCHASING AIRFRAMES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the minister would be well advised to get it officially and not just from a single Senator, however distinguished he may be—in fact, an aide to the Senator. That is very inadequate evidence to deal with a billion dollar contract. I want to switch a bit. Has the minister given consideration to the prices paid by Australia for Lockheed airframes and has he considered whether the same method of dealing with the problem might cut down the overall cost substantially?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am certain that we can cut the cost at any time and have an aircraft that does not do the job. When this aircraft has been completed, we will have the most effective long-range patrol aircraft in service anywhere in the world. I might say, as a result of my recent visits to Norway and with our NATO partners, this aircraft is needed in the North Atlantic. I think we should get on with this purchase.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF ADVANTAGEOUS POLICY FOR INDUSTRIAL MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Given the statement just made today on Parliament Hill by the minister to the milk producers who had come to meet him, in which he told these milk producers, and through them all Canadian milk producers, that he agreed with them that they should continue to produce milk on a profitable basis, can the minister tell the House if he is expecting sure profits for these industrial milk producers during the dairy year 1976-77?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, if they produce within the quota allocated to them, they will have a profit.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question.

Since part of the surplus of fluid milk ends up as industrial milk and thus increases the industrial milk surplus, could the minister tell the House if he accepts that this surplus from fluid milk producers be penalized in the same way as the surplus produced by industrial milk producers?

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, we have a supply management committee made up of producer organizations from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They are the ones who decide on how the quota should be allocated. I want to make it clear that I said outside the House what I said in this House before, there is a limit to production. They should not produce a product that is going to waste.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE MINISTER AWARE LOCKHEED RETAINED REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of National Defence is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Victoria. Notwithstanding the affirmation the minister made in the House on March 22 when he said in reply to the hon. member for Victoria that no payments or commissions had been made by Lockheed to any Canadian, and we now know that that statement was not true because of the fact that they retained the firm of Reisman and Grandy—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McGrath: —when did the minister determine that this firm, representing two former senior deputy ministers, was retained by Lockheed and what did he do when he came into possession of that knowledge?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as I believe I indicated in an earlier answer, I first heard that the firm of Reisman and Grandy had been engaged by the Lockheed Company sometime last month. In other words, it was fairly recently. When one refers, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member did in his question, to payments and tries to compare a payment for a professional service with an improper payment or a bribe, I think we should be very clear we are talking about two different things. Of course, Lockheed makes payments. I suppose they pay their hotel bills when they are in Canada, too.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Richardson: No doubt, as other corporations are entitled to do, they engage professional advice, whether lawyers, accountants or consultants. This is quite different from bribery and I think that should be made very clear.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY WHETHER REISMAN AND GRANDY MADE PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): When the minister did learn that this firm was representing the Lockheed company did he then contact the partners in the firm, given the public knowledge that the Lockheed company has been involved in pay-offs in other countries in connection with similar contracts? Did the minister contact Messrs. Reisman and Grandy to determine whether or not they had made any payments for any reason whatesoever to any individual in Canada, and, if not, why not?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think we are dealing with two separate issues. There is the question whether or not senior civil servants should become consultants shortly after their retirement. The House has addressed itself to that issue and the Prime Minister has responded. Until that question is further defined and guidelines have been established, it is not practical or appropriate for me to suggest that the Lockheed company cannot use consulting services any more than any of the other major corporations which are clients of this firm and other consulting firms.

[Mr. Whelan.]

Mr. McGrath: Since this particular firm happens to consist of two former senior deputy ministers—the deputy minister of finance and the deputy minister of industry, trade and commerce—and since it now represents the interests of the Lockheed company in Canada and is involved with the Government of Canada in determining a way out of the financing difficulties, is it now the minister's intention to meet with the principals of this firm to determine exactly what their interest is with the Lockheed company and what their interest is with any other Canadians, including those in the Government of Canada?

Mr. Richardson: No, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to talk to this company about all the other arrangements they have with other clients. There is a long list of Canadian corporations which are clients of this firm. I do not consider it my job to talk with the company about that.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY CONTRACT WITH MR. CRUTCHLOW DELAYING SIGNING OF CONTRACT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Might I direct a further question to the Minister of National Defence and ask him whether or not Mr. Crutchlow or any other individual in his department or in the Department of Supply and Services entered into any contract calling for the expenditure of any funds up to this point in time which was not properly authorized and if that is the situation, as has been reported, is this a factor which is holding up the signing of the final contract with Lockheed?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): I do not know of any authorization of that type.

Mr. Forrestall: Is the minister telling the House that he has no information with respect to Mr. Crutchlow entering into any contract or undertaking with Lockheed for the expenditure of any funds prior to the actual signing of the contract? If this understanding is correct can the minister indicate on what basis Lockheed has gone ahead and spent, up to this point, something in the nature of between $10 million and $12 million in work-up expenditures before the contract has been signed?

Mr. Richardson: I was not referring to the current expenditures which I said are taking place on engineering studies. I was referring specifically to the question about Mr. Crutchlow. I do not know his part particularly. But the Department of Supply and Services did accept the offer which was made to us by Lockheed; that offer was accepted in principle following the decision of the government to purchase these aircraft. As I have indicated before, there are some costs related primarily to engineering and design. There are no production costs at the present time. There are some costs which have been incurred which no doubt would have to be negotiated in the event of termination of the contract, but as we are still proceeding to complete the contract that is a rather hypothetical question.

● (1430)

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR ARRANGING FOR DESIGN STUDIES BEFORE CONTRACT SIGNED

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I hate like the devil to pose hypothetical questions to the minister because I know he is so precise in his responses, so might I direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Supply and Services. Upon what authority did the Minister of Supply and Services enter into any arrangement whatever with Lockheed for the commencement of any engineering, design or work-up studies prior to the signing of a final contract?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, we told Lockheed Aircraft Corporation that we intended to contact it, and of course this came after a requisition from the Department of National Defence. There is at present no formal contract with this company. Since his question does require an answer, I would ask the hon. member whether he would agree to grant me one or two days to answer with more precision so that the interests of Canada and of the government are better protected.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister which follows from the answer of the Minister of Supply and Services. In view of the interest in this contract and the very large sum involved, and in view of the very legitimate questions that have arisen as a result of problems that are outside the minister's domain, I wonder whether the minister would talk to the House leader and, either through the guise of estimates or some other procedural method, have this whole matter referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, so that very detailed questions can be asked and very definite answers given by the minister in order to help explain the situation, and so we will not take up the whole question period over the next few days asking questions and trying to get answers?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this subject was before the standing committee last week when numerous questions of a detailed nature were asked and answered.

Mr. Nowlan: A further supplementary question. I appreciate in part the minister's answer, but in view of the fact that some of Lockheed's problems arose out of either public or private meetings of some committees in the States, I would ask the minister to consider a public meeting, or is there a possibility of exploring the matter through a private meeting of the external affairs and national defence committee so hon. members can ask questions and get answers from the minister? As far as I am concerned, I do not want to see an LRPA jeopardized because of some corporate problems of an international company.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that the hon. member is trying to find ways to purchase these aircraft rather than ways of not doing so. I would be prepared to meet with the committee or anyone else who wants to discuss the subject. Of course, I think that the calling of a committee meeting is the responsibility of the committee concerned.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF FUNDS AVAILABLE AT NATIONAL DEFENCE TO FINANCE PRODUCTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Supply and Services. Since the minister has said he would do some further investigating of the Lockheed contract, would he also check this out. The Minister of National Defence stated that Lockheed was aware of the fact that the Department of National Defence did not have sufficient funds available to proceed with the LRPA contract and that Lockheed gave a verbal assurance that it would provide the interim financing. On the other hand, the Minister of Supply and Services is saying that financing is the responsibility of DND and he will not say whether he knew that DND had only $30 million available or whether he knew about Lockheed's verbal assurance to provide interim financing.

In an effort to clear up the confusion surrounding this contract once and for all, I should like to ask the minister whether he was aware that DND had only $30 million available to start production of the LRPA, and was he aware that Lockheed had made a verbal agreement with DND to provide the interim financing itself?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. McKenzie: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister think that it was wise of the Department of Supply and Services to proceed to negotiate a contract with Lockheed which required first year payments of more than $100 million on the strength of nothing more than a verbal assurance?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I said that my department received a requisition from the Department of National Defence and under the Financial Administration Act, when we receive a requisition from a department, we are assured that the financing is provided.

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DISCUSSION OF FINANCING WITH EMERGENCY LOAN GUARANTEE BOARD OF UNITED STATES

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Defence. Is the government aware that a $300 million borrowing by Lockheed for the Orion program would require approval by the emergency loan guarantee board, a United States agency; and in view of the suggestion that Canada should be the guarantor, has the government discussed this matter with the emergency loan guarantee board of the United States and, if not, why not?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the government has discussed this matter and is, of course, aware that their authorization is required.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the last question put to the Minister of National Defence. In the negotiations that the minister entered into initially, did he make those inquiries of the United States concerning the emergency loan guarantee board in order to determine whether there were any problems in connection with the Lockheed Corporation?

Mr. Richardson: No, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge my officials did not do that. They talked with the Lockheed Corporation, which indicated to them that they could arrange the financing.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE REQUEST FROM REISMAN AND GRANDY TO BE RELEASED FROM OATH CONCERNING SECRECY OF INFORMATION—SUGGESTED INQUIRY

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The provisions of the Public Service Employment Act provide for a certain oath of secrecy. That oath specifically provides, and I quote, "that I will not, without due authority in that behalf, disclose or make known any matter that comes to my knowledge by reason of such employment". Has the minister or any member of his government had authority requested by either of Messrs. Reisman or Grandy, or their consulting firm, to release any information that they have acquired as a result of their duties with the government?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Leggatt: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer the minister has just given, and in view of the fact that it is unlikely that any specific authority was requested, would the minister now consider establishing an inquiry to ascertain if information has been released in violation of Schedule III, the oath of secrecy under the Public Service Employment Act, in view of the contractual relationship existing between Lockheed and the two former deputy ministers?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I would think that that matter would normally come within the wider considerations which we discussed a moment ago, which have been addressed by the Prime Minister, concerning guidelines for senior servants, which is of wider scope than this particular relationship with one company.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASONS FOR DELAY IN SIGNING, OTHER THAN FINANCING

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. I should like to know what other items are holding up the transaction with Lockheed apart from the question of interim financing.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, it is the interim financing or short-term financing that is the primary problem. As is widely known, shortly after that problem emerged the Lockheed company got into difficulties as a result of accusations concerning improper payments in other parts of the world. This had or appeared to have some effect on their financial stability and their ability to carry on, so that became a secondary problem. We are trying to solve both problems, first of all the production phase financing and, secondly, our conviction supported by a statement by the United States government that the Lockheed is financially viable and can in fact complete the contract. I believe we are working successfully towards a solution.

* * *

● (1440)

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FLOUR AND GRAIN RAIL SUBSIDIES BE REMOVED ONLY AFTER SEAWAY TOLLS INCREASED

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Will he in the interest of retaining the balance of competition between Halifax and Saint John on the one hand and Montreal on the other remove the flour and grain rail subsidies only after seaway tolls are increased, and not before?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a bill dealing with the subject is before the House. I do not think the two items need to be directly related.

* * *

INCOME TAX

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE ALLOWABLE EXPENSES FOR VOLUNTEER FIREMEN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Because of the fact that under the Income Tax Act volunteer firemen are only allowed a total of $300 annually to cover all expenses, would the minister give consideration to raising this allowance so it will better reflect present day costs? This $300 allowance has not been upgraded for many years now and these volunteer firemen do a tremendous service to many municipalities throughout the country.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, after the suggestion of the hon. gentleman I will take it under consideration.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE LOTTERY WILL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ADVERTISING

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, because the government continues to see fit to operate without a Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, which in fact may be an improvement, I am forced to put my question to the Postmaster General. In view of the fact there were numerous incidents in past Olympic lotteries where some winning tickets were unsold, thus making the preceding advertising campaign misleading vis-à-vis the outcome, would the minister assure this House, particularly since he is supposed to be so closely related with COJO, that all future Olympic lotteries will in fact comply with the advertising campaign and, if not, will he take immediate steps to have them altered accordingly?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has checked into the advertising concerning the lottery and found nothing improper. It provides, in fact, for the precise number of prizes promised providing all tickets are sold.

Some hon. Members: Provided.

Mr. Mackasey: It is obvious that because of the computer type of operations in the selection of winning numbers, when certain tickets are not sold there is the possibility that certain prizes may not be drawn but are added to the next particular draw. I might add that I do not know if I am any closer to COJO, Mr. Speaker, than the hon. gentleman who I see most Sunday afternoons on CTV talking about the Olympics.

Mr. Jelinek: Very plainly, Mr. Speaker, can the minister or the government assure the House that there will be as many prizes awarded in the Olympic lotteries in future as there are advertised, which has not been the case in the past?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I think we have that assurance. Changes have been made in the method of distribution. I am not in charge of the lottery, however, I am in charge of the coins.

* * *

MANPOWER

SUGGESTION BY EMPRESS HOTEL TO MISS POULIOT THAT QUEBEC OUTSIDE CANADA—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Manpower and Immigration been informed of the response given to Miss Danielle Pouliot, a resident of Valleyfield, Quebec, and a student at the Sherbrooke University, who had sought employment at the Empress Hotel in Victoria, British Columbia; a response which was dated March 8 and made public in the Montreal press over the weekend which stated in part, and this was underlined in red: "Unfortunately, we are not in a position to offer employment to those residing outside of Canada"?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the verbal notice the hon. member gave me of this question just before the question period. I think the most charitable explanation would be that the hotel, and I am not apologizing for them because it is their responsibility, must have made an error, because that kind of answer, of course, is both incorrrect and unacceptable.

Mr. Wagner: Mr. Speaker, in view of this excellent answer of the minister, for which I thank him, will he undertake to have his officials contact the chairman of the CPR or CP Rail in order that all personnel of these companies are clearly told that Quebec is, until further notice, part of Canada and that such a display of silliness is unacceptable?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will supply me with copies of the correspondence I will be glad to take it up with Mr. Sinclair and let him know how we feel about it.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

BRITISH COLUMBIA—SUGGESTED NEED FOR REORGANIZATION OF STAFF—CONFIDENCE OF MINISTER IN ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, since a high turnover rate has been usually accepted as one indication of poor morale, and in view of the fact that 33 of the 43 members of the socialization division of the British Columbia Penitentiary resigned or transferred in 1975, and 75 per cent of the custody division are in the service less than six months, will the Solicitor General not agree that the administration of the B.C. Penitentiary requires some immediate and undivided attention to bring about radical reorganization of the staff structure as well as philosophy?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the same rules apply to the B.C. Penitentiary as apply to many other penitentiaries. There are problems at the B.C. Penitentiary but I have doubts as to whether they are due to the administration of that particular penitentiary. I think this will become more clear when the reports of the two recent incidents are published.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, as an aftermath of the second hostage taking at the B.C. Penitentiary a month ago the staff unanimously voted no confidence in the administrator while the Solicitor General wrote to him expressing his confidence. Can the minister tell the House whether he still has unqualified confidence in the administrator and what steps he has taken to bring unity to the administration of the British Columbia Penitentiary?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I still stand by that statement, and I think when the hon. member sees the reports

to which I referred he may be ready to change his ideas as well.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF REDUCTION OR INCREASE IN CHEESE IMPORTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I shall put my question to his parliamentary secretary.

In view of the demonstration held by the producers of industrial milk of Canada at noon today, and bearing in mind the representations they made about their problems with regard to their product, I should like to ask, first, whether the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce works in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture with regard to cheese imports, and second, whether those imports will decrease or increase in the coming dairy year? If so, could the minister tell the House why this should be so?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this morning I met representatives of the Agricultural Producers' Union and industrial milk producers. We reviewed the whole policy of cheese imports and I assured the producers that there will be no increase in the import of cheeses already produced in Canada, especially cheddar. In addition, we looked into the possibility of meeting at some time to study production techniques of cheeses that could be made here in Canada, so that after having established our manufacturing potential, we can adjust an import program instead of our Canadian production.

I am pleased to tell the hon. member that we are working in close co-operation with the Department of Agriculture for we have announced a cheese quota of 50 million pounds for the current year, as was announced by the Department of Agriculture. Before closing, I wish to assure the producers that the imports of any type of cheese manufactured in Canada will not be increased in the next few years.

POSSIBILITY OF PROTECTING PRODUCTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF CHEESE

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the parliamentary secretary for the excellent answer he has just given me, and put the following question to him.

Considering that the dairy producers in Canada are becoming more interested in producing different kinds of cheese, would the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce help the promoters of those products and provide them with financial assistance and support by ensuring that their products will be protected on the home market and that other products will not compete with those new cheeses?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, at present we import 210 different kinds of cheese, the majority of which are not made in Canada. In answer to the hon. member's question, I wish to point out that a meeting will be held shortly to determine manufacturing techniques in order to ascertain the cheese manufacturing potential in Canada, in view of eventually limiting the importation of those which are not made in Canada.

• (1450)

[*English*]

MINISTER'S VIEW OF RESPONSIBILITY OF TRADE AND COMMERCE FOR ENCOURAGEMENT OF CHEESE PRODUCTION

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister satisfied that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce will be responsible for the encouragement of cheese production in Canada, particularly when they do not know a darn thing about agriculture in the first place?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the responsible Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, with my guidance, will remain responsible.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Jarvis: That is exactly what I am concerned about, lack of guidance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jarvis: If there had been any guidance, there would have been a reduction in imports. The parliamentary secretary just gave an answer about the upcoming meetings of cheese processors with officials of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Has the minister or have his officials been invited to those meetings?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, very rarely is there a meeting involving agricultural production at which either I, my parliamentary secretary or one of my officials is not present. I would doubt in these instances that we would not be invited. I am not aware of whether or not we have been invited.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

MINISTER'S VIEW OF METHOD OF PATRIATION— ACCEPTABILITY TO PROVINCES

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In view of the minister's statement last week in an interview that the government intends to make the BNA Act more Canadian but that in theory and in law it would remain a British Statute, how does the minister feel that this action would constitute the repatriation of the constitution?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the article referred solely to methods of patriating the constitution. No decision has yet been taken on whether it would be patriated or how it would be patriated. One

method, of course, is to patriate it by way of passage in the U.K. parliament accompanied by a proclamation of the Governor General of Canada which would include an amending formula to the BNA Act which would make it part of the constitutional law of Canada.

Mr. Ritchie: Mr. Speaker, in view of the so called second option which seems to be favoured, the use of a mechanism for constitutional review similar to the failed Victoria conference, what makes the minister feel that this mechanism would be any more acceptable to the provinces now than in 1971?

Mr. Basford: I do not think it was on that aspect that a conclusion was not reached at the conference in Victoria on the constitutional charter.

* * *

FINANCE

EFFECT OF INCREASED INTEREST RATES ON AVAILABILITY OF FARM IMPROVEMENT LOANS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. As the result of the recent increases in interest rates, has the government had any consultations or does the minister intend to have any consultations with the banking authorities to determine whether in fact the increase in interest rates heralds a new era with regard to the availability of farm improvement loans, because what happened in the past is that the banks have tightened up on the availability of farm improvement loans to farmers? Has the minister had any consultations or does he intend to have any to determine whether banks will continue to make these loans available as they have in the past?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that the banks will continue to make farm improvement loans. There have been a number of questions in the past with respect to the lending policy in 1975. I do not have the exact figures with me at the moment, but my recollection is that the volume of loans was up rather than down during the year, as suggested by a number of questioners. Therefore we would anticipate that the farm improvement loan program will continue. The hon. member must bear in mind, of course, that under the system the banks reserve the right to choose as to who would or who would not be a good lending risk, in accordance with good banking principles.

Mr. Korchinski: In view of the fact that statistics might prove that farmers take out more loans but do not necessarily differentiate between farm improvement loans and demand loans which they may be forced to take as a result of action which banking officials are taking with regard to the borrower who in fact has been a good risk for many, many years, can the minister differentiate between these two separate loans?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Speaking from memory, my recollection is that the figures I referred to were figures for farm improvement loans, but I could confirm that.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DATE OF HALL REPORT ON RAILWAY PENSIONS—REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the interest of many thousands of Canadian railway workers, including those retired as well as those still in service, in the report of Dr. Noel Hall on railway pensions, can the minister now say when the government expects to receive that report? Can the minister also assure the railway workers of Canada that when the report is received the government will consider it immediately?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that I have been in touch with Dr. Hall. He has indicated to me that because of the delays involved in getting all the actuarial studies done and because he wishes to have it done very thoroughly, it will not be ready until the end of April. As soon as we receive it, I can assure the hon. member we will certainly act on it as quickly as we can.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBILITY OF REDUCTION IN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Is he in a position to indicate to the House or when will he be able to tell the House the degree of cut backs of civilian employees at armed forces bases across Canada, and especially the areas where civilian employees will be affected? I am getting all kinds of rumours from my constituents that there will be a substantial cut-back in firefighters. I should like to know the score.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this is part of the infrastructure study which should be going to cabinet within the next two weeks. As I have indicated before, I cannot prejudge how long cabinet will take to consider these recommendations.

* * *

AUDITOR GENERAL

REASON FOR DELAY IN INTRODUCING NEW LEGISLATION

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board, who is affectionately known amongst his colleagues as the "abominable no man." I should like to ask him, in light of the fact that it is more than a year since the review committee brought in strong recommendations for a new Auditor General's act and the minister has made commitments to bring in the act which he has not kept, whether he would advise the House if this is so because too many senior civil servants have objected to the passage of the act, and will he produce and table copies of the correspond-

ence ha has had with other departments indicating their unwillingness to accept this new legislation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we have already agreed on a policy on this matter. The government's policy was adopted by the cabinet and it is being considered by the Department of Justice for the wording of the legislation. It is a pleasure for me to inform the hon. member that developing this policy took us quite a long time, but I am satisfied that the measures we proposed as to the role of the Auditor General are wholly acceptable to the Auditor General himself.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

ANIMAL FEEDS CONTAINING MILK PRODUCTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO RESTRICT IMPORTS

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. What action is he taking in respect of milk products in animal feed products coming in from the United States illegally, in view of the fact that there is an embargo on any products containing more than 40 per cent milk solids and quite a number of them are coming across the border at present?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, a certain amount of prepared feed is allowed to come in if it has a higher percentage. I cannot remember off hand the exact amount which it is supposed to be. I am waiting for a full report which I have not received as yet, but I do not think the amount is as large as some people think it is.

* * *

● (1500)

TRADE

QUANTITY AND SOURCE OF IMPORTED ANIMAL FEEDS

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Can he tell us the quantity of feed coming through and from what sources this feed is coming across the western Canadian borders into Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will consider that question as notice and I will give the hon. member an answer in the near future.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

ATLANTIC REGION—MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM—TRANS-NEWFOUNDLAND CORRIDOR STUDY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that there is evidence of a deterioration in the whole transportation system from Vancouver to Halifax, I wonder if the minister would indicate the results of the discussions with the Atlantic region transportation ministers as a result of their request that the highways improvement program be implemented, and also as a result of the trans-Newfoundland corridor study with regard to rail freight and rail express service, which is deteriorating to the point of no return.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the discussions I had with the transport ministers related more to issues like support for movement of freight within the Atlantic region and possible new programs to use that freight assistance more adequately to improve development in the region. It was with the highways ministers that I had the more detailed discussions on highway strengthening, and I was presented with a fairly detailed brief. I made the point that highway strength anywhere else in the country had been rather more in response to the assistance we were giving to the Atlantic region rather than to the signing of a new program, but I did undertake a further examination of their brief before responding.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

BROADCASTING, FILMS AND ASSISTANCE TO THE ARTS

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.—Mr. Guilbault.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR AND THEIR DEPENDANTS

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-92, to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war and their dependants and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Some hon. Members: Next sitting of the House.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the House agree to call this bill for second reading later this day, once we have seen it?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to make a statement on motions about House business, and perhaps I can deal with it then.

Mr. Speaker: On the question as to when the bill should be read a second time, at the next sitting of the House is the response which ought to be recorded. However, at any time the House is at leave to give its unanimous consent to alter that arrangement.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty to inform the House that an objection signed by the hon. members for Hastings (Mr. Ellis), Huron-Middlesex (Mr. McKinley), Oxford (Mr. Halliday), Regina East (Mr. Balfour), Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker), Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan), Battle River (Mr. Malone), Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling), Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), and High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek), has been filed with me, pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, chapter E-2, RSC, 1970, to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

If the House agrees, I would suggest we follow past practice and print the text of the objection as an appendix to this day's *Votes and Proceedings*. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I suggested the business of the House for the coming period, and I should now like to announce one or two alterations. It had been anticipated last Thursday that we might have reached the conclusion of the debate on Bill C-89 on Friday. We did not do so. It is anticipated that that will happen very early in this afternoon's proceedings.

I think the Chair has a judgment to make on a question raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West, but if that is disposed of and we are able to go ahead with the bill, it is my understanding that second reading will be completed, and there is an understanding that any votes on the bill will be postponed until tomorrow at three o'clock. We would then proceed to Bill S-31, Bill C-71 and Bill S-10 on which I gather the Chair has now reached a decision as to whether the bill is proper form to be considered; the information I have is that that is probably so. We would then be able to take up that bill. When we have concluded that business, it would be my intention to revert to second reading of Bill C-83.

I should like to have an opportunity to speak with the House leaders about the bill which has been given first reading today. We have no desire to hold up its consideration; however, it is not a simple bill and I think there should be an opportunity for hon. members to see the bill before they are asked to pass judgment on it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the business of the House, and particularly the comments of the government House leader with respect to Bill C-89, I thought it had been made reasonably clear that so far as we were concerned the debate was finished at four o'clock last Friday. We are awaiting a ruling with respect to this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair certainly will be awaiting argument from the government side with respect to the bill and on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. Depending on what the argument may be, hopefully, having done some study and research on the matter over the weekend, the Chair will be in a position to bring in a ruling immediately. However, that depends on the remarks made later this afternoon. That is as much guidance as the Chair is able to give at this moment.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether, having perused my remarks of Friday afternoon, I may be allowed to make an additional point. It is in clarification of what I said. I hope I will have an opportunity to do so in the course of the remarks that will be heard this afternoon.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 2,772, 3,188, 3,568, 3,917, 4,146, 4,149, 4,150, 4,164 to 4,166, inclusive, and 4,577.

[*Text*]

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP ON JUNE 7, 1975

Question No. 2,772—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Prime Minister use a government-owned aircraft to travel to and from Montreal on Saturday, June 7, 1975 for purposes of attending a Liberal Party function honouring the Minister of Transport and, if so (a) what is a full description of such aircraft (b) what is the cost per hour of flying time (c) what was the total cost of the trip to the taxpayer (d) where did all flights originate and terminate (e) what are the names of all persons on board the aircraft at any time during the trip?

2. What is the (a) name (b) job designation (c) salary of each crew member?

Order Paper Questions

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

MR. P. LEVASSEUR

Question No. 3,188—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 478 on the subject of those who have been employed as Special Assistants by the Prime Minister's Office since April 20, 1968, what is the complete Public Service record of Mr. P. Levasseur who is shown as having been employed by the Prime Minister's Office on June 13, 1968 to January 5, 1970 (a) what positions, if any, in the Public Service did he hold prior to this position (b) to what position was he reassigned in the Public Service on January 5, 1970 (c) what was the salary involved and how long did he remain in such position (d) is he still in any way employed in the Public Service (e) has he at any time since leaving the Prime Minister's Office been employed on a contract or any basis whatsoever by the government and, if so, what are the full details (f) what are any and all connections he has had with Dorval Airport in Montreal or the new airport at Mirabel?

2. What is a detailed description of the reasons that his employment with the Prime Minister's Office terminated on January 5, 1970 and did this in any way involve connections, activities, or anything whatsoever to do with a foreign power with diplomatic representation in Ottawa?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): 1. (a) Not applicable. (b) P.M.7—Manager, Bureau of Co-ordination, Montreal International Airport Project, (January 5, 1970—March 31, 1970). Manager, Airport Support Programme, (April 1, 1970—August 4, 1972). Resigned from the Public Service effective August 5, 1972. (c) P.M.7, $18,089-$20,556 (5-01-70); P.M.7, $19,100-$22,900 (1-10-70); P.M.7, $19,400-$24,200 (27-09-71). (d) No. (e) See (b). (f) See (b).

2. See replies to questions 430 and 478.

DREDGING—PORT HARMON, STEPHENVILLE, NFLD.

Question No. 3,568—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What are the names of firms who tendered for dredging of Port Harmon in Stephenville, Newfoundland?

2. In each case (a) what was the amount of the tender (b) who was the successful tenderer?

3. On what date was the project completed?

4. On what dates and in what amounts were progress payments made?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): For Harbour Improvements (Dredging) Stephenville, Nfld. project for which contract awarded December 19, 1972: 1. J.P. Porter Co. Ltd., McNamara Corp. Ltd., Verreault Navigation Inc.

2. (a) $0.988 per cubic yard, $1.09 per cubic yard, $1.20 per cubic yard. (b) J.P. Porter Co. Ltd.

3. June 12, 1974.

4. Progress payments No. 1: $88,228.40, dated 25/01/73; No. 2: $38,353.08, dated 30/03/73; No. 3: $35,796.35, dated 11/06/73; No. 4: $265,623.80, dated 12/06/73; No. 5: $236,527.20, dated 10/07/73; No. 6: $147,360.20, dated 22/08/73; No. 7: $61,009.00, dated 13/09/73; No. 8: $58,193.20, dated 10/10/73; No. 9: $35,666.80, dated 20/11/73; No. 10: $22,526.40, dated 03/01/74; No. 11: $56,316.00, dated 16/01/74; No. 12: $190,573.31, dated 17/07/74.

For dredging Stephenville, Nfld. project for which contract awarded June 1, 1972: 1. Harbour Development, J.P. Porter Co. Ltd., Marine Construction Ltd.

[Mr. Cossitt.]

2. (a) $1.38 per cubic yard, $1.47 per cubic yard, $2.97 per cubic yard. (b) Harbour Development, a division of Universal Constructors & Engineers Ltd.

3. August 22, 1972.

4. Progress payments No. 1: $62,928.00, dated 08/09/72; No. 2: $40.860.90, dated 20/10/72.

FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS—TRADE AND TARIFFS

Question No. 3,917—**Mr. Marshall:**

Has the government taken action on the recommendations of the Food Prices Review Board report on fish and fish products on (a) government assistance to the industry (b) domestic consumption (c) trade and tariffs and, if so, in what manner?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Ministry of State for Fisheries as follows: (a) On April 23, 1975, the Hon. Roméo LeBlanc announced a $50 million program leading to long term measures to strengthen Canada's fishing industry. $41 million had been authorized to provide assistance to groundfish fishermen for producing first quality fish and to processors who produced groundfish products and maintained July 1, 1974 prices to fishermen. $10 million was authorized to help solve marketing problems encountered by other segments of the industry throughout Canada. (b) Since the beginning of 1975, the Canadian fishing industry and the federal and provincial governments have jointly undertaken a national promotional program under the title of "North Atlantic Seafood Association" aimed at increasing the consumption of fish in Canada. This program is initially of three years duration. The Consumer Services Division, Fisheries and Marine Service of the Department of the Environment has strengthened its programs, subject to budgetary constraints, aimed at educating Canadian seafood influentials in order to promote greater seafood awareness among consumers and the merits of specific types of seafood in diets. (c) The current GATT Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTN) provide Canada with an excellent opportunity to improve access to world markets for Canadian fish and fish products. In developing our position in the MTN on these products we are, of course, taking into account the views of the Canadian fishing industry and Provincial Governments. We are being particularly mindful of Canada's general objective in the MTN of increasing processing prior to export where this is economically viable through the reduction of foreign trade impediments to more processed products.

NATIONAL REVENUE EMPLOYEES

Question No. 4,146—**Mr. Matte:**

1. From 1974 to date, how many employees have worked annually for the Department of National Revenue in Ottawa?

2. How many are (a) French speaking (b) English speaking (c) bilingual?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Taxation: As of July 1975: 2,550; As of December 1975: 2,811; As of February 1976: 2,817. Customs and Excise: As of July 1975: 1,272; As of December 1975: 1,358; As of February 1976: 1,364.

2. Taxation	(a)	(b)	(c)
As of July 1975	192	1615	743
As of December 1975	204	1714	893
As of February 1976	200	1695	922
Customs and Excise			
As of July 1975	59	804	409
As of December 1975	56	818	484
As of February 1976	55	806	503

NOTE: Statistics for term employees at the Taxation Data Centre are not included in this reply. See our answer to Question No. 4,150. Figures are only available on a monthly and not an accumulative basis. Records prior to July 1975 were not kept in such a way as to enable us to give a complete reply to this question.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—TOW WEAPON SYSTEM

Question No. 4,149—**Mr. McKinnon:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,782, on what dates will the (a) first (b) final TOW weapon system be issued to Armed Forces troops?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) and (b). The following table outlines initial and final delivery dates by components.

Component	Initial Delivery	Final Delivery
Launchers	August 76	June 77
Missiles	April 76	June 77
Field Test Sets	December 75	October 77

ADDITIONAL STAFF OF TAXATION DATA CENTRE

Question No. 4,150—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did the Taxation Data Centre employ additional staff from January to June for each year 1973 to 1976 and, if so, how many?

2. How many were (a) French speaking (b) English speaking (c) bilingual?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes. Numbers of additional term staff employed at the Taxation Data Centre in the years 1973 to 1976 were as follows: 1973, 11,345 temporary employees were hired but at no time did the total number of temporary staff on strength exceed 4,852. The difference represents turnover throughout the year. 1974, 11,783 temporary employees were hired. Peak temporary staff did not exceed 6,921. 1975, 10,098 temporary employees were hired. Peak temporary staff did not exceed 6,589. Information for 1976 is not available as all temporary employees have not yet been hired.

2. This information is not available from any source which would enable the Department to extract readily and without inordinate work, time and cost details of the linguistic status of term employees at the Data Centre. Because the Data Centre has been temporarily exempted by Treasury Board, until decentralization of the Data Centre is complete, from the requirement that incumbents appointed to term positions must meet the linguistic standards of their position, temporary employees at the Data Centre are not therefore recorded in the Official Languages Information System. (OLIS)

QUEBEC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,164—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What is the number of individuals committed to the Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre by Provincial Orders in Council and upon discharge, how many are (a) discharged to another institution (b) discharged to a residential centre (c) released upon their own recognizance on parole?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

ONTARIO REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,165—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What is the number of individuals committed to the Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre by Provincial Orders in Council and upon discharge, how many are (a) discharged to another institution (b) discharged to a residential centre (c) released upon their own recognizance on parole?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

PACIFIC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,166—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What is the number of individuals committed to the Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre by Provincial Orders in Council and upon discharge, how many are (a) discharged to another institution (b) discharged to a residential centre (c) released upon their own recognizance on parole?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Two. (a) to (c) Nil.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 4,577—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did the Department of National Defence, as part of the Federal Assistance Programme to municipalities, grant loans for school construction or other projects in the Constituency of Champlain and, if so, in what amount?

2. What was (a) the name of the project (b) the municipality involved (c) the amount of the grant?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

Order Paper Questions

● (1510)

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions No. 3,794 and 3,903 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC SERVICE PERSONNEL

Question No. 3,794—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. On January 1, 1973 and January 1, 1975, by department, departmental corporation and agency corporation, what was the total number of employees?

2. For the same dates, by department or corporation, how many employees were located in the Ottawa-Hull capital area?

3. For the same dates, by department or corporation, how many employees were located outside of the Ottawa-Hull capital area and in what locations?

Return tabled.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

Question No. 3,903—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. How many applications for loans were received by the Farm Credit Corporation from the Province of Newfoundland in (a) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975 and, in each case, how many were (i) approved (ii) denied (iii) received from those under 35 years of age?

2. By federal district, what is the number of employees in the Province of Newfoundland under the Department of Agriculture?

3. What federal facilities, buildings, etc. are under the Department of Agriculture in the Province of Newfoundland?

4. What is the breakdown of funding under the Department of Agriculture, its agencies and DREE, to the Province of Newfoundland for (a) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975?

5. By product, what are the statistics showing agricultural production in the Province of Newfoundland for (a) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975?

6. On what date was the Farm Credit Corporation office opened in Newfoundland and what is the staff complement?

7. Since the opening of the office, how many applications were received in 1975 compared to the same months in 1974?

8. On what dates did officials of the Farm Credit Corporation visit the west coast of Newfoundland?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 3,984?

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Mr. Richardson.]

[*Text*]

*APPOINTMENT OF RIGHT HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR PRINCE ALBERT TO THE COMPANY OF COMPANIONS OF HONOUR

Question No. 3,984—**Mr. Harquail:**

1. Did the Prime Minister receive a request from Her Majesty the Queen for approval of the appointment of the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert to the Company of Companions of Honour?

2. Did the Prime Minister recommend and approve the appointment?

[*English*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is no. The answer to the second part is yes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO ADD NEW DEFINITIONS

The House resumed, from Friday, March 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) that Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: When this bill was last before the House, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) raised a point of order. It was indicated by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) that they would like an opportunity to consider the matter. Indeed, the Chair was seeking an opportunity to consider the matter in order, first, that argument on the other side of the question might be presented and, of course, that the Chair would have time to examine the matter to see whether the point of order was in fact valid. It might be appropriate at this time if the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council made a contribution to the argument, or the Minister of Finance, as the case may be. Then we could hear the hon. member for Edmonton West, and then perhaps I would try to make a decision.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, in due course will I have an opportunity to reply to the reply?

Mr. Speaker: I suppose, in fairness the hon. member for Edmonton West who seeks to clarify something he said on Friday last, he might conclude remarks.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I think this might help clear up the situation. The question arises concerning the point I raised about the power of the Minister of Finance to enter into an agreement to disperse funds paid into the consolidated revenue fund. This question arises out of this particular bill and has reference to Bill C-73. This matter was not considered by the House, it was not raised and Bill C-73 has been passed by parliament. However, I want to point out that the agreement

with the province of Ontario signed by the Minister of Finance was tabled only in mid-January after the bill had been passed. Parliament had no opportunity to determine what kind of model agreement could be entered into by the minister. There is nothing in Bill C-73 which applies to the share of any revenue.

Now I come back. Does parliament at this stage have the opportunity to authorize the minister to enter into such an agreement providing for the payment out? There is no doubt the minister is empowered under the bill to enter into an agreement with a province with regard to the anti-inflation measure, but the minister has no power whatsoever to pay out moneys under any formula, to any province, out of the consolidated revenue fund.

If that power is to exist, it must come by way of a recommendation from His Excellency. That was not provided for in the recommendation to Bill C-73. I do not care whether the minister claims he has power under Bill C-73. There is nothing in the recommendations concerning payment of the funds to a province.

Does this bill relate at all? Yes. First of all, this is a bill to amend the Anti-Inflation Act. Second, Bill C-89 has direct reference to section 4 of the Anti-Inflation Act, Bill C-73. There is, under section 4 of the Anti-Inflation Act, the power to enter into agreements. I refer to page 6 of Bill C-73, particularly to section 4(3). May I say I am not relying upon the first minor amendment that appears in the present bill. However, let us look at clause 6 of this particular bill which amends section 20 of the Anti-Inflation Act. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that there we are right into the heart of the matter. Section 20(4) of Bill C-73, the Anti-Inflation Act, provides:

> Where a person has contravened the guidelines by paying or crediting as compensation in the course of a business or as a dividend, an amount that exceeds the amount that he was, under the guidelines authorized to so pay or credit, the administrator may, if he is not satisfied that there are circumstances that, based on the particular facts of the situation, justify the person in so contravening the guidelines, make such order as he deems appropriate to accomplish either or both of the following objectives:

Then paragraph (b) states:

> —where no order has been made by him pursuant to subsection (5) arising out of the same circumstances, to require the person to pay to Her Majesty in right of Canada or to withhold out of subsequent payments or credits of a like nature and pay to Her Majesty in right of Canada, an amount stated in the order equal to the whole or any portion of the excess payment or credit as estimated by the administrator.

That is the amount required to be paid to the government of Canada under the order of the administrator. Then there is the model agreement signed by the minister with the province which takes the amount paid under the order of the administrator and divides it with the province on some formula. This formula, this amendment in Bill C-89 is directly connected with that matter. As a matter of fact, section 20(4)(b) is repealed, and in addition sections 20(5)(b), 29(6) and 20(7) are repealed and replaced by sections of clause 6 in Bill C-89. It is precisely under these subparagraphs that the administrator's orders are made.

I ask: How can there be any greater and more direct connection between the two bills? Therefore, it is at this point there should be in the amending bill a provision that any moneys paid to the account of Her Majesty pursuant to such an order may be divided between the government of Canada and a province according to whatever agreements exists. For that there would have to be a recommendation from His Excellency. That is precisely the point I make. There is no recommendation. There is no power to share those moneys with a province under the amendments contained in Bill C-89 which amends Bill C-73. I think I have established the argument to make the connection between Bill C-89 and Bill C-73.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It may not be necessary for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) to contribute to the point. As I understand the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), whenever an agreement is made between the federal government and the Minister of Finance with a province, it may be without statutory authorization.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No.

Mr. Speaker: If I understand the point correctly, it might have been authorized in Bill C-73, but in any case it is not dealt with in Bill C-89. The hon. member for Edmonton West, if I understand his point correctly, indicates that the provisions he has just referred to, which I have read very carefully, do not authorize the establishment of any agreement for the sharing of revenue.

● (1520)

It is a matter of fact. Surely, therefore, since they do not propose to do such a thing, no recommendation is required in the statute. The point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West, that the purported agreement is without statutory foundation, may be valid. The argument that there is no statutory foundation for it in Bill C-73 and, therefore, that there cannot be any foundation for it in the amendments, may be valid; I do not know. Yet the amendments contained in Bill C-89 do not in any way touch on provisions which would relate to any such agreement. I have read these provisions carefully. I would welcome it if the hon. member for Edmonton West could indicate any instance in which such agreements are affected and, if so, in what way they are affected by this particular statute so as to require the royal recommendation.

The hon. member argues that if this statute proposed authorization for the entering into of such agreements, it would require the royal recommendation. In fact, it does not do that and the act does not do that. However, if it were proposed that it should do so, a royal recommendation would have to accompany the act.

I do not have to judge whether the entering into of agreements with provinces is, first, authorized by statutes which in turn must be accompanied by a royal recommendation, but I have to decide, first, if Bill C-89 concerns itself with those agreements; and, if so, does it concern itself in such a way as to require the royal recommendation? It seems to me, on the argument advanced so far, that the answer to the first question is no. Therefore, the answer to the second question does not apply.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect—

Mr. Speaker: With the greatest respect, I am ready to hear the hon. member on that point.

Anti-Inflation Act

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, section 4 of Bill C-73, the original act, without question empowers the minister to enter into agreements with the provinces but does not authorize the minister to enter into an agreement to pay to a province funds paid into the consolidated revenue fund. Bill C-73 did not provide that. Paragraph 9 of the model agreement the Minister of Finance filed in January says as follows:

Payments to the province: Canada hereby agrees, with respect to the aggregate amount paid to Her Majesty in right of Canada pursuant to any order made by the national administrator under sections 20 and 22 of the federal act against a person in the provincial public sector, to pay to the province an amount equal to such part of that amount as may be determined on the basis of a formula to be agreed upon between Canada and the province.

I referred to that paragraph of the model agreement last Friday. Under section 20 of Bill C-73, the administrator is to make orders directing those payments to the government of Canada. I am referring to payments referred to in paragraph 9 of the model agreement. But, Mr. Speaker, Bill C-89 amends section 20. Actually, it deletes whole sections which refer to those orders and it substitutes new sections. Those are to be the orders under which moneys are paid into the coffers of the government of Canada. Therefore, if money is to be paid in under Bill C-89 because that will be the applicable law, the money will be paid into the coffers of the government of Canada in accordance with the terms of the amended sections of the act which will be in force after the passage of Bill C-89. Surely there cannot be any payment out unless there is authority.

Bill C-89 goes to the very heart of Bill C-73 in amending the powers of the administrator. Once this bill passes, if it does pass, the administrator's orders will be governed by the amendments the House is now considering. They will be governed by the provisions of Bill C-89, not of Bill C-73. With the greatest respect, I cannot see how there can be any argument that Bill C-89 is tied integrally to Bill C-73. I do not see how any payment to a province of moneys paid under an order made pursuant to the provisions of the bill now before the House would not require the royal recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before I call on the Minister of Finance, may I say this. It seems to me that the hon. member for Edmonton West says that any bill which seeks to amend a statute which was accompanied by a royal recommendation must also be accompanied by a royal recommendation whether or not it amends those provisions of the original statute which required the royal recommendation.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, no, with respect.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there is no argument as to whether or not both Bill C-73 and Bill C-89 authorize any payments out of the consolidated revenue fund for the purposes contained in the agreement. The provisions of both Bill C-73 and Bill C-89 would authorize payment into the consolidated revenue fund of funds which might be assessed against some person as a result of a provincial, public sector agreement. That would authorize payment into the consolidated revenue fund but not out. The critical point to be understood is this: the agreement with Ontario or the other provinces referred to by the hon. gentleman do not purport to be agreements to pay out to the provinces. At this point there is no appropriation of funds for that purpose. The agreements are merely agreements to enter into negotiations for establishing a formula which might be followed if any payments of this kind are to be shared with a province. In other words, it is an agreement to enter into an agreement.

Various things would need to happen if there were such negotiations. If the administrator ordered payments to be made into the consolidated revenue fund, and if there were negotiations between the government of Ontario and the government of Canada about the division of such payments, then I, as Minister of Finance, would have to bring before parliament an appropriation act to appropriate such part of the consolidated revenue fund as might be necessary to cover the payment. In other words, I would have to bring forward legislation with the imprimatur of the royal recommendation in order to make such payment out. As you said, Mr. Speaker, neither Bill C-73 nor Bill C-89 authorize such payments out. Indeed, the agreement itself is only an undertaking to enter into discussions to negotiate such a formula if such a payment should be made.

On the broader basis, this seems to me the sensible way of going about it. Obviously, a considerable process of negotiation will need to be embarked upon. Until we know what the amount is to be, it makes no sense to bring in an appropriation bill in advance.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But you agree to pay.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, amounts to be negotiated.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. During the weekend I tried to consider carefully the argument advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I gave him an opportunity to clarify today and I questioned him today about the matter of primary concern to the Chair. During the weekend I examined the sections to which the hon. member for Edmonton West referred and read them today as he was referring to them. The question the Chair must decide is much less complicated than the questions which have been raised in argument, and it is this: When does a bill which comes before the House require a royal recommendation? A royal recommendation is required when the government seeks to introduce a statute which would provide the government with power to draw upon the revenues. I must find that the provisions of any statute, with respect to which it is argued that the royal recommendation is necessary, contain that possibility.

I have examined carefully Bill C-89 which proposes to amend Bill C-73 and listened carefully to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I do not see, in the bills referred to, that kind of power which would reside in the government as a result of passage of the statute. Whether or not it would reside in Bill C-89 is an argument which should have been raised in the past.

Whether or not the model agreement tabled and referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton West is an agreement without statutory authority is another matter. It is an interesting and valuable argument. But there are other remedies. That argument is not, essentially, an attack on Bill C-89. It may be an attack on the government's position

and authority vis-à-vis that particular agreement or its power to enter into an agreement specifically with a province along the lines of the model agreement.

If I may speak on the specific provisions of Bill C-89, I cannot find that the bill ought to be impeded at this stage by an insistence on the royal recommendation accompanying any provisions which I have been able to examine and study during the weekend. I therefore find that the bill is procedurally acceptable at this point.

I believe the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) had the floor when this matter was last debated on Friday.

● (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on Bill C-89. I do not know whether I am out of order but I am pleased to have this opportunity because last Friday, while we heard some ten members speak on this bill, we had no opportunity to do so. I do not want to blame the Chair, but I think it is quite reasonable that we have our turn today. Besides, my colleague the member for Bellechasse was supposed to speak on Friday, but as the opportunity was not given him, I hope we shall have a few minutes to express our view today.

Again a few moments ago I heard hon. members discussing some legal points. What we understand about this matter of legality is always the same. I even heard Mr. Speaker say that even if there has been a royal recommendation, the government can do anything, it can act as it sees fit. It is the same thing when we approve a bill. We kill ourselves trying to make the bill as clear as possible and to propose better amendments. But at the end of the bill there is a small line which kills everything else and allows the minister to use the bill as he pleases. I think that this somewhat sums up this afternoon's discussion. Moreover, it is the same with all our bills. This is why I do not want to miss this opportunity, the second reading debate of Bill C-89 to amend Bill C-73 which established the Anti-Inflation Board.

Only four months after, the government feels the need to amend its Anti-Inflation Act whose lack of precision surprised everybody. Panic-stricken by the vertiginous price escalation which occurred these last three years, the best the government could do was to draft Bill C-73 in a hurry not to lose face.

Of course, it was hard for the Prime Minister after his 1974 campaign to control prices and wages. The government did not want to make a fool of itself by accepting the temporary freeze proposed by the Progressive Conservatives during the last election campaign. That is why they brought in this strange so-called control legislation which in fact only controls the workers' wages. Today, they move an amendment which does not actually change much in the incomes of wages earners. Bill C-89 will enable at least workers to appeal the decision of the AIB. In the Anti-Inflation Act of December 1975, only the party who felt aggrieved by a decision of the board could appeal. As the main responsibility for wages lay on the employer, the latter could appeal the commissioner's ruling. The best example is the case of the Irving workers.

The board fined the paper company for signing an agreement with its employees exceeding the guidelines authorized by the board. The company welcomed the fine because that board decision allowed it to save millions of dollars in the years to come. But the workers saw their wages cut without even being able to protest, whereas this amendment would at least allow them to appeal against the AIB's rulings. In brief, if they are not satisfied with the ruling, they will at least be able to complain loudly about injustice, even though nothing will be changed, Mr. Speaker.

Now I take to witness the remarks of the Prime Minister who, following the demonstration staged by more than 15,000 CLC members on Parliament Hill on Monday, March 22, 1976, is reported to have said that it was all useless.

Labour was right in stating that, as days pass by, inequalities become ever more obvious. When the government launched its anti-inflation program last fall, everyone without exception expected a firm and universal policy. We even expected the right hon. Prime Minister to take as a basis the temporary freezing advocated by the Conservatives during the last electoral campaign.

It is true that the Liberals took a stand against freezing prices and salaries but the government could even have improved upon that freeze but it was afraid to lose face among its own supporters. That is why it could not afford to be realistic. So, finally, it gave birth to this partial freezing, which is so partial indeed that it cannot even be considered as such except by the wage earners.

If the government had been in earnest, it would have, first of all, controlled its own expenses by freezing its own budget. I think this is the first control which was expected in Canada: the freezing of the federal government's budget.

● (1540)

Some will say that expenditures had to be increased in certain areas. Yes, in certain areas, but that is precisely what is rediculous, Mr. Speaker. The expenditures in some of those areas have been reduced, for example, medicare assistance to the provinces. Expenditures have been reduced in essential areas and increased in areas where they never should have been. For instance, I have already mentioned in the House the millions of dollars appropriated by the federal government for the opening or the construction of new income tax offices in every area so as to increase the number of inspectors who will check up on everyone in order to collect income tax or other charges. The government is ready to vote millions of dollars to harass people and to take what little is left of their savings.

When I say that expenditures in some areas should have been frozen, this is one where they should have been frozen until the economy recovers. I believe that we could have kept income tax collectors in their present offices. They have quite enough room to check on every workers. Let nobody tell me that this is to serve the people better, Mr. Speaker. They want to spy on the people and check into the family budget. Today the government starts by accepting a budgetary increase of 20 per cent while asking the workers to limit themselves to an increase of 10 per cent the first year, 8 per cent the second year and 6 per cent the third year. The government is well aware that the

inflation rate will be above 12 per cent in 1976, but it is still freezing the salary increase of the small wage-earner at 10 per cent. No wonder therefore if today the whole labour movement is waging an open war against the anti-inflation legislation.

In fact, the unions are not against a complete and temporary freeze of government revenue and expenditures, and even a wage freeze, provided that the freeze be universal and in discriminate. Then, the government should sit down with representatives of the federal and the provincial governments, representatives of the employers and of the employees, and look fully into the situation together in order to find a solution.

Mr. Speaker, this would be acting in a realistic way, as should be the case toward other groups and other men. People are made to discuss and not to fight each other all year round. We will not revive our national economy if we stand apart and hold our neighbour as an enemy. This is no longer the time to behave as champions and play the political game for one's group's sake. Sure enough, the easiest way for the government to rule is to create division among the groups, to provoke national and international strifes, disputes between the provinces, the groups, the blue and white-collar workers, and to make everybody stand up against each other so that it can rule as a master.

That is how we are governed today. Mr. Speaker, if the government does not finally give serious thought to the security and welfare of the entire population, then the disastrous situation we know today will persist. Although all this wrangling, all those fights were politically useful to the government by maintaining it in power, I think it would be dishonest to keep up this masquerade any longer.

And I agree with the unions when they say that the present government has a double standard policy, that we are heading towards authoritarianism, for this may be how a dictator rules. It seems to me that this may be the new society we hear so much about these days, the new society advocated everywhere.

And in support of my comments, Mr. Speaker, here is an excerpt from the CLC brief to the government concerning the government's double standard policy. I quote *Le Devoir* of March 23:

> When a union has managed in its last agreement to keep ahead of the consumer price index and secure for its members a 2 per cent productivity premium, those grains can be cancelled in the new agreement by the so-called experience adjustment factor. On the other hand, a corporation which has made excessive profits during the five years prior to October 14, 1975 is allowed to maintain its profits at 95 per cent of that level. There is no experience adjustment factor in the case of profits.
>
> If inflation exceeds the increase allowed under the guidelines for the first year, we are prevented from making up for our losses before the second year of our contract. On the other hand, any cost increase by a corporation is immediately reflected in a price increase; in other words, the corporation does as it always does.

The Anti-Inflation Act has no effect whatsoever on large corporations. And then, further down, the union members' brief says:

> TOWARD AUTHORITARIANISM
>
> More than that: they policy applied through your anti-inflation program, as can be seen from what is happening and the prevailing mood, is leading our country straight down the road to authoritarianism. Act C-73 and its regulations are turning every employer into an agent responsible for imposing the will of the State upon the workers and their unions.

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

That is authoritarianism, Mr. Speaker. Someone on the other side said that the unions are experts in authoritarianism. I believe that, in this regard, they have the best example right here with this government. And if we are going on with this kind of dictatorship, I repeat what I said previously, we will be introducing more and more disorders in our society, and among social groups and tomorrow we will be faced with total anarchy unless the government wakes up in time.

We must hope—and I am looking forward to it with all my heart—that the government will become aware of these facts and stop being the servant of financial groups. It is a fact that it was elected by them, that it is here for them but if the government is sincere or wishes to restore the peace that everybody expects in this country, it should momentarily forget financiers and financial interests and devote itself for a while to social concerns.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I think the House is extending, as it is difficult to see each other now. In any event, I would like to say a few words about this bill. Last Friday I wanted to make a few comments.

Mr. Speaker, once more I would like to be the spokesman for low and average income earners, such as workers in general and farmers who have irregular incomes and who too often have to operate at a loss for certain productions. When this anti-inflation policy was announced, I declared that it was impossible to support current government measures because low income earners would be most affected and big corporations would go on making profits and even too often, excessive profits. We now have the evidence which has been published in newspapers that Dominion stores' profits have risen by 28 per cent since the announcement of the anti-inflation policy, which means that unfortunately the projections I made at the time have been proven right.

I said that these measures would contribute to perturbate the social climate in our country. The ensuing events have shown I was right once again, as we can see by the various outbreaks of opposition that this law has provoked all across Canada. We only have to hear the sometimes violent words uttered by those who feel they are victims of these controls. I do not approve of violence nor of violent words, but when there are groups who feel their rights have not been respected and that they are being done an injustice, the violence of their reaction is understandable.

Let us have a look at the disputes which oppose the Ontario and Quebec governments to the public service employees and related categories. We see that the situation is in a state of complete disorganization which is likely to affect the students considerably: in Quebec the school year is on the verge of being a complete failure because of a dispute concerning money. In each news bulletin from my province we hear of schools which are closed, either by the school boards, or for study sessions, or because there is no more transportation or because children refuse to go to school or are going when there is no authority to let them get into the buildings. We are in a complete state of chaos. I do hope that these conditions will be corrected in any event but meanwhile, people who are concerned are worried to see the late development of these events in our country.

● (1550)

The Trudeau government does not deal with the cause of the evil; on the contrary, it attempts to lessen the effects of the true cause with the expectation that our corrupted economic system will survive and let the millionaire club continue to control the economic and political life of our country. I hope that such are not the objectives aimed at, but anyhow such are the results. They are rich Canadians who know that our economic system is furthering the interests of a minority of financiers despite what is suggested by some politicians who have become stooges and who quite often maintain that our economic system enables many Canadians to be affluent.

Those great characters, most of them unknown to all nevertheless rule the economic life of the country. Indeed they control our financial institutions. They steer our economy from deflation to inflation periods. In this connection, it would be beneficial to read over again the remarks of His Holiness Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical on economic and social problems published in 1931. I will quote a very interesting excerpt:

It was in 1931, but the situation remains the same in 1976.

"What first strikes us nowadays is not only the concentration of wealth but the building up of a huge power, a discretionary economic power, in the hands of a small group of men who are not usually the owners but just act as trustees and managers of the capital they administer as they wish. This power is particularly great among those who, holders and absolute masters of money, govern credit and grant it at their discretion. In so doing, they somehow distribute its blood to the economic body whose life depends on them, so that without their consent, no one can any longer breathe."

Mr. Speaker, let us ask one of these men, whose power has become greater than all the governments of Canada, how much he is worth in dollars and cents. This would amount to asking of these people to tell us in what position he prefers to make love. He surely has a preference but will not dare tell us and will then answer in the same way.

Our debt-credit system for the financing of the public sector is obsolete and constitutes one of the main causes of inflation and unemployment. That is why Bill C-89 is now before us, in an attempt to find solutions to such situations. It costs too much to this government, to provincial and municipal governments to finance public utilities. The more we go ahead, the deeper we plunge into the abyss; the more we run into debts, the more it costs to pay the interests on these public debts. The more taxes we levy, the less money the government has to do something else, to proceed with the building of piers and merchant marine vessels, and with the construction of public buildings which are needed by the people.

For instance, let us take the Jacques Cartier bridge in Montreal whose initial cost Canadians have paid up to now three times in interests alone, and the capital has still to be paid back. Let us look, in the province of Quebec, at the James Bay. This project is supposed to cost $12 billion, of which $6 billion are in interests alone. It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker, to see how money-capital is so well rewarded and how we fail to reward work-capital.

Again this year, the most important item in the federal budget is the debt service: $4 billion a year in interests. If this is not inflation, I wonder when we are going to find a real example of it. Again last week, the Bank of Canada increased the bank rate from 9 to 9½ per cent, which will enable the banks to increase once more their interest rates. The burden will fall therefore on borrowers, which will result in an increase in operating costs.

And as a consequential effect, prices will rise further. In the end, once more, consumers will have to shoulder this price increase due to increased interest rates. In that regard, the government is doing nothing. I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) whether the Governor of the Bank of Canada consulted with him last week before authorizing an increase in the discount rate of ½ per cent. If we are really serious about fighting inflation, we will have to ask each and everyone and every organization in Canada to do their share and not only ask for it, but require it. We require restraints from labour but we let the door wide open to big business, charted banks and multinationals.

According to a press report, the minister announced that he "was giving up the idea of a special tax on export profits"—I read that in *La Presse* and I quote:

> The Federal government has just provided organized labour with a new opportunity to howl at the inequity of the anti-inflation program.
>
> Yielding to pressures that have been building up since the program was announced last October, the Cabinet has decided not to implement its planned 100 per cent tax on part of the export profits of Canadian businesses. Instead, the Anti-Inflation Board will merely monitor the profits of export companies and the way such profits are reinvested.
>
> In other words, export companies may, theoretically make unlimited profits on their export market transactions, without being bothered by Mr. Pepin's Board. On the other hand, their Canadian employees will not be allowed to share this manna: they will remain subject to wage controls, which are more than ever the basis of the anti-inflation program.

Those are, Mr. Speaker, two examples which show that the anti-inflation legislation and regulations are not really implemented in all fairness with repect to every Canadian, whatever his occupation in society.

With regard to the interest rate increase, the governor of the Bank of Canada has stated that it was intended to slow down the rate of growth of the money supply. The authorities of our central bank intend thus to maintain a rigid credit policy. This may surprise financial quarters who would expect, to some extent, a lowering of the rate that serves as a barometer for money rental in Canada.

Even financiers do not agree. How can one give good advice to the government on its financial policy, on its economic policy, that might ensure greater well-being of the people and allow low-income workers to upgrade their confidence not only in Canada but in the government that manages the affairs of this country?

Last week, the right hon. Prime Minister, in reply to a question I raised in the House, asked me whether the hon. member had a formula that would enable the government to finance the public sector more adequately. I took good note of his question and I want to advise him that there is a formula which, to my mind, would deserve to be tried out and which certainly could not give worse results than the ones that are advocated and applied by this government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a way the government can raise the standard of living of all Canadians, without increasing anything at all, without taking anything from anyone, without paralyzing the economy, without bringing about inflation or deflation. And that would be to have public capital financed by means of interest-free credit advances, issued by the bank that belongs to all Canadians, known as the Bank of Canada. The government would now have a wonderful opportunity of applying that policy and I mean with regard to the construction of the building at the corner of Wellington and Bank that will house the offices of the Bank of Canada.

● (1600)

This will be quite an experience; it is so close to this Parliament and so if the experience is successful, as I am convinced it will be, all hon. members will have a chance to visit our bank, our institution in our own building, paid by us and not financed by New York financiers, who are leading New York City to bankruptcy.

Such a measure would result in lower taxes, those taxes which the government collects to pay the interest on the public debt or the borrowings he makes, and would correspondingly increase the money supply available to consumers to buy the goods they need. Although it is true that Social Crediters do not find much support for their ideas on the setting up of a national dividend or a minimum guaranteed annual income, some people on the other hand are in favour of the creation of new interest-free credit to finance public capital.

An economist named Theobald considered this problem of government financing. He came to the conclusion arrived at by the members of the Social Credit Party a long time ago, namely the financing of public capital through new interest-free credits. This economist goes on to say, and I quote:

> A government has three methods of obtaining the funds necessary to meet its obligations. First they can tax the people and the institutions to get possession of their money . . .

—this is the method used in Canada—

> . . . Secondly, they can borrow money from the people and the institutions and pay interest on the borrowings. Thirdly, they can simply create money and use the funds created for their purchases.

This is the formula we advocate for public financing of long-term capital expenditures. I continue:

> One thing everybody agreed on in the years 1936 was that the government should never create money. This opposition to the creation of money was based on the belief that the demand for goods should always equal supply as long as the government did not interfere with economy. Another economist, Keynes, destroyed this belief by demonstrating that demand and supply were not necessarily always equal in wealthy countries.

Keynes, the economist, inspired many governments in the last years.

There are several methods to fill the gap between supply and demand. It would be possible, Mr. Speaker, to lower the supply level without affecting materially the demand by paying the same salary for shorter hours. It would then be possible to increase the demand by telling the people that more gooods are necessary for a decent life and a better standard of living.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

> This government could simply fill the gap between the actual and potential production by building wharves, clearing slums, controlling pollution because untapped ressources would be found in the economy. The government would not have to raise its revenues through taxes and borrowings; money could be simply created out of additional funds without imposing any inflation since, by definition, there would be no shortage of goods.

This is, Mr. Speaker, the testimony of American economist Robert Theobald who thinks it is possible to democratize money and use new interest-free credits for the development and capital goods of our country. To this end, I suggest that the government use the Anti-Inflation Board to educate the people on the government financing system and see to it to make everyone understand the simple facts and the functions of money, whether it be coins, paper money or bank credits under various forms.

● (1610)

This does not mean that endless studies on economic and monetary policies are absolutely necessary; it means that everybody should be able to understand, first, that money is a means of exchange, a payment method in itself: it is without any value and does not cost anything. Intrinsically, it has no value at all. Second, the control and regularization of the volume of money required must be materially improved to meet the needs of modern progress and of change due to an economy of capitalization.

In the past few years, there are projects under way with a view to improving energy resources, extending the heritage, improving shipping and port facilities, and finally all public utilities needed by the Canadian people. All these projects would become important assets for society and would furthermore create a great number of jobs. These projects would cost hundreds of million dollars, but it would be less than nothing compared to the advantages for the Canadian people. It would be applying, I think, Keynes' theory who advocated so strongly the fact of making financially possible what is physically workable.

But in order to do so, we should set up a national credit bureau which would provide the necessary funds for the production of goods and services which would benefit the whole of society. This would create jobs as long as natural ressources remain plentiful. In a peace time free society the over supply of labour cannot be forced into various occupations but with education, retraining, good wages and proper housing, it can be enticed into accepting other jobs. We must remember that the gross national product can and should be increased if we wish to ensure a reasonable standard of living for all Canadians.

Never before, Mr. Speaker, has our ability to produce, to move and to communicate been as great as it is now, yet this government's demands and requests that we tighten our belts are inevitably conducive to controls that producers impose on themselves in various ways. Let us consider, for instance, the case of the dairy producers who must necessarily decrease their production if they do not want to be penalized.

As a matter of fact, representations were made today asking the government to take steps to prevent that their annual revenues be decreased by 19 per cent compared with last year's. All those Canadians who participated today in the demonstration on Parliament Hill do not ask

for the impossible, they only want that justice be done. They do not want charity.

If the government in its wisdom decides before Wednesday to reduce the production quotas of industrial milk producers, it has in turn to increase the subsidies to allow them to get at least the same revenue as last year's. Generally the government's anti-inflation legislation provides for a 10 per cent increase in the wage earners' revenues and, as regards this group of Canadians called industrial milk producers, if the policy is not improved within two days, those producers will suffer, in 1976-77, a decrease of about 19 per cent in their revenues.

Those figures are proven by accurate calculations of production costs, operation costs, sale prices and revenues that may be obtained by the operators. I therefore believe the government should show some of its teeth to those neglecting to pay their taxes. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) recently answered a question under my name on the Order Paper. He informed us that multinational and national corporations had income tax arrears in the order of $223 million as of March 31, 1975, on which they pay 6 per cent interest. There is no mention of whether they pay a penalty as do private taxpayers who are penalized for late filing. And if income tax officers in the Department of National Revenue so decide, because they have every power, even under Section 152 (7) of the Income Tax Act which provides, and this I checked once more yesterday to answer a taxpayer, even when returns are filed in time, even if the taxpayer acted in good faith; if the tax officer decides not to accept his figures and assess him as he is empowered by the act, the statute allows them to blow hot and cold. I feel this is utterly unfair.

I would urge the government to show some firmness in respect of those big corporations neglecting to pay their taxes in time, and give part of the taxes so recouped to the Canadian Milk Board so that industrial milk producers may remain in business and hope to go on serving the people of Canada. I feel that within two days the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) together with his colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) and other members of cabinet should review that policy, in all fairness to industrial milk producers. I believe it is in the interest of every Canadian that the policy be more adequate and take into better account the representations by industrial milk producers.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel Bill C-89 does not include many significant improvements to the Anti-Inflation Act. True, some provision was made for appeal in certain circumstances, but basically the large organizations will still be all powerful. They will go on doing as they wish, because clearly accounting procedures give them all kinds of legal ways to come down with balance sheets that fill their needs and allow them to go around the act, to make more profits notwithstanding anti-inflation legislation such as the one passed in Parliament in December.

I hope the government will take heed of representations by hon. members in this House. I realize that my representations on behalf of low or middle income people have probably less weight than those made by persons contributing generously to election funds, but nevertheless I think it is my duty and that of all hon. members to stand for something which, in my opinion is a just cause.

And if after a while we realize that these people take advantage of their representives or of the situation, it would still be time to come up with another law to bring them back to their senses. But so far I admit that this Anti-Inflation Act does not treat fairly low income earners and does not provide sufficient enforcement to make large commercial organizations or big corporations realize that we in this country are faced with a crucial issue which we must straighten out all together, that is inflation.

If we succeed in putting our economy back on its feet, I hope we shall be able to allow our workers, the labour force of Canada, to work and earn a living. If the government and the cabinet really want to fight inflation, we shall have to use a lot of money to put everyone to work, to increase our gross national product so that we may say in the very near future: The gross national product has increased, unemployment is down. If we can really say those things honestly, we shall be able to say that we have done something to fight inflation, money will once more play its true role and the dollar will regain its real value.

However I am convinced—and I would like to be wrong—that the action we are taking to try to fight the problems caused by an unbalanced economic and financial system will not succeed in meeting this objective because it does not go at the root of the problem. This is the monetary system, milk which is in the hands of private agencies which exploit this system as if it were a commodity instead of using it like a service. This is the difference. A monetary system is a service and not a commodity. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I close by asking once again that something effective be done in the next two days to help industrial milk producers in Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

● (1620)

[*English*]

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe it has been agreed to allow this bill to go to the standing committee on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is it agreed, on division?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUARANTINE ACT

AMENDMENT TO EXTEND APPLICATION TO DANGEROUS DISEASES

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill S-31, to amend the Quarantine

Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like today to move second reading of Bill S-31, an Act to amend the Quarantine Act. The intent of the substantive amendments proposed is to provide the legislative authority for prompt and appropriate action at Canadian ports of entry to prevent the importation into Canada of dangerous diseases in addition to the four infectious and contagious diseases named in the Schedule to the Quarantine Act.

The Quarantine Act is at present contained in Chapter 33, 1st supplement, of the Revised Statutes of Canada and was proclaimed in force on January 1, 1972. The act of 1972 was then a recasting of the original Quarantine Act which had been in effect for over one hundred years. Indeed, the orginal act was passed in the very first session of the Canadian Parliament in 1868, and, except for two amendments introduced in 1918 and 1919, remained in force until the 1972 revision.

There is an old proverb that goes: "There are three things done well in haste: flying from the plague, escaping quarrels and catching flies". A strange combination, but undoubtedly words of wisdom in their days. However, social medicine has made tremendous advances and we no longer deal with a plague by fleeing, but rather try to contain it and prevent it from spreading to new areas.

In the early nineteenth century in London, for example, cholera would periodically be brought in by travellers from abroad and a fresh epidemic started. This situation could have been prevented by effective quarantine laws. The concept of quarantine is not new however. The word "quarantine" dates back to at least the 14th century and was ascribed to that 40 days of isolation imposed by the local government on travellers arriving in certain European ports in an attempt to prevent them from infecting the local inhabitants. The proposed amendments, however, do not prescribe a period of isolation as drastic as 40 days.

The present Quarantine Act is designed to minimize the risk of importation into Canada of the four major quarantinable diseases. At the time of the last revision of the act these major diseases of concern were smallpox, cholera, yellow fever and plague, all highly contagious and infectious diseases. Fortunately, these diseases have been eradicated in Canada.

Great improvements in global health have unquestionably resulted from preventive health measures applied in Canada and in other countries throughout the world. For example, smallpox, I am glad to say, appears to have been all but wiped out. The latest bulletin on the subject issued by the World Health Organization shows the existence of only 61 reported cases, confined to one small area of the world, of this once dreaded disease. However, until major quarantinable diseases completely disappear from the world, legislation which provides the authority to inspect, examine and, if necessary detain, international passengers and international carriers entering Canada must be retained. This is particularly true in the light of the present jet age, when high capacity aircraft can transport over 400 people to Canada from any corner of the globe within a single day. As I mentioned, the present legislation provides Canada with quarantine powers only in respect to the four scheduled diseases-cholera, plague, smallpox and yellow fever.

The diseases—and only these diseases—are recognized by the World Health Organization as requiring quarantine control. Through its adherence to the International Health Regulations, Canada has quarantine control only over these four infectious diseases.

The present act is quite specific with regard to the four scheduled diseases and measures are currently being taken to safeguard Canadians against them. For example, quarantine stations have been designated at all major ports of entry and at the present time, there are 17 of these across Canada. Of this number, six relate to maritime traffic and the remaining 11 to air traffic. However, recent international experience and new developments have demonstrated that a vacuum exists in the present act. New and highly communicable diseases, such as Lassa fever and Marburg virus disease, have appeared in some countries.

[*English*]

It may be recalled that last December, in response to a question from the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) I mentioned that I proposed to introduce into the House during the current session a number of changes to the Quarantine Act. These changes are now before the House and are intended to deal with such dangerous exotic diseases as Lassa fever.

A few words about this disease might help to put things into perspective. Lassa fever was first recognized after two American missionary nurses died of a mysterious, undiagnosed illness, in the town of Lassa in northeastern Nigeria, in 1969. Subsequent laboratory investigations revealed that Lassa was a dangerous, acute, infectious disease caused by a virus which was isolated, incidentally, only about six years ago. There is evidence to suggest that the disease is not actually new, but that it has been indigenous to certain countries in West Africa for many years. It is, however, only since 1969 that it has been recognized by specific, medically accepted nomenclature. Subsequent outbreaks of the disease in West Africa have confirmed its very high mortality rate.

It is the tendency for the virus to be passed from person to person and the concern that it could be spread across continents by rats carrying the virus that makes the disease so potentially dangerous in the world. This fact, along with the increase in the speed, volume and worldwide scope of international travel, results in a potential threat to Canadian public health. Approximately 40 million travellers pass through Canadian ports of entry annually. Should any one of these be a carrier of a new or heretofore unknown dangerous disease, there is not sufficient provision for emergency authority in the act at present to detain or isolate that person, even if the disease is confirmed as presenting a grave danger to public health. Authority does exist in the present act to permit quarantine control of diseases other than the four now listed in the schedule, but only through the passage of an order in council adding the new disease to the schedule.

Our problem with the provisions of this section is twofold. In the first instance, addition to the schedule of, for example, Lassa fever as a disease subject to regular quarantine control would not accord with Canada's obligations under the international health regulations. I mentioned

earlier that the four diseases listed at present were the only ones currently recognized by the World Health Organization as being subject to the international health regulations. These regulations stipulate that adequate control of these diseases justifies appropriate routine quarantine action being taken by signatory countries, of which Canada is one, with no reservations.

● (1630)

I have used Lassa fever as an example of the type of disease that is causing some concern, but the same situation applies to other dangerous diseases both known and, as yet, unknown. It is obviously impossible, in advance of an emergency, to list a disease that, while widely accepted as highly dangerous, has not yet achieved international identification nor consensus as to its medical name.

It is, therefore, necessary to honour the international protocol while at the same time providing the means whereby, during an emergency, quarantine control can be exercised over all—and I repeat, all—dangerous diseases. If a dangerous disease does enter Canada, that disease will be added to the schedule by means of an order in council and will remain on the schedule until the danger has passed. Thus, the disease in question will not—I repeat, will not—be subject to routine or regular quarantine control, but merely to emergency control for a limited period.

This leads, naturally, to the second problem which is one of time. There is simply not enough time between the appearance at a port of entry of a new suspect disease and the passage of an order in council to ensure that appropriate protective measures can be taken. Immediate detention and isolation is imperative in such cases; thus, the method provided for in the present act is obviously inadequate for the purpose of meeting such an emergency. What this bill before us will do is allow immediate detention of persons suspected or known to have a dangerous disease which is not on the schedule until measures are taken to add that disease to the schedule. Again I emphasize that this would be an emergency control for a limited period only.

Other countries, such as the United States and Great Britain, have had for several years emergency quarantine powers for diseases other than the four recognized by the international health regulations. It is, in effect, similar emergency powers that are now being proposed for Canada but with the added provision for judicial review of any detentions ordered in such circumstances.

What, specifically, is being proposed, Mr. Speaker, are two major changes. The first is to ensure a means within the provisions of the Quarantine Act whereby a quarantine officer at a port of entry may, in an emergency situation and with the approval of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, order the dentention of a person arriving in Canada whom that quarantine officer reasonably believes to be the carrier, or to have been recently in close proximity to a carrier, of a contagious or infectious disease not listed in the schedule to the act.

Such unlisted diseases are referred to as "other diseases" and are, intentionally, not listed in a separate schedule to the act in order to provide needed flexibility. This detention will be for a period of time not to exceed 14 days. An important feature of the amendment is the reflection of the government's concern that the Canadian Bill of Rights be fully respected in any detention so ordered. Proposed subsection 8.1(6) makes it necessary for the Minister of National Health and Welfare to justify, within 48 hours, the detention order to a judge of the superior court of the province in which the person is detained. In such instances, the judge is required to hear the case within one day and is empowered to revoke, vary or confirm the detention order.

The second major change would provide for detention in those cases where it is definitely determined, as opposed to being suspected, by a quarantine officer that a person arriving in Canada has a disease considered dangerous to public health. Detention in these circumstances would, again, require ministerial approval.

In addition to the two major amending clauses that I have outlined, there are six further amendments the purpose of which is either to clarify the existing act or to make changes consequential to the substantive amendments.

[*Translation*]

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it clear that the proposed amendments before us now form just a part of the overall contingency provisions which are being developed and revised on a continuing basis. For example, in response to the December question from the hon. member from Simcoe North, I also mentioned that a working group had been formed to look into isolation facilities. Because the interest of provinces in the provision of adequate isolation accomodation at strategic locations across Canada parallels that of the federal government, the participation by provincial officials is an important aspect of the discussions of the working group. Recommendations can be expected from these discussions on the type of facility needed to treat the most virulent of diseases.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed are both logical and essential if all due precautions are to continue to be taken to preserve the health of Canadians—particularly in the light of ever changing world conditions. I expect and hope the bill under discussion will be regarded as akin to insurance protection against a potential threat but, like many such contingency provisions, will be rarely if ever utilized.

For example, under the present act, there have been no involuntary detentions within the last 15 years, though, of course, there have been routine medical checks performed on ships and planes a number of times.

[*English*]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank hon. members opposite for their agreement to proceed with the speedy consideration of this bill.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I wish to say we do not have any intention of trying to block this bill. We do, however, have a number of reservations to express because this bill will not only affect visitors to this country in the near future but in fact will become permanent legislation affecting all Canadians who come and go from this country.

It was interesting to note the minister indicated that the first Quarantine Act was passed in 1868. That act, which was introduced by the Conservative government of the

day, lasted for 50 years. The government at that time had so much foresight that no changes were required for a period of 50 years, as opposed to the present administration which passed some amendments four years ago, in 1972, which are now no longer adequate. I think this is a clear indication of the type of legislation lacking in foresight which the present government might bring forward.

One thing that has concerned me somewhat during the past week or so is the great degree of pressure applied on this side of the House by the other side to try to shoot this bill through the House as quickly as a bullet would go past one's nose. I do not like passing, with such haste, bills which have such far reaching results. In addition, we as an opposition party have an obligation to the people of Canada to ensure that anything that passes this House with such haste is not legislation which in some way may be harmful to the country. We are very much interested in seeing good laws passed through this chamber and we must ensure that all the facts are on the table before passage is approved.

One suggestion I heard as a reason for this bill—I am sorry the minister did not refer to it—is the fact that we will be hosting the Olympics in the summer of 1976; and we need this bill to take appropriate precautions. But the minister chose to talk about Lassa fever instead. We know Lassa fever has been around for some time—even before the last changes were made to the Quarantine Act. The minister did not indicate whether the Olympics had anything to do with the desire to speed though parliament legislation, or whether it would make any difference in terms of how we receive Olympic athletes from areas where these exotic diseases exist or from areas where other diseases not mentioned in the Quarantine Act might exist. Perhaps the minister could clarify this matter, as the point is significant.

● (1640)

The minister suggested that we must pass this bill in order to control the spread in this country of Lassa fever and other virus fevers, including those at present unknown diseases which may come up in the future. He shows commendable farsightedness in the concern about diseases yet unknown. Perhaps this bill will fare better than the previous bill passed in 1972 which was in force only four years. This one may be in force longer, as it covers diseases known and yet unknown.

The minister is asking for far reaching quarantine powers to be extended to himself and his officials. Before we grant such far reaching powers we must make sure they are needed. Under the provisions of this bill, athletes coming to this country from West Africa or Europe, and Canadians who have been visiting those areas, could be quarantined for lengthy periods. Therefore, we should know specifically to what use he will put the powers the minister seeks. The bill does not specify how these powers are to be used and is, therefore, deficient in that regard. As this bill will affect people so directly, it would be useful if we could see the regulations which will be in force under this law before we pass the bill so that we may know exactly what we are passing.

We do not yet know how widespread Lassa fever is. According to some authorities, only about 100 cases have been confirmed, world wide. I am told that there could be many more unconfirmed cases. Perhaps we are over-reacting to a potential threat to Canadians which is very small. That is how it seems at first glance. Appearing before the standing committee of the other place when this bill was being considered there, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare said recently, in 1976, that the World Health Organization had rejected an application Canada had made two years earlier to have Lassa fever added to the list of notifiable major quarantinable diseases. The parliamentary secretary said:

> The application was rejected on the grounds that not enough was known at that time about the disease, and that it was doubtful that including Lassa fever in the international health regulations would be effective in controlling the spread of the disease.

Since the World Health Organization obviously has not changed its mind about the utility of listing Lassa fever among quarantinable diseases and since Lassa fever is the only disease to which the amendments to the Quarantine Act might apply, it is fair to ask if there is any point to this bill at all. The members of the World Health Organization are experts possessed of information. If they question the inclusion of the disease in the list of quarantinable diseases and our present methods of controlling the spread of the disease, should we not examine the matter further?

In short, although the bill, ostensibly, is designed to control the spread of diseases like Lassa fever and the Marburg virus, it does not mention them specifically. Why not? Is the minister afraid of international repercussions? Does he think that some countries, particularly West African countries, those sending Olympic athletes to this country, will accuse us of detaining their citizens under the pretext that we are controlling the spread of Lassa fever in this country? If the government wants to avoid such accusations, it should be more frank about the intent of the bill, and we could deal with this matter more easily.

The minister referred several times to it, as do the explanatory notes to the bill, that these extraordinary powers are needed to deal with emergency situations. So far, no one has defined such emergencies or what action is contemplated in these emergency situations. This omission raises questions about the minister's sincerity in dealing with this question. He ought to tell the House what emergencies the government has in mind and how the government proposes to deal with them. In the past, the quarantine officer made decisions regarding quarantine. This made sense, as quarantine officers were either physicians or nurses working under the direction of a physician. The minister proposes a different approach. Apparently he does not trust physicians to make the right decision: he, himself, wants that authority. Why does the minister want this authority? Why is he taking this power away from physicians who are trained experts in the field and can be relied on to make the right decision? He ought to explain that matter as well.

Health authorities agree that it is difficult to intercept carriers of quarantinable disease at their point of entry to this country. It is almost impossible to do this, as 40 million travellers cross our borders every year. I do not see how this bill will be effective in preventing the entry to this country of carriers of disease. In today's world of rapid travel, an infected disease carrier can travel from foreign parts to Canada very quickly. Hence, would it not be better

not to insist on controls at the border and to insist on more stringent examination of travellers coming from areas of known infection or in which disease is endemic? The minister suggests that we will tighten border controls. He did not refer to more stringent physical examination of people coming from areas rife with infection or where disease may be endemic. He did not indicate what kind of authority will be given to officials at the ports of entry, or specifically how they are going to detain people. It comes back to the same thing: under normal circumstances we have 40 million travellers coming through our ports of entry and with the Olympics there will perhaps be a few million more.

● (1650)

If the minister is concerned about Lassa fever it would be logical for him to instruct the quarantine officers specifically to watch for and perhaps even require people coming from areas in West Africa, where this disease exists, to be examined. If he is concerned about Marburg virus fever, perhaps he should look at the possibility of examining people from those areas, the athletes and indeed the fans coming to watch the athletes in action. Perhaps they, too, should be examined at the ports of entry. However, the minister does not say they are going to do that. We are left in a complete vacuum as to what the government will be doing. Greater powers are being asked for without our being told how they will be used.

The minister also indicated there were some 17 quarantine stations in the country—six maritime stations and 11 air stations. I have a document before me entitled "The Canadian contingency plan for Lassa fever" which states that at this time there are no safe facilities in Canada for isolation of patients or for the protection of attending staff and the avoidance of laboratory bio-hazards from this disease.

The minister has not told us what he is going to do about that. It is fine to isolate them, but the fact is we do not appear to have safe facilities in which to isolate them; by that I mean safe from the point of view of spreading the disease to people who work in the quarantine area. If it is a laboratory which will have to be involved in confirming what the disease is in fact, we do not have laboratories that are sufficiently safe to protect the laboratory workers from the disease in any of these 17 areas to which the minister referred. He has not given us any assurance that we can indeed handle these isolation cases with safety as far as our own workers are concerned. On page 5 it is said that the existing facilities admittedly do not meet bio-hazard safety standards in dealing with such dangerous communicable diseases, and a definitive contingency plan for Canada must await the availability of a purpose-designed isolation facility and maximum security laboratory.

It sounds from that as though the contingency plan with which we are now dealing is perhaps a little premature. We do not have the kind of designed isolation facilities which are secure, medically speaking, that are required.

With those comments and reservations, I again ask the minister to give us answers to these questions and inform us before trying to ram this bill through committee. We will, of course, object to any attempt to ram it through the committee. We will insist upon hearing a number of witnesses whom we believe are experts in this area, in addition to the experts provided by the minister's department.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, both the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) and the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) have made reference to the history of this legislation; therefore, I need not say anything in that respect.

It is interesting to note that we are dealing with an act that has been on the statute books of Canada, in one way or another, since the year one. Even though it has not been amended very many times during a century or more, it is understandable that in these days of new diseases and new viruses, coupled with the speed of transportation, a new look at our quarantine provisions could well be necessary. Speaking generally, we concede the need for this legislation. Although there are questions we may want to ask when the bill gets to committee, we are prepared to give it our support.

Like the previous speaker and his colleagues, when this bill was put into our hands one of the first approaches we made to it was from the standpoint of civil liberties. We wanted to know whether any rights, either of Canadians going abroad and coming back home or of visitors or immigrants to this country, were being set aside.

As I say, we have looked at the bill rather critically from that point of view. I must say that we do not see it as a curtailment or denial of civil liberties. Canadians are not, by this bill, being denied the right to come back to Canada. Immigrants or visitors are not, by this bill, being denied the right to come into this country if they qualify under the Immigration Act, and so on. What is being done is that if persons are suspected, not only of the four diseases that are already listed but of new diseases whether known or unknown, they will be subject to quarantine for a time equal to the incubation period of that disease, or sent to their destination under certain agreements to meet with medical authorities, and so on. On that basis we do not see it as an interference with civil liberties.

I had hoped that I might be able to finish before five o'clock. However, I will need another four or five minutes. Therefore, I had better call it five o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert)—Fisheries—Seals—request for tabling of report on decline in population and need for decreasing quotas; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Agriculture—Effect on export trade of removal of transportation subsidy on flour—Government action; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Regional Eco-

nomic Expansion—Inquiry whether there are any plans for port of Pictou, Nova Scotia.

It being five o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private member's business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions. I understand it is the wish of the House that we proceed to motion No. 37 in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche). If that is understood, notice of motions No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), No. 15 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan), No. 19 in the name of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson), and No. 20 in the name of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Diefenbaker), shall stand at the request of the government.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

SUGGESTED FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONSIDERATION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF DECENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider a comprehensive plan of decentralization, as envisioned by the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada, with special emphasis on, (a) the constitutional division powers, (b) decentralizing the decision-making process within federal government departments, (c) improved intergovernmental relations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion—I have found this a good way to begin a speech—decentralization may not be a glamorous word but it is one of the most important words in the political lexicon today. In its fullness, it provides a bold, exciting new way to restore the vitality of Canada. For it is through decentralization that the country can be pulled back from overdependency on federal government officials and Canadians across the land provided with a way to develop their opportunities.

● (1700)

I hope to show why, and how, the federal government ought to press vigorously a decentralization policy in a way that will enable municipalities today to cope with the explosion of social problems brought about by urbanization. Before long in this debate a government spokesman will be telling us that the federal government is already committed to decentralization. Actually, the present policies of the federal government make decentralization a game of musical chairs adding to the proliferation of government. I am arguing here that decentralization, first of all, depends upon a determination to slow down and control the haphazard growth of government in Canada.

This goal is all the more important when we grasp the implication of two basic trends in Canada: first, government spending now accounts for 40 per cent of the gross national product; second, 19 per cent of Canada's work force, two million people, are on the public payroll. What this means is that government at all levels is growing faster than the economy. The Economic Council of Canada has warned us about this escalation. Unless it is slowed, the spending of the three levels of government will exceed 50 per cent of the GNP before the end of this decade. Provincial expenditures are rising fastest of all. This is principally because of delivery programs in the social security area which are direct offshoots of the state of the economy and the federal government's economic and social policies.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave).]

The trend toward a dominantly governmental economy is now a chief characteristic of our society. That trend must be broken, because the increasing intervention of the state in economic and social life will substantially change—for the worse—the character of our society. Increasing tax burdens on private economic activity will inevitably lead to the elimination of that activity, and the increasing dependency of people on government programs will result in diminished initiative in the much-needed further development of Canada.

Around the world people are asking: Can democracy cope with the complex problems of a modern, interdependent global community? There is a "crisis of political faith" in the ability of democratic governments to respond, according to the distinguished social scientist, Robert Heilbroner—"All the polls indicate a serious dropping off of public belief in the efficacy and trustworthiness of government." Canada is by no means exempt from this voter disenchantment. Distrust of a large, powerful and faceless bureaucracy in Ottawa is intensifying. People are paying higher taxes than ever to support an ever-growing government—and yet the problems of transportation, housing and safety in society are getting worse. Decentralization is not a magic answer to all this, but without decentralization the problems of the municipalities, the level of government closest to the people, will become chaotic.

The rate of urbanization is nothing short of a phenomenon. Before the end of this century, 94 per cent of Canadians will be urbanized and three-quarters will live in 12 major cities. Urbanization is caused by an interlocking set of developments spawned by exploding technology. Government efforts must be directed toward managing the process of urbanization. The special problems of urbanization—public assistance, transportation, environmental management, leisure, recreation and housing—interact on one another and demand more money which municipalities have no way of raising, thus exacerbating their dependence on provincial and federal government grants.

The quality of life in urban centres is diminishing, despite local efforts; the institutional framework of government was established long before the social impact of urbanization was ever dreamed of. As the role and level of government in Canada has expanded, each level—federal, provincial and municipal—has become involved in areas in which the other levels previously had a special or exclusive interest. Complexity and fragmentation of government has followed. This has resulted in a proliferation of duplicative, autonomy-seeking special agencies in each level of government and hence has highlighted the problem of a decision-making mechanism which can no longer respond

to the needs of a society in an era of accelerating social change.

Thus, a new philosophy at the top is needed to meet the super problems of big government and urbanization. Only a new philosophy can counter the mounting evidence that government is big, rather than strong; flabby, rather than powerful—that it costs a great deal and doesn't achieve very much. More tinkering with government will not be enough. That is why the present federal government's policies on decentralization are inadequate. They are focused on spreading out certain government departments such as DREE, Revenue, and Supply and Services, and diversifying the sources of federal purchasing, as the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) said on September 3, 1975, when he announced a task force on decentralization of government. This approach is too narrow a concept of decentralization. A comprehensive plan based on a philosophy of streamlining is urgently needed—not more piecemeal solutions to mounting problems.

Mr. Speaker, there are three basic areas of decentralization I wish to touch on, first, the constitutional division of powers. Decentralization is a theme running through the report on the Constitution of Canada produced by the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons in June, 1972. I see in the chamber this afternoon the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) who was co-chairman of that committee. I would welcome his contribution to the debate. After recommending a new constitution, the committee's second recommendation was as follows:

> A new Canadian constitution should be based on functional considerations, which would lead to greater decentralization of government powers in areas touching cultural and social policy and to greater centralization of powers which have important economic effects at the national level. Functional considerations also require greater decentralization in many areas of government administration.

The principal way in which constitutional decentralization can be brought about is contained in recommendation No. 50 which sets the division of powers in a more modern context as follows:

> Concurrent powers which predominantly affect the national interest should grant paramountcy to federal parliament and those which predominantly affect provincial or local interests should grant paramountcy to the provincial legislature.

Therefore, a complete policy on decentralization begins with full support of the constitutional committee's recommendations on decentralization and a commitment to implement them. A more functional allocation of governmental powers will benefit all regions.

As the President of the Treasury Board has himself noted: "Alienation exists in other parts of Canada, especially in the west. The reason for this is that the federal government appears insensitive and unresponsive, just as it used to seem to Quebeckers." In every area of Canada people feel that the constitution is preventing their governments from doing what they would like to see them do.

The committee proposes an expansion of provincial powers in such areas as income support, criminal law, marriage and divorce, educational TV, taxing powers and international arrangements. The committee supports limitation of federal powers with respect to appointments to the Senate and the Supreme Court and with respect to federal spending in fields of provincial jurisdiction. Correspondingly, greater centralization is necessary in the regulation of the economy. Hence, there should be a transfer of some existing provincial powers to the federal parliament, for example, an increase in federal jurisdiction over air and water pollution, international and interprovincial trade and commerce, incomes, securities regulation, financial institutions, unfair competition and foreign ownership.

The constitutional committee made a major recommendation concerning decentralization in the field of social security: the federal government would determine over-all spending in such programs as old age pensions, supplements and family allowances, and the provinces would determine how this total was to be distributed within limits to preserve national standards and maintain the principle of redistributing income.

There is today a great deal of confusion over jurisdiction and increasing political rivalry in promoting bigger social benefits. Integrated economic-social planning between the federal and provincial governments is imperative to prevent the escalation of universal benefits into a welfare state. Strategies for growth, housing and transportation are but three of the items in which the people will best be served by the three levels of government working closely together.

In considering ways to decentralization it should be reaffirmed that the federal parliament must retain the primary responsibility for general economic policy in the country. Thus, decentralization does not rule out centralization in primary areas. The federal parliament must have sufficient economic powers to regulate and influence the economy. However, in fulfilling this constitutional responsibility of centralization, the federal government should explore more ways of decentralizing its operation so that federal policies can be regionally adapted.

It is not satisfactory to leave this matter to the new committee of officials dealing with federal-provincial relations under the terms of Bill C-38—for the authority and role of the House of Commons should not be diminished. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) has said, "There is an inexorable danger that these new processes we are developing will bypass parliament and will mean that decisions are taken at some other place; and it is this place where, under our system, decisions are supposed to be taken."

● (1710)

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the second item under the general heading of decentralization; that is to say, decentralizing federal government departments. Here the news is not quite so good. The importance of our policy reference to the constitution should not be diminished, for complete reform of present incompatibilities takes us directly to the constitution. However, a new constitution cannot be achieved overnight. On the other hand, we do not need a new constitution in order to improve administration, but only a new outlook. The injection of the judgments and feelings of Canadians across the country into a more regionalized government service would be tangible proof that the central government wishes to reach out to all Canadians.

Historically, 25 per cent of federal civil servants work in the Ottawa-Hull area, with three-quarters dispersed throughout the rest of Canada. The United States appears to do a better job of decentralizing, since only 12 per cent of the American public service is in and around Washington, D.C.

More importantly, in Canada the decision-making process is still clearly centred in Ottawa; only 14 per cent of senior executives are located outside the national capital region. Most executives have had no field experience and they do not want to go to regional centres because they believe their prospects for career advancement reside primarily in the national capital region. How can the federal government be made more sensitive to the needs and aspirations of Canadians when ambitious public servants consider field assignments to be equivalent to exile?

How, indeed, can we believe that the federal government is serious about decentralization when we see in the 1976-77 estimates that the federal public works department will spend more money on new capital construction in the city of Ottawa alone, $65 million, than in the entire four western provinces and the northern territories combined, $43 million? In fact, there will be more federal capital spending in Hull, $70 million, than in the entire west and north.

As an Albertan, I note that of the 74 capital construction projects to be carried out next year, only two new ones are found within Alberta—government buildings in Calgary and Lethbridge, with nothing, incidentally, in Edmonton. In addition to the Ottawa-Hull national capital region, Quebec will get 16 high-priced projects worth almost $93 million. Surely, I tell myself, there can be no connection between voting patterns and the awarding of public works projects in a government of such high principle that serves all the people!

That is why the present federal government's announced policies on decentralization give an illusion of improvement without ensuring the reality. Only a start has been made. Recent steps by the federal government have been the relocation of the Royal Canadian Mint in Winnipeg; announced intention of having 70 per cent of the staff of DREE in regional offices and 30 per cent in Ottawa, reversing the present proportion—only 270 Ottawa civil servants affected; the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce extending business counselling assistance to three new areas and delegating, on an experimental basis, to regional offices some granting authority. Since the government has determined that we must have Petro-Canada—our party voted against it—at least it is in Calgary and not Ottawa.

The government points with pride to the move of the supply department's cheque redemption control division to the Gaspé town of Matane, providing 250 jobs and a $2.3 million payroll. What happens to the civil servants who do not want to move? Why, they are given the option of finding jobs elsewhere in the civil service. No wonder we have a hard time distinguishing between decentralization and duplication. As the Montreal *Star* has noted, as long as decentralization is seen as merely a synonym for pork-barrelling, public confidence in a necessary and overdue program is likely to be weak.

The last annual report of the national capital commission suggests that "it may be possible" to reduce the

[Mr. Roche.]

percentage of the federal public service in the capital from 25 per cent to 20 per cent. This 5 per cent shift could involve 25,000 jobs. But the Ottawa civil servants aren't worried. The report says it will take 25 years to attain its objectives. Yet the Treasury Board President has said that decentralizing it to get "the highest priority". What does the government's decentralization committee have to say about this contradiction? And, by the way, of whom is this committee composed, when do they meet, and when will they report?

Decentralizing the decision-making process is of far more value than redistributing a handful of civil servants. The joint committee on the constitution of Canada recognized this and stated:

> Most Crown corporations could have their headquarters outside Ottawa, as many already have. Federal departments like agriculture, energy, mines and resources, environment, national defence and transport could have their principal offices elsewhere, and many other departments could give their regional offices more authority. Even when Ottawa must remain the effective centre of administration, a greater effort can be made to encourage regional input.

The western premiers, at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, called for the establishment of industrial "centres of excellence" throughout the various regions of Canada. These centres would be based on natural and human resources, supported by research and marketing assistance to develop a vital economic unit capable of serving national and international markets. Such a program concept suggests clear initiative on the part of the federal government in the establishment and support of new centres of industrial activity in Canada. It would involve decentralization of the technical expertise of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to plan and support the development of such centres, and the major funding of research activities and new industrial enterprise in cooperation with other departments of the federal government.

We can see, now, the necessity of the federal government permitting the provincial governments and various local organizations to participate in the planning of broad economic development policies, in establishing regional industrial priorities, and in the development and implementation of programs. There should be, in short, decentralization of decision-making power on assistance programs, and strengthening of regional offices.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the third and last item, intergovernmental relations. We have seen that constitutional reform is a long-range goal. Decentralization of the administration, while attainable in the near future, still requires structural changes. What can be accomplished immediately is more inter-governmental co-operation. A fresh spirit of federal government co-operation and consultation will do wonders in achieving decentralization of the decision-making process.

The municipalities, especially, will be helped via this method, since there is little hope for the entrenchment of expanded municipal rights in a revised constitution. Facing the crushing super problem of urbanization, the municipalities must negotiate a better tax position with the provincial and federal governments. Recognizing the plight, indeed the trap, of municipalities, the federal government could find a structural way for the inclusion of local government in the federal and provincial decision-

making process. In this way, local officials would be sharing more directly in the management of urbanization—a complex social problem—rather than merely finding ways to cope with the effects of urbanization.

The joint municipal committee on intergovernmental relations which reported a couple of years ago told us, in short, that the role of local government today no longer satisfies the needs of society experiencing the process of urbanization. In brief, the federal and provincial governments cannot solve the problems of an urbanized society without the link to the community provided by local government. The municipal governments must have expanded methods of increasing their tax revenue. That is the nub of the problem, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, the municipalities want a restructuring of revenue-generating capacity and involvement in the federal and provincial decision-making process. Their demand for more participation is supported by the joint committee on the constitution. Their recommendation No. 67 says:

In the light of the injustice done municipalities by their having to rely on the property tax for the bulk of their revenue, there should be a sharing of tax fields between governments that would allow municipalities direct access to other sources of revenue.

A three-level task force of representatives from Ottawa, the provinces and the municipalities have been studying for nearly two years the problems of public finance. The report, which will soon be completed, was commissioned by the last national tri-level conference in Edmonton in 1973. It is easily predictable that the report will insist that the cities are running out of money to build and service the structures needed for an additional urban population of 12 million in the next 20 years. The property tax is a hopelessly outmoded method of revenue-raising, incapable of providing the gigantic amounts of public capital needed to continue building our cities.

I see my time has practically elapsed, Mr. Speaker, if it has not already, and I would ask the permission of the House to continue for a few minutes so I can conclude my remarks.

● (1720)

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Roche: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues. True, decentralization calls for massive changes in the financial system of Canada so that municipalities can provide the public transportation, housing, water and social services demanded by urbanization. Grants by senior governments that want the political credit for handing out money are not the answer; today there are so many millions of dollars of transfer payments being issued from one government office to another that it is impossible to keep track of it all, let alone provide accountability to the people.

Despite the constitutional inadequacies, the federal government has basic urban responsibilities that can only be exercised by partnership, not paternalism. A national urban strategy is desperately needed. But, as Toronto metro chairman Paul Godfrey, who is also president of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities said:

"I fear the national urban strategy will be a long time coming, and that when it comes it will be revealed as having been developed by a group of civil servants peering blankly at the rest of the country through the smoke of their campfires on the Ottawa River."

Nowhere is a fair-minded federal policy more urgently needed than in the funding of rapid transit, which is the backbone of urban growth. In the 1974 election campaign, the federal government promised a significant contribution toward urban transportation capital investment. This was good news to Edmonton in the process of constructing Canada's third subway system. But the government reneged on this promise by imposing a specious definition of "commuter system" that excluded rapid transit systems that operate within municipalities. So much for any financial aid to Edmonton. This promise was fulfilled in the same manner that the promise of federal assistance—made by the Treasury Board President—for the Edmonton Cultural and Convention Center was fulfilled. That is to say, nothing. Is it any wonder that out west we no longer trust this overly-centralized federal government that is making such a mockery of the aspiration to better intergovernmental relations?

As far as we in Edmonton are concerned, the federal government's policy in urban transportation is deficient in funding, scope, timing and concept and has discriminated particularly against Edmonton. Now, when we learn of proposals to terminate the CNR transcontinental passenger service through Edmonton, we are understandably upset as well as fighting mad at a federal government that refuses to recognize the importance of Canada's fifth largest city as a key distribution and terminal centre in western Canada. The industrial growth of northern Alberta is dynamic; 90 per cent of all projects proposed or under construction are north of Red Deer. All modes of transportation, including rail passenger transport should be developed and improved, rather than eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, my conclusion has admittedly been lengthy. But true decentralization is both vast and deep. Last week, the Edmonton area members of parliament met with the city administration in Edmonton and the chamber of commerce. It is clear to me that the leaders of our community want to see implemented a new philosophy of government that will meet modern social pressures. For the quality of life at the community level will continue to be impeded unless the anomalies and pressures faced by the cities are alleviated.

Above all, decentralization demands a willingness by the federal government to implement a new system of revenue-sharing to help community leaders all over Canada cope with urbanization.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton- Strathcona (Mr. Roche) was quite correct in saying that the word "decentralization" is a key word in our lexicon today. I think we would all agree with this, whatever our political philosophy may be, but I do not necessarily agree entirely with the context in which he puts it. It seemed to me, particularly at times that he was getting close to the Progressive Conservative party philosophy that the less government, the better.

An hon. Member: The more government, the better, is yours.

Mr. MacGuigan: Generally speaking, I find I am in agreement with him more extensively than I am in disagreement. I want to state at the beginning, for the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), that liberal philosophy is, more government where necessary and where it is beneficial to the people.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No, the more government, the better the government; that is your philosophy.

Mr. MacGuigan: No, that is NDP philosophy. I am not going to speak about their philosophy today. I may have something to say about it sometime, but not in this context.

I should like to make clear one concern I have at the very beginning, and that is the enormous emphasis the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona placed on municipalities. I find this very curious, because surely decentralization is a lot more than, and not only, that. Also, the municipalities and their problems involve a lot more than this matter of decentralization. Perhaps I might make this a little bit more specific. In the province of Ontario the problem, in many respects, has been the fact that the provincial government in recent years has created, as a kind of emanation from Queen's Park, where the provincial government is located, a further centralization. The system of regional governments has been very badly worked out, as a result of which the costs of government have actually increased, yet the services to the people have not. There have been two competing bureaucracies set up in the same localities.

I do not think one can simply consider the problems of cities in the context of decentralization. There are a lot of things involved. I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona that the property tax is not a suitable tax, but this surely is not a matter of decentralization but, rather, a question involving the form of taxation you are going to use. I think we all would like to see some changes made.

The end result of the suggestion that this is to be all laid at the door of the federal government will be a perpetuation of the idea that no provincial government, like that of Ontario, has any authority or responsibility in the area, particularly if people think it is the federal government that should change the plight of our cities in Ontario when in fact it is the provincial government that has the primary responsibility. I do not think we do a service to the cause of decentralization or of reform if we do not recognize that it is the provincial governments in Canada which ought to clean up this bloody mess. I will come back to that issue in a few moments, Mr. Speaker.

I want, first, to refer to the Special Joint Committee On the Constitution of Canada which presented its report just a little over four years ago. That committee recommended both more centralization and more decentralization; more centralization, generally speaking, in respect of economic powers, and more decentralization in respect of social powers and the administration of federal government powers, and more decentralization in the federal powers which are retained in the interim before any changes can be made.

I want to quote briefly from that report. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has given a pretty good summary of the committee's report, but I should like to bring it together in two or three sentences. I quote from the committee report at page 2:

> We have spoken of the need for an increase in both centralization and decentralization, depending on functional considerations. In our view greater decentralization in areas of culture and social policy would benefit all the provinces. We propose such decentralization for reasons of functionalism and flexibility, and to meet the regional differences which became obvious to us in the course of our hearings.

The committee went on the specify some of the areas in which decentralization should occur. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has already referred to these. Again quoting from the report:

> On the other hand, greater centralization is necessary in the regulation of the economy. Hence there should be a transfer of some existing provincial powers to the federal parliament.

Again there are some examples to which the hon. member has already referred. Then my final quotation from that report:

> At the same time, we favour considerable administrative decentralization in the operations of the federal government. This change of administrative direction requires no change in the constitution. It does require a change of heart. It involves the recognition that geographically Canada is a very, very large country.

● (1730)

Although parliament recognizes that the considerations of that committee were constitutional ones, and no constitutional changes have taken place which reflect its recommendations, it is nevertheless fair to say that there have been many changes in federal policy as a result of the recommendations of that committee. The process of regular intergovernmental consultation has been set up, and especially the tripartite consultation between the federal government, the provinces, and the municipalities—not without considerable difficulties, I might add, in the case of this latter form of consultation because of continuing provincial objections to any formal meeting in which the federal government actually meets face to face with the municipalities. Of course we have disregarded that kind of objection which the provinces continue to make.

In other areas as well, even in the matter of the appointment of senators from the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, which creates a greater regional balance in the Senate, there was a fulfilment of the recommendations in the committee's report, as well as the very significant movement which occurred in the federal government's family allowance program, which was again the carrying out of the recommendations which the committee made with respect to income support measures.

I would like to quote again from the committee's report, recommendation 84, paragraph (3), which reads:

> Demographic grants (old age pensions, family allowances and youth allowances) and guaranteed income payments (guaranteed income supplements) should be matters of concurrent jurisdiction with limited provincial paramountcy as to the scale of benefits and the allocation of federal funds among these income support programs.

This kind of limited provincial paramountcy was written into the Family Allowance Act as a simple federal statute. It could be changed subsequently, but for all practical purposes the result is the same as if it were a constitution-

al change because no government is likely to change it without giving it careful consideration.

I could go on to talk about the multicultural program and other ways in which the government has implemented the report at a non-constitutional level, but I merely want to sketch the fact that there has been a considerable change in government policy as a result of the recommendations of the committee.

Not the least important of those changes has been that with respect to the general decentralization of administration which has been occurring. Partly this is just a question of giving better service to people in various areas to make sure that they are adequately served by federal offices in their areas, but I think it is more important than that; it is a chance for open decision making and shared decision-making. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has referred to this and I agree thoroughly with what he had to say on it. I think this is the primary advantage of decentralization, and decentralization at the decision-making level is the most important kind. I suppose that sharing economic benefits from decentralized government offices across the country is another advantage which may occur, but I do not think that this pork-barrel aspect, if I may refer to it that way, is anything like the main reason for decentralization.

I think we should also recognize that modern technology itself does not necessarily require centralization. We should take the unemployment insurance program as an example of this. When the Unemployment Insurance Act was changed, and also computers were used for the first time in putting the whole system on a recorded basis in one central place, it was thought that the new system would be that there would be one office—in Ontario it is Belleville—and that all the operations of the Unemployment Insurance Commission which affect clients would be in Belleville. That is where the computer was to be, and from where everything was to work.

After two or three years' experience it came to be realized that this type of centralization was one which gave very poor service to the clients, and indeed was one which did not adequately take into account the kind of varied decisions which have to be made with respect to particular clients' cases. About two years ago the present minister instituted a new program of decentralization in which the regional offices which had been disbanded were upgraded, the local offices were re-established, and new local offices were established.

In addition to that there is a program for the establishment of computer terminals at most of the offices across the country, so that when the program is completed across the country the client in a particular office who goes to the wicket will be able to get very complete information as to the status of his claim right there through the use of computer terminals, and he will be able to get a decision right there from the insurance officer, which is reflected at once in the computer, and on the basis of which payment is made immediately. In other words, he gets first-quality service and he gets it face-to-face from the people who make the decisions, but because of the computer he gets it much more quickly. He would not get this if the system were centralized in Belleville and not plugged into the local community through the local unemployment insurance office.

That is an indication of the way in which government programs can reflect a desire for decentralization, and one in which the benefits are not only for the individual but also for the system because the system functions better, and even a systems specialist would see that, if he is not one whose basis is entirely mathematical.

I think that there is considerable agreement between the positions that the hon. member has advanced and those I am here enunciating, but again I should like to repeat my concern over the fact that for him this seems to come down to the municipal question. I think that the person whom decentralization should serve is the citizen. It is primarily for the purpose of giving him input into decision-making, and the proper service, as well as a regional share in his government's services. I think that any benefits that may occur to municipalities as a result of this are really incidental, and I do not think that they are primarily the responsibility of the federal government, certainly not under this kind of program.

We have to put the responsibility for municipal problems where it properly belongs, and if we do not do that, as I mentioned before, we are going to perpetuate a false impression of our provincial governments, which are not doing their jobs, because we are creating the impression that it is the federal government, which should be solving these problems.

Municipal problems today are indeed staggering. I am most familiar with those in Ontario where I see, as a result of the half worked-out and badly worked-out system of regional government, that the system has been made worse. We have a government in Ontario which is handing over to the municipalities the costs which the provincial government should be absorbing. The provincial government is saving money by making municipalities pay more, seemingly without any regard for the position in which the municipalities find themselves, and all this is being done without any relief from a proper tax base. That is a very serious problem in the province of Ontario, but it is an Ontario problem, one which the people of Ontario should solve. I dare say they should solve it by changing the government, but that is not a problem which we can solve in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): But Stuart Smith is supporting the government.

Mr. MacGuigan: If I may say to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), we may at least have some common ground in our attitude toward the government of Ontario.

I just want to say that I think we must be careful not to make this kind of mistake, not to think of these problems which are provincial as being federal.

The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is quite right in saying that there has to be a federal urban presence. The federal government itself is present under probably some 30 programs in cities, and it has a great duty to co-operate with the provinces and with the municipalities

in planning, especially in the area of urban transportation. It should be co-operating more than it is, and I agree with the hon. member on that point as well, but the fact is that this responsibility of the federal government toward the municipalities is still primarily a peripheral responsibility. It is not peripheral in respect of transportation, but the heart of the municipal problem is a provincial problem, and it is only the provinces which can solve that problem. We have to keep the focus where it belongs.

● (1740)

I think it has been useful for us to have had a chance to look at the problem of decentralization. The general recognition of the need for decentralization is one of the most striking phenomena of today. This is true of business as well as of government. I do not think we should consider this as anything which is peculiar to governments alone. It is something which is a general part of human life today. As the hon. member himself suggested, it is nevertheless compatible with greater government at the international level, but only to the extent that it carefully preserves the independence and the right to make decisions which various countries around the globe have. I certainly join the hon. member in saying—and I think he did say this—that decentralization does not necessarily mean less government in the world; it means more careful government, government which is more carefully tailored to the needs of the people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roche: I should like to pose a question to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan). He said that I put a great deal of emphasis on having municipalities accept their own responsibility for property which they have on their doorsteps. I did dwell on that. I should like to ask the hon. member if he agrees that, without a new revenue sharing formula in this country, the municipalities are handicapped and cannot solve the problem of urbanization; that that is precisely the reason a national urban policy is needed with an initiative by the federal government which will help the municipalities to find a way which will be proper under the constitution for revenue sharing; and that it is not, consequently, correct to say that it is only the problem of the municipalities when in fact the power to tax at the principal levels in this country is held and maintained by the federal government.

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, if I may briefly reply, I agree with the hon. member that the problem is with respect to revenue sharing, but it is revenue sharing by the provinces. I do not think that it requires any changes between the provinces and the federal government. It requires a willingness on the part of the provinces to share their revenues with municipalities. It requires the provinces to share their income tax resources with the municipalities, but as I kept repeating it is the provinces which have the responsibility.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) raised the question he brought before the House through notice of motion No. 37, which I do not need to read now. It is a motion which deals first with the constitutional relations between the provinces and the federal government i.e. the constitutional separation of powers, or the division of powers secondly, with the decentralization of the decision-making process among the federal departments and, lastly, with the improvement of intergovernmental relations.

Of course, this is an opportunity to speak in detail of any subject pertaining to the constitutional problem. Before raising the question of the division of powers as such and that of the powers which should remain within the provinces or those which the federal government should retain, I would simply like to add a few words about the question of the patriation of the Canadian constitution which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) raised a few weeks ago.

I just want to say that I am happy to see that our Prime Minister has decided once again to contact the provincial premiers and ask their consent in order to repatriate the Canadian Constitution. For that is what the Prime Minister has done. He has contacted again the provincial first ministers and asked them to agree to the repatriation of the Constitution. However, the Prime Minister said that this time there should not be any obstacle in the way of the agreement, as was the case for Quebec and Victoria, in 1971. After numerous concessions by several provinces which granted certain demands from Quebec, this province refused once again to agree to the Victoria Charter and to the patriation of the Constitution.

Quebec has been acting in this manner for many years. I do not have the document in hand, but it is a fact that Quebec has always refused to give its agreement because it demanded certain a number of constitutional concessions from the federal government in the areas of immigration, of communications, and of social security, at least before 1971. Since then, there have been some administrative arrangements and apparently the question is more or less settled. But Quebec has always refused its consent to the federal government and the other provinces for the repatriation of the Constitution unless the other provinces and the federal government made concessions in those areas.

I believe that Quebec, an important province of this country, has the right to demand certain things, perhaps because of its peculiar cultural characteristics. I believe that the interests of the entire country are equally important here. I was deeply disappointed, especially in 1971, because for the first time we seemed to have reached an agreement about the repatriation of the Constitution as well as on a amendment formula, and furthermore, the Victoria Charter provided some safeguards for the French language in the country.

And for a French-speaking Canadian living outside Quebec, this is important. However, it is the province of Quebec who rejected that safeguard.

In my opinion,—

An hon. Member: Thanks to Quebec.

Mr. Breau: Yes, my friend tells me that Quebec influence has ensured the survival of the French fact. I would like to say that the Acadians and the French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec acknowledge that the linguistic, cultural and political influence of Quebec has really been

beneficial to them. However, an Acadian who represents the first Frenchmen who came to North America and Canada will never accept that his language depends on Quebecers. Acadians have always maintained their language, and they were Frenchmen who settled in North America, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick many years before other Frenchmen settled in Quebec.

Miss Bégin: Many years before? Be more precise!

Mr. Breau: Many years before! I shall look up the history books for the benefit of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, and I shall report to her. I merely say that Champlain came to Nova Scotia before going to Quebec.

I would like to say that by systematically objecting to the repatriation of the constitution, Quebec takes a position that smacks of blackmail. It is saying to the rest of Canada, perhaps to Anglophones or to the Ontario people who want to repatriate the constitution, that between them, Ottawa and the provinces, they are trying to find a way to amend the constitution that would be suitable to all concerned. And, in my opinion, to insist on obtaining some constitutional concessions even before accepting the patriation itself without amendment is almost blackmail.

And I can say that I am proud that our Prime Minister has indicated he would again contact the provinces and ask their consent, and that this time he would urge Parliament to act unilaterally to bring home the Canadian constitution since is has never been here before, and then we would try with the provinces to find some means of amendment which would protect Quebec as well as Ontario or British Columbia, which also had certain reservations in 1971 about an amendment formula.

Once the constitution is back home, and this is my opinion not necessarily the government's, if Quebec still wants to frustrate an agreement on an amendment formula, both Houses will have the responsibility to see to it. There must be an amendment formula attached to the Canadian constitution once it has been brought back. That is not to say that the federal Parliament should unilaterally amend the constitution, but it should, for example under the 1971 formula, give Quebec and Ontario a right of veto, and I think it should even give one, under certain circumstances, to British Columbia. I am no expert in constitutional law, but I think that such a mode of amendment could not be considered as unreasonable.

In my opinion the federal Parliament, the government, should, when the constitution is repatriated, consult with the provinces regarding an amendment formula and try to win their consent, but even then, the federal Parliament ought to assume its responsibilities and try to obtain an amendment consensus. I emphasize that we should not amend the constitution unilaterally; this would not be acceptable even though it would be constitutionally sound but it would be most unwise politically. We have the responsibility to deal with issues such as the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) is bringing up here. Unless the constitution is repatriated and a consensus is reached regarding the amendment, we in Parliament, and Canadians in general, will not be able to amend the constitution. I am aware that other hon. members wish to speak. To conclude I shall say that I have been extremely surprised to note the position taken by the premier of my province when he recently announced that he would side with Premier Bourassa, in a very intricate official statement. It was rather difficult to understand clearly what his intentions were but we inferred that he was going to enter into an agreement with Mr. Bourassa in order to take a stand agains the Prime Minister because, apparently, he was concerned that the Prime Minister would do that within the context of partisan politics.

Naturally, that is not true; I feel his own remarks smell far more of party politics than anything else because there is not much logic in his release unless it is political logic. And I feel that the expression "political logic" is a bit contradictory in itself because, as we know, in politics there is often very little logic or reason. I merely want to say that Mr. Hatfield wants to join a strange partner because where the linguistic question was concerned, Bill 22, they certainly were not allies. In fact, Mr. Hatfield came quite close to intervening at the Supreme Court of Canada. At least; he sent observers.

We wondered what we had to say to Quebec concerning the linguistic question, within the province, in its own sphere. But I find it strange that Mr. Hatfield should have decided on that strange alliance. Perhaps patriation of the constitution and some amendments to it, might give linguistic rights to the Francophones outside Quebec, on the one hand, and on the other, reaffirm the linguistic rights of the Anglophones in Quebec, and give Canada the possibility of amending its constitution: that might, in turn, give certain advantages to New Brunswick as well as other provinces.

I must say then that I am happy the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona brought up the matter of the constitution, because it gave us the opportunity of discussing it.

• (1750)

[*English*]

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. member who just spoke. I am prepared to concede that the question he raised and discussed in respect of this motion is a matter of great difficulty. The difficulty perhaps is not something that has come about quite recently.

The problems in respect of the provinces are matters which have been with us for many years. While none of us condone obstruction, all of us on the other hand must recognize the legitimate partnership which exists, a partnership of democratic consultation, between the federal Government of Canada and the provincial governments. Perhaps the premiers to whom he addressed his words rather harshly are the people who are very much concerned about the details of this issue of patriation brought up under rather suspicious circumstances by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). This issue is couched in terms of confrontation rather than consultation. The hon. member should not forget this. It is unfair of him to single out the Premier of Quebec, the Premier of New Brunswick, or any particular provincial premiers in respect to this whole matter of consultation. The very essence of the federal process is that consultation must take place.

The patriation discussion that has been going on in the last little while is an example of confrontation which

certainly is not in accordance with the great traditions of this country. I can understand in some respects the difficulty in which the provincial premiers find themselves.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member accept a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) on a question.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member finds it normal that after years of consultation, when nine premiers are in agreement or perhaps eight, because we do not know where Mr. Hatfield stands, someone somewhere should look at the situation and solve the problem. We could go on for another 100 years because one province does not want amendments.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Naturally there is no person in Canada who would not like to see a resolution of this problem, but I, and I am sure the people of this country are not either, am not interested in any resolution or attempt to solve this problem which would create many other problems in the country. I think that is the issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The hour for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

QUARANTINE ACT

AMENDMENT TO EXTEND APPLICATION TO DANGEROUS DISEASES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill S-31, to amend the Quarantine Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when debate on the second reading of Bill S-31 was interrupted at five o'clock I had indicated our readiness to support it. As I said, in line with what had been said by the minister and the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk), we live in an age in which new diseases and viruses turn up unexpectedly. In this age of fast, mass transportation the Government of Canada must be able to cope with persons or vehicles which might bring new or strange diseases to this country. The bill deals not only with persons; it deals also with vehicles of all kinds, whether they travel on land, by sea, or in the air.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

As I said, we asked ourselves some questions about the bill when we first saw it. First, we wanted to be sure that it does not interfere with basic civil rights, or does not do things which might be done under the Immigration Act and thus deny certain rights which would otherwise apply. We cannot find that there is any unwarranted interference with civil liberties. The bill does not deny a Canadian the right to come back to this country, or a visitor's or an immigrant's right, under the Immigration Act, to come here. It provides for a person suspected of having a certain dangerous disease to be put in quarantine for the time it takes that disease to incubate. I need not spell it out. As I say, we looked at the bill with the question of civil rights in our minds and find nothing objectionable in it on that score.

As I say, the bill requires certain persons to be quarantined for the length of time it takes a strange or dangerous disease to incubate. After all, even the astronauts, heroes though they were, who came back to the United States from the moon were put in quarantine lest they had picked up some strange disease in that part of the universe.

The other question we asked ourselves was if the bill provides for powers too wide for parliament to give to the executive. I notice that the hon. member for Athabasca expressed concern on this point. We can deal with it when the bill is in committee. It seems to me that the bill contains protections. Quarantine officers are given certain rights and powers. If a quarantine officers feels he must do more than is permitted by the legislation he must get an order from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde). If the aggrieved person feels that the order is unfair, there is provision in the bill for an appearance before a judge within a matter of hours. It strikes me, therefore, that there is a reasonable balance between the situation which can develop if someone is found to be the carrier of a new virus or strange disease and the rule of law. In other words, we do not want to give the executive unlimited power. I do not find this bill offensive on that score.

I echo the concern raised by the hon. member for Athabasca when he mentioned that about 40 million persons cross our borders every year and wondered if we can solve the problem of disease control simply by passing a bill. I also echo his concern about our limited facilities for checking strange diseases and for putting people in quarantine. But the bill seems to make the kinds of amendments to the Quarantine Act which are called for in these times; therefore, Sir, we are prepared to give the bill second reading so that it can go to committee where witnesses can appear and where we can ask any further questions which ought to be answered.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, my comments on Bill S-31, an act to amend the Quarantine Act, will be brief. Some questions I had anticipated asking were answered by the minister this afternoon, or raised by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

I acknowledge receipt of three documents from the department which I found extremely useful. I shall allude to them in discussing this bill. Some aspects of the documentation are paradoxical, in that they raise certain questions. Although I have no intention of going through these

documents in detail, I want to make one or two references to what in each document I think is somewhat of a paradoxical situation.

One document is rather intriguing. It is entitled "International Health Determination of Lassa Fever Problem". It is particularly pertinent. It was written, I gather, by Dr. Sprenger of the department, a senior consultant, Quarantine and Regulatory Medical Services Branch, Department of Health and Welfare. It is an excellent document outlining Lassa fever.

● (2010)

As I understand it, this particular document on Lassa fever and Marburg disease is really the proto-type of the type of problem that brought about the implementation of the particular piece of legislation we see at this time. As I indicated, there are some aspects of this document about which I am concerned. I want to quote one section. It reads:

> In contingency planning against Lassa fever, the new international dimension we are facing is not so much control of one of the scourges of the past as it is taking steps to prevent the emergence of a new plague in Canada and in countries of the world with which we have direct transportation air links.
>
> Vivid illustration of the inadequacy of relying on any voluntary system of control to curtail international transportation of patients was the self-arranged return earlier this year to London by commercial airline from West Africa of a doctor stricken with Lassa fever. The public has a right to expect compliance powers to exist for the effective enforcement of quarantine control. Urgent action is vital when faced with such an inadvertent importation, in order to minimize the risks. The risks when dealing with diseases caused by the dangerous pathogens can be considerable.

With the legislation before us it seems that we are embarking upon a whole new era of quarantine. There is no question that there are great powers given to the minister and, indeed, to the quarantine officer. At some appropriate time I hope the minister will respond to this whole new line of progress in terms of quarantine, particularly when in the past we have had essentially a voluntary system other than those entities to which the minister referred. This is important. We must recognize that we are embarking on a new area in terms of quarantine and new disease entities.

I received a document earlier today entitled "Canadian Quarantine Manual". This is particularly pertinent. I wish to quote from Section 4.2.1. which reads as follows:

> The Federal Quarantine Act was promulgated the 1st of January 1972—

The minister made reference to that earlier this afternoon.

> —and is an Act to reduce the hazard of introduction into Canada of infectious or contagious diseases. It will be noted that the format of the Regulations has been changed from the previous specific type of format applicable to Maritime trade to a discretionary type of format more applicable to the speed of current international air travel.

What concerns me somewhat is that the minister indicated that we had dramatic changes to the Quarantine Act in 1972 which was promulgated January 1 of that year. We now have new amendments to the act with the prototype Lassa fever and Marburg disease being given as the reasons for them. I find this strange. As the minister indicated, Lassa fever was a well recognized entity in 1969. It was recognized as being a very virulent type of organism with a high morbidity rate. The same can be said of Marburg disease. If one refers to the document I mentioned earlier entitled "International Health Dimensions of the Lassa Fever Problem", it is well illustrated that both these disease entities were well known to medical circles and in the international community as being a deadly serious virus.

The minister has some explaining to do as to why we are seeing these amendments at this time. If in fact that concern existed in 1972 when it was promulgated, I cannot help but think we should have seen the amendments at that time.

The last document concerns the Canadian contingency plan with respect to Lassa fever. The hon. member for Athabasca referred to this earlier. For those who are interested, it gives an excellent introduction on the disease itself and situations in which the virus organism can present itself. In addition, it deals with the principles underlying the federal government's participation in the program.

This implies two things to me. It seems to be somewhat in contradistinction to what the minister stated later today. I assume the minister implied that at this time there are only four disease entities—cholera, plague, smallpox, and yellow fever—that are part of the Quarantine Act and in fact no other disease has been listed. However, as I read this particular contingency plan it is implied that Lassa fever may in fact be on this list. This is a specific question which could be asked at a later date.

As was indicated earlier, it is not certain from the documentation whether in fact we have a capability to carry out the particular principles enunciated in this document. At any rate I want to recognize and acknowledge the importance of these documents. I plan to study them in more depth. I have additional questions related to these documents that I would like to ask at a later time.

We are a global community that has become much smaller with the passage of time, particularly with the jet age. Because of that we are far more vulnerable to contagious and infectious disease. I agree in principle with the minister that we need the capability to prevent certain infectious or contagious diseases that may prove to be very detrimental to the health of Canadians. They may be highly communicable and have a high degree of morbidity.

As I interpret the legislation, there is a necessity to be able to provide the facilities and also to have a contingency type of plan to look after Canadians returning to Canada, who may well have a contagious disease, for treatment and diagnostic purposes.

There are several questions that, in my view, have not been answered. One particular area is with regard to federal-provincial jurisdiction. It is well recognized that the federal government has a responsibility in terms of the Quarantine Act. This was alluded to earlier today. It is also an accepted fact that the traditional health care system is a provincial responsibility.

I wish to pose a hypothetical question because I am not clear as to the jurisdiction in this area. In the great number of cases one would see, in terms of contagious or communicable disease, that type of individual who has been visiting, in this instance, let us say West Africa, and who has returned home to his particular province. Four or five days

later he develops symptoms that are consistent with the particular disease entity, in this instance Lassa fever. I am not clear in my own mind where jurisdiction now falls, whether this is a matter strictly under the jurisdiction of the province itself or whether the federal government has a direct responsibility and can intervene if it feels it has information at its disposal which would suggest there may well be a health hazard to Canada.

● (2020)

As the minister outlined earlier in his comments this afternoon, the four diseases listed in the Quarantine Act at present are cholera, plague, smallpox, and yellow fever. I am not certain as to the means the minister and his department would use to determine what other pathogens would be listed under the Quarantine Act. I am not even sure how they would be determined. Do we really have the epidemiological capability to make this type of determination? We need far more information about the staff within the department and the follow-up capability which exists. It is important to know what consultation has gone on between the provinces and the federal government and, of course, it is extremely important to know what has happened in the international context. Has there been input from the World Health Organization?

The minister did indicate, if I understood him correctly, that if a particular pathogen is thought to be dangerous enough it would be listed by order in council. And if I understood him correctly, that listing could be terminated at any time by order in council. Is that correct?

I am also interested, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has alluded to this, in the possible infringement of civil liberties involved. This is another important area which should be looked at carefully during the committee stage. I alluded to that earlier in my comments.

There is one other aspect on which I should like to spend a moment or two because I had hoped, when this quarantine bill was introduced, that the minister was implying a greater concern on the part of the government with respect to tackling the various contagious and infectious diseases which presently exist in Canada.

I know the minister has received various representations in the past regarding the positive role the federal government could and should be playing in combatting these diseases. To give one example, I should like to talk for a moment on the subject of tropical diseases and parasites which are increasing, frankly, at a substantial rate in Canada.

We must recognize that Canada, like many other temperate countries such as England, Sweden or New Zealand, is really faced with these exotic-type diseases because of the global age and because of the jet travel which is now so common. The danger is compounded by the great degree of tourism. Figures were quoted earlier; the figure of 40 million was mentioned in connection with the Canadian tourist industry. And, of course, we are seeing a migration of people from all countries of the world.

The other thing we must recognise is that there have been disturbing reports principally from ports of entry, from major cities including Halifax, Montreal, Edmonton, and Vancouver. Certainly the Toronto General Hospital with its tropical and parasitic disease clinic could show a very alarming increase in the incidence of tropical and parasitic diseases. I think we must recognise, and I quite agree with the minister in principle, that because of this type of setting and the facility of communication we see today it is highly unlikely that Canada will ever again be free of exotic diseases in the future.

If we look carefully I think we would find it startling that there is no school of tropical medicine within the confines of Canada. I have seen estimates that probably less than one per cent of physicians in Canada have any education or particular experience in the area of tropical or parasitic diseases. It is unfortunate that there seems to be such an indifference at times within the profession and the medical schools. There are so many of these diseases, many of them common to tropical countries etc., and little knowledge is actually imparted through the medical schools and, indeed, by nursing schools. I find this most unfortunate.

We must also recognise that at government levels there has been lack of funding for some of the post-basic education and the training of physicians and nurses, as well as for the training of the technical personnel who are extremely important in this particular specialty of tropical and parasitic diseases.

I hate to come back to the word research because I have talked about it so many times, but it is another area of medical research where the government has really not given the type of support needed to deal with tropical and parasitic diseases. I have also received representations from various people within the profession and within the pharmaceutical industry stating that on occasions we have had difficulty obtaining certain of the drugs, what one might call exotic drugs, necessary to treat some of these tropical diseases which, I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, do occur and have occurred in Canada. I should also indicate we have many examples of lengthy delays before patients reach the specialized clinics which are at a premium in the Canadian context.

I also want to indicate that we have very little knowledge when we come to discuss the subject of multiple infections, the toxicity of drug reactions, the conditions which can cross the placental barrier, to name just a few of the perplexities associated with the study of tropical and parasitic diseases. I have no intention of lecturing on the issue of tropical and parasitic diseases. I suspect the average individual probably thinks of tropical or parasitic diseases as mainly confined to pinworms. I suspect that anyone who has raised children is well aware of that particular condition.

I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, there are other threats to health in this area, for example, amoebiasis. If one looks carefully it is endemic in an area such as Toronto. Studies in the province of Saskatchewan have indicated that approximately 30 per cent of the native population in that province have anti-viruses in an endemic form. We must recognise that we escape epidemics in these instances because we do have hygienic facilities and the type of practice in this area which have prevented epidemics up to this point. But we must also recognise that it may lie dormant for life. It is not uncommon at the time of autopsy to find that many patients have suffered from this particu-

lar disease. I think this is true of every province across the country.

You might find it of some interest, Mr. Speaker, that malaria was at one time endemic in parts of Canada, in the Kent and Essex counties specifically. I am rather interested in the fact that the anopheles mosquito is still present here—it was reported two or three years ago in Oregon. A soldier returned from Viet Nam—his malaria had not been diagnosed at that point—and visited a picnic area. Mosquitoes in that part were infected, and later a group of nurses who visited the area came down with malaria within a short period of time. This is an indication that some of these diseases which we think of as being extremely rare, which we think could not occur in Canada, do occur.

Many hon. members will recall the Peterborough Petes of the Junior A League who visited Leningrad two years ago. Half the team came down with a severe parasitic infection.

I am simply saying that I hope the minister, in bringing this quarantine bill before us, is thinking beyond the act itself and is paying some recognition to the importance of tropical and parasitic diseases and to some of the other exotic diseases to which he has referred. I am quite concerned that we do not have the capability at this point to handle these diseases despite the importance of the issue and despite the implications of the bill.

● (2030)

May I reiterate that I support the principle of quarantine for certain infectious diseases and in pathogenic cases; but I also suggest that there are many unanswered questions, and that we need greater leadership from the federal government in areas such as tropical and parasitical diseases.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few comments to make in connection with these changes. In general I agree with them. Much has been said before about the need for changes in the present Quarantine Act. The need to cover so-called dangerous diseases is self-evident. Fortunately these diseases are quite rare and hopefully will remain so.

I presume that certain additions may be made to the list by order in council. However, I think it is most important that any additions of so-called dangerous diseases to the list be along the lines of those suggested by the World Health Organization. In other words, I hope we will not act unilaterally in adding so-called dangerous diseases to those already on the list.

Much has also been said about people moving around the world these days, and it is a fact that it is almost impossible within a short period of time properly to screen the average visitor, immigrant or person returning to Canada from abroad.

I should like to make mention some of the changes regarding the handling of suspected cases. At the present time under the Infectious and Contagious Diseases Act the period of detention is not to exceed the prescribed incubation period, and on the authority of the quarantine officer an appeal can be made to the deputy minister of the health service.

There are some significant changes in the new subsection (8)(1)(c) under which a person can be detained up to 14 days under the authority of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde). In other words, a quarantine officer must get authority from someone higher up the ladder. On weekends, holidays, and so on I wonder about the chain of command in this regard. Presumably a quarantine officer would have to telephone or communicate in some way with Ottawa.

Knowing what it is like at times to get decisions, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there may be some trouble in implementing this provision. I would be interested to know what will be the actual mechanism used to enable a quarantine officer or customs officer who suspects someone is suffering from a dangerous disease to take prompt action. I suggest there would be a good many cases that would take three or four days, perhaps even a week, to deal with.

With regard to the provisions dealing with a judicial review the minister must justify to a Supreme Court judge detention in excess of 48 hours unless within that period the suspected case is confirmed. This seems to me to be pushing the time element to the extreme and I have some doubt whether this process could be completed within that period. Any person who is detained can ask the minister to justify before a Supreme Court judge of the province the reason for his detention, which seems to me could lead to delay.

As far as the new section 9 is concerned I have no great problem. I presume that the regulations will be along the line of what is considered reasonable in medical circles and customary throughout the world.

I think some questions can be raised in regard to subsection (7) in that a quarantine officer may act not only when he suspects a person has an infectious and contagious disease, as was the case before, but when he suspects a person has any other disease which may, in the opinion of the quarantine officer, constitute a grave danger to public health in Canada. This immediately raises in my mind the question whether the quarantine officer will be given guidelines, or will he be allowed considerable latitude in deciding what constitutes a grave danger to public health in Canada? A quarantine officer is not a person trained in medicine and presumably will have to rely heavily on guidelines. As the bill is presently written the situation is not too clear. It seems to me possible, as the bill is presently worded, that a quarantine or customs officer acting on his own could in certain instances detain a person unjustifiably.

The amendment to subsection 8(1)(d) is a slight broadening of the original act. In the original act this provision applied to a person who had been in close proximity to someone who was a carrier of a contagious disease or who is in close proximity to someone who is infested with insects. Under this change the person in question need only have been in close proximity to a person who may have, or may be the carrier of an infectious or contagious disease, and this includes people arriving in or departing from Canada. This tends to broaden the area of jurisdiction of the quarantine officer and enables him to work a little more effectively in cases of doubt. He will also carry more responsibility and will have brought into his area of

jurisdiction considerably more people. This leaves the situation open to abuse and could cause the zealous quarantine officer some unhappiness. I think some guidelines will have to be formulated carefully in this particular area.

Under subsection 8(2) the scope of a quarantine officer's jurisdiction is extended to people arriving in or departing from Canada. I presume that Canadian citizens will be covered by this provision. The third part of the amendment represents a change in the original act, Section 8.2. This extends the act so it applies to anyone arriving from a place outside Canada. That means all visitors will be subject to the same rules as any resident of Canada who has been abroad.

● (2040)

The main issue I think involves the fact that the act is considerably broader. The number of diseases that are involved is quite limited, but they are important to those who might be afflicted, and important to the health of our people. The act seems to give more latitude to the quarantine officer. Undoubtedly it will cause some unhappiness and a fair amount of conflict when visitors are held under the act. Therefore I think it is important that, when we review the bill at the committee stage, we get answers to some of the difficult questions which may arise. Some of these questions have international overtones, particularly as the measure applies to visitors and immigrants from abroad. Those few words are all I have to say in respect of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I find it rather difficult to follow three of my colleagues, each of whom is a doctor, and I refer to the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk), the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes), and the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie). When the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) introduced this bill we were treated to a rather fascinating lesson on the history of the Quarantine Act. It brought to our attention a concern regarding the possibility of contagious and infectious diseases becoming more prevalent in Canada. If this is the fact we should be extremely concerned.

I was very interested to learn of the role the World Health Organization plays in respect of this matter, particularly when it comes to a desire on the part of the federal government to add contagious diseases by way of order in council. I should hope that the minister does consult the World Health Organization before moving in a unilateral way.

The hon. member for Lambton-Kent brought home the necessity of medical research in this area. He pointed out most vividly the necessity for continuing co-operation and the continuing provision of funds in order that we might have the best medical research possible.

What I have found most fascinating about this whole matter is that in his introduction the minister made no mention of the Olympics being held in this country this year. I find this strange, particularly in light of the fact that about a month and a half ago the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) also brought forward a bill because of a concern about the possibility of terrorists coming into the country at the time of the Olympic Games.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

This is perhaps also the concern of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but rather than coming clean he completely ignores this possibility in his introduction of the bill, and says nothing about this means of keeping people out of the country.

Perhaps this bill is part of an Olympic package. The first bill dealt primarily with terrorists and now we have this one which primarily deals with diseases. I hope the minister will enlighten us in this regard, if not here in the House then at the committee. At that time I hope he will be honest with us. I am not suggesting he is less than honest now, but there are some questions that should be answered in order that we may determine why the government is bringing a bill of this type before the House.

Considerable emphasis has been placed on Lassa fever and Marburg disease. Both of these infections have been isolated for some period of time, as pointed out by the hon. member for Lambton-Kent. I wonder why these diseases have been emphasized at this particular time. I suggest the answer is that this is the second part of an Olympic package.

The hon. member for Athabasca in a brilliant speech said that he agreed with the bill in principle, but pointed out there are many questions that have to be answered. The two diseases I mentioned have been known of for some time. That being the case, I wonder why they have not been brought within the Quarantine Act before now. Instead, the minister has waited until almost the time of the Olympic Games and then says he is concerned about the health of Canadians.

What we have here is an extremely powerful bill which actually restricts the movement of people. Some concern has been registered regarding its effect on civil liberties. There is no doubt but that it does have an effect. The explanation to clause 3 states:

> The purpose of this amendment is to empower a quarantine officer in emergency situations to take certain action, subject to the approval of the Minister and, where the action involves detention for a period in excess of 48-hours, subject to review by a judge of a superior court, in order to prevent the introduction into Canada of dangerous diseases not presently covered by the Act.

That is the purpose of the main change to this act. It will broaden the section, and I suggest it is a change that we should look into thoroughly when we are considering the bill in committee. As I have suggested, this change affects the freedom of movement and the civil liberties of people. This does not stop with the actions of a quarantine officer. He now has this right when he suspects a disease may be brought into the country. This is peculiar wording and I suggest it defies definition. We will have to look into the definition of the word "suspects". When the quarantine officer has suspicion about a dangerous disease being brought in he has the right to detain individuals.

What is even more important, and this has not been mentioned, but has been alluded to, is the fact that a collector of customs will also be in the same boat. He will also have the awesome power that before now only rested with a quarantine officer. If a customs officer suspects there is a dangerous disease being brought into the country he too can stop the individual and contact the quarantine officer. The quarantine officer must in turn contact the Minister of National Health and Welfare in writing, and

the minister must then proceed within 48 hours by way of a superior court judge who will determine the rightness or wrongness of this particular detention. Therefore these matters are of some concern.

● (2050)

I listened to my friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), a very respected gentleman in the House, who spoke about the possibility of loss of freedom of movement and also loss of civil liberties. Of course this matter will be looked into more thoroughly by the members on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs where that concern will be registered, but in keeping with what the government is trying to do because of the Olympic Games which will take place this summer, we all want co-operation. This does not mean to say that we will give the government a blank cheque. It is not the role of the opposition to give governments blank cheques, and particularly this government. I do not want to be partisan on this bill because this bill is for the benefit of all Canadians, and hopefully it will enhance the role played by our country in support of a city which is hosting the Olympic Games.

I believe that we should proceed with caution. We all want to co-operate, but with co-operation comes the necessity to say, "Stop, let us look at what the minister is attempting to do." If we have to ask questions, let us ask what is the opinion of the World Health Organization regarding the procedure proposed by the minister in this bill. What do they think about Lassa fever and Marburg disease? Should it be spelled out by order in council and brought into the bill? I think we must determine whether this is the practice. I believe it is. If the minister can convince our colleagues that it is not, then this matter has been standing for some time because the government does not have the required answers and that is why it was impossible to bring in this bill before now. The minister will have to tell us that.

We must have answers describing how one determines a dangerous disease. How does the customs officer determine this, and how does a quarantine officer determine it? Can the minister give us answers in that regard? We want to know what other criteria will be set to determine a disease, and will this information be passed on to those who have the authority to detain or quarantine people entering the country at ports of entry? This bill is supposed to deal with emergencies, but nowhere in this bill is it spelled out what an emergency is. That is another question which should be answered by the minister once this bill goes to committee.

I heard there is some question as to whether there are enough places with suitable quarantine facilities. I believe the hon. member for Athabasca voiced some concern in that regard. He is of the opinion that there are not enough such places.

Mr. Yewchuk: There are none.

Mr. Alexander: The bill specifically refers to "other places having suitable quarantine facilities". What does the minister have in mind? Where are they and how many are there? I think these are important questions.

I do not wish to take much more time of the House on this bill except to state in conclusion that the hon. member for Athabasca, the hon. member for Lambton-Kent, the hon. member for Dauphin, and I all say that we accept this bill in principle but that many questions remain to be answered. The minister, who is usually open, fair, and honest, will give the answers, I hope, in order to satisfy the curiosity of the opposition.

[*Translation*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE, CROWN LIABILITY ACT, IMMIGRATION ACT, PAROLE ACT

JURISDICTION GIVEN TO CANADIAN COURTS TO TRY PERSONS FOR CERTAIN OFFENCES COMMITTED OUTSIDE CANADA

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-71, to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Crown Liability Act, the Immigration Act and the Parole Act, be concurred in.

[*English*]

Mr. Francis Fox (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Senate has now completed its study of Bill C-71 and I am hopeful that the House this evening will concur in the amendments proposed by the Senate.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order which might save time. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) was good enough to advise me, and I have checked it through with members of our committee on this side, that apart from one amendment all these amendments are in reference to translation and are to clean up a few things of a technical nature. Only one amendment is a fairly major one. I wonder whether we could not move one motion to approve all these amendments. Someone might insist on procedural grounds that we cannot do so, but the House can make its own rules. This would save time because there are so many small amendments with regard to language and translation that I hope the House will see fit to save time and pass them altogether.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is what the motion does.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I think that is the way the motion is drafted and I hope the House will concur in that motion. I should like to point out to hon. members that these amendments in general are minor ones, and for the most part quite technical in nature. Some deal with punctuation and changes of certain words and expressions in the French version. As such they ensure a higher degree of precision and agreement between the French and English texts of the bill. Hon. members will be interested to note,

however, that one of the amendments proposes that credit card offences, which as contained in the legislation passed by the House were indictable ones, be made punishable on summary conviction as well. Having regard to the wide range of activities covered by the section on credit cards, some of which could be minor in nature, we believe it is appropriate to provide for the alternative as proposed.

Bill C-71, which was introduced on July 17 last, has been given detailed and careful study in both Houses and in their respective committees. Several worth-while and substantive amendments were made to it in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, amendments which I believe strengthened and added significantly to the original bill. The further amendments referred to us by the Senate are but another step in the process by which legislation, as its progresses through all stages of parliament, can be improved and perfected. I believe we have before us now a bill which will be an important and worth-while improvement to the criminal law and part of what I earnestly hope will be an ongoing process of updating the law in order to make it a flexible, realistic, and responsive tool for dealing with criminal offences in our society.

In conclusion I would like to thank members of the Senate for the worth-while suggestions made. I hope all members of the House will wish to concur in the amendments proposed by the Senate which would permit the Department of Justice and the Minister of Justice to work toward an early implementation and early proclamation of Bill C-71, after having consulted the provincial attorneys general.

● (2100)

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The other place is often criticized with reference to amendments, but once again it has proved that in accordance with the jurisdiction it has, besides taking care of minority rights, it must take a second look at bills which are of a technical nature. In this case it has done so, not only on an important point in reference to the theft of credit cards but also in reference to translation. The Senate was set up to protect minorities and to act as a sort of court of appeal for this Chamber on matters which must be approved expeditiously, such as Bill C-71.

I am glad that the parliamentary secretary said that there is some responsibility and duty on this House to get on with this bill and get it approved because of the attitude today of those who wish to impose distress and evil on society. There is a feeling of what I call the permissive society, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has said that he is endeavouring to tighten up the law.

I am not criticizing either the Minister of Justice, the parliamentary secretary or the government, but a situation arose where two people were given bail. One was charged with murder, and the other with attempted murder. Just a short time ago they came from Vancouver to Calgary and murdered a police officer. They then took two females as hostages for 45 hours. It was only due to the good work of

the Calgary police force that those hostages were freed and the matter was settled.

I endorse exactly what the parliamentary secretary says: let us get on with the job.

I should like to say one last word with reference to the Senate. Too often in this place we hear that they have no function, no real jurisdiction, and they are not doing their job. The purpose of the Senate was to set up a group of fairly wise men who could look at the technicalities of legislation received from this House, and I think the Senate is functioning in that regard. We have a large volume of legislation, and we do not have time to examine it carefully. The Senate has done an excellent job in bringing these amendments before the House of Commons, and this proves that we need the Senate and that the constitution has operated for the benefit of Canadians in this regard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: I hear someone to my left, and I am glad he had something to say because I well remember Mr. Hazen Argue, who is now a Senator, every year from 1958 to 1962 moving bills every year to abolish the Senate. The only thing I could say about him is that he has arrived there.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I know it is against the rules of this House to impute motives, but I wonder if my friend, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), did not make that speech just to provoke me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): When we are told by the government that there are some Senate amendments to a bill and that they are just a few technicalities which need not take any time, I have learned from experience that one should look at those amendments to be sure that something is not being slipped through. Indeed, on some occasions I have found that to be the case. However, in this instance when we were told that these amendments to Bill C-71 were on the list, I made sure that I read carefully the amendments as they appeared on page 1125 of *Votes and Proceedings* for March 17, 1976, and it is correct, as the parliamentary secretary has pointed out, and as has been confirmed by the hon. member for Calgary North, with one exception they are corrections in translation from English into French, corrections in grammar or construction, or what have you.

The only amendment of substance has to do with credit card wrongdoings, and I think we all agree that there should be the options of summary conviction or indictment.

So these amendments present no problem to us, as sometimes happens with Senate amendments, and therefore we are prepared to support the motion for concurrence in these amendments.

I am really surprised at the enthusiasm with which it is suggested tonight that we should maintain 104 full paid

Senators in the other place so that if our translators do not do a good job, their translators will do it for us. Is that the function of the Senate?

An hon. Member: Come on, now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Come on, now, yourself. Or go on, now, to the Senate if you want, but to suggest that these amendments justify the existence of that other place I suggest is really as ridiculous as I think the hon. member felt it was, because of the smile on his face. As far as I am concerned the other place is still for the birds, but we are prepared to vote for the amendments it has given us tonight.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit one question. I wonder if he has checked the amendments dealing with theft of credit cards where the Senate reduced it to a summary conviction which, of course, is an option to the Crown. I think that is very important because any one charged with an indictable offence cannot leave the country and go to another nation. This way, basically if a person is charged under summary conviction he could go elsewhere. Often a youth might be able to pick up a Chargex, and in that regard I think it is a good suggestion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In response to the question of the hon. member I can only assume he was not doing me the favour of listening when I was speaking. He probably listened to what I said about the Senate, but I pointed out that there was the one issue of substance in their amendments. I have to correct the hon. member. The change does not reduce the charge from an indictable offence to a summary conviction offence. It leaves both options open to the court, and I think that is a change the members of the committee of this House ought to have made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

FEEDS ACT

AMENDMENTS TO BROADEN DEFINITIONS AND CONTROL OVER MANUFACTURE, SALE OR IMPORTATION

The House resumed, from March 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Whelan for concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to amendments made by the House of Commons to Bill S-10, to amend the Feeds Act.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my speaking at this time on this particular amendment is to try to put on the record some of the unusual things which have happened to this bill.

The bill was a straightforward housekeeping bill introduced in the Senate, brought into the House, amended in the House and sent back to the Senate, and the Senate sent it back here amended. All I can say is that to any person who is a member of the public—and I might even say a member of this House of Commons—trying to keep track of what is happening to this bill this is an exercise in profundity which can only be described as asinine.

Let me explain what I mean. This bill was a straightforward bill introduced in the Senate. It came to the House, the House amended it and passed the bill. Since both the Senate and the House passed the bill, under the rules of this place and the other place neither House could consider the bill. They could consider just the amendment. I am hopeful that what I am complaining about can go into the record as a suggestion that there should be some way whereby the records of the various members of parliament and of the people across the country trying to follow these debates could be clear enough that we all know what is happening.

● (2110)

All we have before us at the present time is a bill passed out of the Senate on March 6, 1975. That is all we have in the form of a printed bill. However, in addition we have a report from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) saying that the bill passed out of the Senate on March 6 is contrary to the Bill of Rights. Those of us who follow what happens in this House understand that the minister took this back to the committee and amended the bill so that it would be within the terms of the Bill of Rights. Because this was an amendment of the bill from the Senate, we sent the piece of paper back to the Senate saying that we had amended the bill so that it would be in comformity with the Bill of Rights, and the Senate took it under advisement. The Senate then made their amendments.

The only way to check what the House did on the amendments and what the Senate did on the amendments is to read *Votes and Proceedings*. I simply say that for those who are much wiser than I who represent just a simple constituency and try to follow what goes on in this House, I think there should be a little better system of co-ordinating the program between the two Houses of parliament so that the public, including members of parliament, would know what is going on in respect of this very involved system in attempting to follow the procedure on this bill which has been before parliament for over a year.

I sympathize with the minister. It must have been a dreadful experience to follow all the ramifications of what went on concerning what this House and the Senate did. I would simply say that the system is cumbersome and crude. We know that our counterparts in the United States have a meeting which allows both their Houses to get together and bring a matter back so that a common bill may be passed by both Houses. I ask in these short remarks, Mr. Speaker, that you recommend to those who know more about the rules and procedures than I do that they try to get a better system so that members of parliament will know what is happening with regard to their legislation. Unless one knows what happens in this House and its committees and in the other place and its committees one does not really know what is going on.

It takes a pretty good student to follow the procedure in respect of this bill. I am not the only one who has found this confusing. Several weeks ago the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) explained that he did not understand it. When it came to the House the members did not understand it either. I should like to register my complaint neither to the government, the opposition, nor the other place, but in respect of the cumbersomeness of the rules dealing with matters concerning amendments passing from one House to the other.

Basically, when a bill is passed by this House we cannot debate it again. When a bill is passed in the other place they cannot debate it again. We need a simple flexible system whereby the two Houses of parliament can get together and produce some type of amendment for both Houses so that we both have something in front of us and know what we are dealing with. I should like to register these criticisms of what on the surface seem to be a housekeeping bill but actually is a mess when one tries to follow the procedures of this House.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in effect I am raising the point of order that was raised some time ago. I wonder whether there is to be a ruling from the Chair on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers). It seems to me the situation ought to be cleared up procedurally.

What happened, as I understand it, is that the Senate passed the bill and then sent it to this House. Then in this House amendments were made, then we passed the bill on third reading and sent the bill in reprinted form back to the Senate. Then the Senate made amendments, not to the reprinted bill we sent back to them but to the bill in the form in which it was passed by the Senate in the first place.

I suggest that what we are doing at this moment will end up being ridiculous. This washes out the tributes paid to the Senate by a couple of hon. members a few minutes ago. I understood there was to be a ruling by the Chair on the matter raised by the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on the point of order?

Mr. Schellenberger: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Before I speak on the bill I should like to speak on the point of order. I understand the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) did question whether or not the Senate had amended the proper bill. I was under the impression that Mr. Speaker would rule on that. I ask the same question that was asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Would Your Honour rule on that at the present time?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must say to hon. members that the point raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) follows directly the point of order raised by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) on March 4, at which time Mr. Speaker said he would look into the matter. He really did not say he would resolve it by making a ruling.

After looking at the whole matter it seems that the problem arises mainly from the fact that both Houses have not based their work on the same document. This more or less causes some confusion because the amendments that were moved by the Senate and referred back to this House were made to amendments made by this House to the original bill. In the House of Commons when we reach the report stage on a bill we reprint the bill if required.

In this case the lines do not correspond. I am advised that whatever amendments have been sent back from the Senate to this House for its approval at this time do not contradict anything in the bill or in the decisions that were made in the House of Commons. The only difficulty is that of placing the amendments in the right place in the original version of the bill. This difficulty can be circumvented. I am advised by the Law Clerk of the House of Commons that the matter is clear.

Although I am not in a position at this time to analyse the situation and make my own evaluation of it, I do have the advice of the Law Clerk of the House of Commons who feels that there is no difficulty regarding the amendments that are presented to this House by the Senate. I am taking into account the fact that the legal branch, the Clerk and the staff of this House know exactly where these amendments apply and will make the necessary changes. This means that the amendments adopted by this House may not apply to lines 7 and 29, let us say, on page 3 or on another line of the report stage reprint of the bill.

I submit to hon. members that the question of amendments is more important with regard to the text and content than to which exact line the amendments apply. I would hope that the House would agree on this unless some hon. member feels we should delay or postpone a decision on these matters until and unless we have some kind of institution such as suggested by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain by which both Houses could come to an agreement. In the present circumstances I do not see a way to prevent such minor difficulties which the Chair believes can be overcome. I do not know how we can resolve the confusion unless both Houses meet and discuss the Senate amendments. I see the hon. member is rising to his feet. I welcome his intervention.

• (2120)

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I support what you said. On behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition I have read these amendments carefully. I want to be sure that we are all talking about the same subject. I do not think there is any quarrel between the government and ourselves. I know that the presentation of the amendments is sloppy, and I suppose we can do little about that, short of sending the matter back. I suggest that the opposition accepts your interpretation, Mr. Speaker, and we understand that it is agreeable to the government. Therefore, why can we not deal with it tonight? After the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) speaks, we are prepared to accept the amendment.

Let me make it clear that we are not debating a bill. We are debating the first item appearing in issue 229 of *Votes and Proceedings* of Friday, December 19, 1975, on page 965. The House is considering an amendment made by the Senate to amendments made by the House of Commons to Bill S-10. The matter is set down, as I say, on page 965 of

Votes and Proceedings. If the government agrees that we are discussing that item, I foresee no difficulty. There will not be opposition from my side of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not know if hon. members want the Chair to read the amendment. The point raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) is well taken. The message from the Senate of December 18 was printed in *Votes and Proceedings* of December 19, 1975. I do not know if I should read the amendment for the sake of those hon. members who do not have readily available their copies of *Votes and Proceedings*. Actually this House is requested by the other place to concur in an amendment the other place made to a bill. It will be the responsibility of the Senate to incorporate our amendments into that Senate bill. It may be difficult to do more, to give instruction to the Senate as to how it should implement any amendments made to the bill. That would have to be done elsewhere than in this House.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that I will not be difficult. I have a suggestion to make. I must say that this is a sloppy way to deal with these amendments. The House is asked to amend the bill in certain lines, but that is not at all that is to happen. Those lines to be amended are now somewhere else in the bill. If any member of the opposition brought in a motion asking for some bill to be amended on page 3, line 10, and he put down the wrong line, on the wrong page, he would soon be told he is wrong.

I think the Senate should have amended the bill in its latest reprinted form, but it did not. I will not press the matter; I will not be difficult, but I do say to Your Honour, and through you to the Table, that we should have the right to see a reprinted version of the bill incorporating all the amendments before the bill gets to the next stage, Royal Assent. Stopping it at that point is difficult. In effect we are approving a pig in a poke. We are approving amendments which are to be put in, and which are not as set down in *Votes and Proceedings*.

I will not object further. I think we should be assured that at some point the bill will be reprinted in proper form and that we shall see it before it is given Royal Assent.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the same point of order, I agree that there is some confusion as to where substantive amendments in the various pieces of legislation are to be included, but I think everyone agrees with the substance of the amendments being discussed. There is no confusion about the substance of the amendments or about the words used by the Senate and House of Commons. I do not think anyone disputes that. Therefore I think we ought to hear the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) who wishes to deal with the amendments as now worded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not wish to argue with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) but I think it will be difficult, even with all the good will in the world, for this House to so correct these amendments that they will appear in a reprinted copy of the bill which can be discussed at this stage. We are discussing this bill in its final stage before this House. These amendments are to be sent to the other place, where they can be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Send the whole thing back. It's pretty sloppy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps this is a good time to suggest that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization should look at this matter in order that we may avoid further difficulties. Perhaps we can find some other way of dealing with the problem.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) made a suggestion, and gave an undertaking on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. He wants to be satisfied about the problem that has arisen before we finally deal with the bill. I do not suggest that we should hold up the bill. I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) will consult with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain. If the hon. member is satisfied, we shall be satisfied. We do not wish to hold up matters.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the same point of order, I shall consult with the hon. member, so long as it is agreed that we shall deal with the matter with due dispatch. We are considering a motion to concur in an amendment.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is right.

Mr. Blais: I understand that not many hon. members wish to speak. Perhaps we could deal with the matter in the next 15 minutes or so.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In the meantime debate can continue.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern about the bill. My concerns were initially expressed before the standing committee which amended the legislation, and which later was amended by the Senate. If hon. members feel they are confused, how do they suppose a new member feels, a new member who is trying to learn the rules and is concerned about the mix-up between the House of Commons and the Senate? We amended parts of the bill. Then the Senate amended parts of the bill and sent them back to the House of Commons for concurrence.

Initially I expressed concern about the position of the small farmer who might have incorporated his farm and who, if found guilty of contravening certain provisions of the Feeds Act, could be fined a stiff fine by the courts. We spend a good deal of time discussing such questions in the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

• (2130)

I want to congratulate the hon. member who is chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture for being so patient as we wrestled with this amendment, attempting to break it down in such a way that the small corporate farm would not be treated in the same manner as the larger corporation. It seems that in our amendments we eliminat-

ed the large corporation from any fine other than the maximum of $2,000. This was noted in the Senate and an amendment was made. It was passed back to us in *Votes and Proceedings*.

Reading from the Senate Debates, Senator Argue said and I quote:

> Here we are narrowing it down to corporations found quilty of an indictable offence, and providing for a smaller penalty for a corporation found guilty on summary conviction.
>
> One of the worries of the members of the other place was that by providing for two types of fines, one for an individual and one for a corporation, a farmer who operates a corporation, for example, that mixes feed in the name of himself and perhaps his family—in other words, a very small family corporation—might be caught twice; he might be found guilty as an individual, and then found guilty as a corporation, so that he might perhaps even be placed in bankruptcy.

When one goes across this country he finds various reasons why many small farms have incorporated. Mainly it is for tax reasons or estate purposes. Because of that, there is a great deal of concern. Many of these small family farm operations and corporations today put in their feeds, in their own mix mills, various drugs and proteins, proteins such as urea which requires a thorough mixing. The labelling must be such that it regulates the mixing of urea into feeds in order that only cattle of at least five months or over 400 pounds should use the protein mixture. As well there are such drugs as aeromycin, terramycin, penicillin, arsenline acid and, at one time, DES mixed in foods for a long period of time so that they are thoroughly dispersed.

Under this legislation an inspector of the Department of Agriculture can go on a farm at will, take a sample of the feed, and have it analysed. Upon analysis it is possible he will find the feed has been improperly mixed. If he feels it would endanger the animals on the individual farm or a neighbour's farm, he could place the individual or corporation under indictment. This is of great concern to me.

I hope the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) will clarify this position and that, even with the Senate amendment, the small corporate farmer will not be treated in the same manner as the large corporation. As I read the amendment I am not sure that is so. I have read it over a number of times. We dealt with it in the agricultural committee. I still feel there is some concern.

The other concern is for small corporations which may only have a staff of one or two individuals. The manager of the corporation may also be involved in the mixing of feed. If his feed is tested by an inspector, analysed, and something is found to be deficient, the inspector can say to the manager of the corporation that there is a problem, and for some reason or other it involves a number of firms and a charge is brought forward.

Under this act, we are zeroing in on managers of corporations. This is all well and good for large corporations such as Swift and Purina, but it is of serious concern to the hundreds of small feed mill operators in western Canada, Ontario, Quebec, and the maritimes. I want to raise this query before we allow the bill to pass. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will relate this to his officials and, in the regulations, they will adhere to the difference between the small corporate feed mill or farm as compared to the large corporation which the Senate is attempting to get at when it amended our amendment wherein we limited the fine to

$2,000. That is the intervention I wish to make tonight before the bill passes on and is given Royal Assent.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a short reply. Our concern is to be fair when drafting the regulations. Regardless of how small a feed operator may be, our main concern is to ensure that the product he is offering for sale does not contain ingredients that will do damage to animals or humans. The byproducts from the animal, whether a dairy cow or swine, that will be used for human consumption must be as safe as possible. That is our basic concern.

If I may, I want to say one thing about the discussion that took place earlier. I do not think you will ever see this minister sending a bill to the Senate first.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, before we deal with this bill, regardless of whether we deal with it in an orderly, proper manner which would take time, or suit the convenience and time of the House of Commons, I want to point out that we are not dealing with something small.

The point raised by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) is extremely important. The matter we are touching on in the amendments deals with fines and imprisonment with respect to offences created by the statute. If I were the minister I would be very concerned about it.

I assume those sanctions are in the bill so that the ministry and the Crown can enforce compliance with the law. I suggest there is some grave doubt as to whether there are any sanctions in the bill if we follow the procedure suggested for the convenience of the House, a procedure I indicated I would go along with for the sake of convenience. However, speaking for the official opposition, we do not regard this nor do we accept this as a precedent for the manner in which we should deal with these matters.

If I were the minister I would be very much concerned that the bill being dealt with by the House tonight really has no teeth in it. I caution the minister. I do not think that is the intention of the government as expressed by the legislation. I ask the minister to review the amendments.

I ask the parliamentary secretary to consider the procedure very carefully, to consider what was said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and perhpas read *Hansard*. This is important.

I do not think there would be any objection from any member to put this legislation aside overnight so that it could be looked at during the morning to ensure that these matters are being properly dealt with and that the intent of the legislation, which this House has dealt with and is agreeable to, has been followed. That is the only caution I have.

I want to say to the Chair and through the Chair to my friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais), that it is a dangerous matter. I would not be opposed to allowing whatever time is necessary in his judgment.

• (2140)

Mr. Whelan: I, too, am concerned about this. The Senate amendment of the bill referred to it by the House contained only one modification of substance with respect to the bill as amended by the House on November 26, 1975. That modification will remove the penalty limit of $2,000 which may be applied to a corporation if found guilty of an offence on conviction by indictment. The limit is replaced by provision for a fine at the discretion of the court. We have asked our legal advisers for an opinion and I gather that this does not change the intent—the Senate amendment preserves the general intent of the House amendment and allows the court to levy a heavy fine on a corporation if found guilty of very serious offences. As I say, the Senate amendment has been examined by the department's legal advisers in consultation with the officials of the Department of Justice, and it is acceptable in this form.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am not quarrelling with the opinion of the advisers with respect to the amendment. The question we face is whether we ought to bring into law in this way the amendment which the department's advisers say is proper. That is the issue to which I am addressing myself. However, it is the government's bill. If the government wants to proceed in this way, that is fine. I do not know whether it is really the intent of the government. In any event, if we appear to be agreeing with this procedure I do not wish either the government or the Chair to feel it is intended by us to be taken as a precedent.

Mr. Blais: I think the House leader of the official opposition has made his position very clear. If I understand him correctly he approves of the substance of the amendment and feels it can be concurred in. However, he does not wish to be tied down; he does not wish the procedure now being followed to be taken as a precedent. I am content to have the hon. member's comments on record in *Hansard*, and perhaps we might now move on by indicating concurrence in the amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be difficult. I shall not stand in the way. I think the whole process is sloppy, and I am glad the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) has suggested that if we do go through with this it must not be regarded as a precedent. Some of us will not stand for this again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I might say a word at this point. The Chair has not taken this question lightly and I wish to reaffirm this to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker). As I said before, the legal branch of the House of Commons has looked at the matter and there does not appear to be much difficulty, though it is suggested the procedure should be improved or modified in order that the House might not end up in a like situation, the object being to ensure that any decision, whether by the House or by the Senate, is a clear decision. Members would then know where they stood and what kind of legislation was passed. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Under protest!

Motion agreed to.

* * *

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Thursday, March 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violence and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favour of the amendment presented on March 9 by my hon. friend from Calgary North respecting Bill C-83. His motion is certainly deserving of the consideration and approval of the House. It asks that the bill not be read a second time, but that its subject matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for study.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) pointed out most eloquently that the 76 page bill should be split, as 39 pages of the bill deal with new gun laws. This is another case of the government bringing in an omnibus or umbrella bill with a mixture of good legislation and bad, and hoping to sneak the entire package through by serving it all up on one platter.

This bill with its gun controls, broader wire-tapping powers for police, and tougher prison provisions, overlooks the real crime problem. When I compare the opening remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) on March 8 with the substance of Bill C-83 I find it difficult to believe that he and I are talking about the same thing. The minister opened his remarks with the statement that this bill represents major legislative initiative on the part of the government. I suggest that the minister's attempts to rewrite the dictionary have had the same unhappy result as the government's attempts to deal effectively with rising crime in our country.

Bill C-83 is a mish-mash, a hodge-podge, and a patchwork quilt of every conceivable sort of dodge that the minister could come up with in order to avoid facing this issue head on. The excellent rebuttal of this bill by my able colleague shows all too clearly that the Minister of Justice

has given us a mixed bag of tricks calculated to throw us off the scent. He and some of his fellow ministers are so determined that no murderer shall hang, or even suffer any real hardship, that they are prepared to sacrifice principle, and even to chip away at the rights of the law-abiding citizen to accomplish that purpose.

The minister went on to say that this bill is designed to ensure the adequate protection of the safety and security of the law-abiding, and the legal rights and dignity of those charged with offences. This is the best indication we could have that the minister has not changed his stripes. He is just as determined as ever to place his own personal convictions above those of the majority of members of parliament and above the wishes of the majority of Canadians. By all means, he says, let us ensure that the rights and dignity of offenders are protected. This is not the same as saying that the rights of all Canadians to full protection of the law should be preserved and protected. The minister should have said that this legislation is designed to protect the safety, security, and legal rights and dignity of the law-abiding.

My sympathies are, and have always been with those who are law-abiding and with those who are the victims of crime. I consider the dignity of the law-abiding to be infinitely more important than the dignity of those who are convicted of crimes, especially those who are convicted of violent crimes. If we can ensure that the dignity of all Canadians will be served by a particular piece of legislation, then let us by all means consider that possibility. But, Mr. Speaker, let us not place the cart before the horse. Let us first do what we must to protect the dignity of those Canadians who respect our system and our laws and who abide by our laws.

● (2150)

The Minister of Justice tells us that the safety and security of law-abiding Canadians will be enhanced by making it more difficult for law-abiding people to obtain and keep rifles and shotguns. In the same breath the minister urges us to approve legislation making it more difficult for people to obtain and keep automatic weapons, pistols, and such weapons as sawed-off rifles and shotguns. For the life of me I cannot make the connection between those weapons designed purely for criminal use, and those designed for, and used by, hunters and sportsmen. I am not talking about the types of pistols used by sportsmen for target shooting or by our Olympic shooting teams. These guns are required to be registered, and it is my understanding that permits are only issued for these pistols to persons known to be of good character and who do not have records of criminal activity.

What I am talking about is the registration of every person in Canada who wants to own a shotgun or rifle. In the first place it is a matter of record that no country in the western world has been able to prevent people from owning guns simply by outlawing them. It is also well known that one of the first things that a communist government does when it takes over a country is to outlaw the ownership of guns, any kind of gun, and the penalty for owning a gun in most of those countries is death.

History has shown that oppressive laws only breed lawbreakers. In some countries like Sweden, Israel, and France, oppressive tax laws have served only to develop a nation of tax cheats. A story in a local paper recently pointed out that the government of France collects only about one half of taxes actually owed, and it noted that the Frenchman and Frenchwoman who is not a tax cheat is a rarity. The same syndrome can be detected in countries where there are oppressive laws concerning the ownership of guns. A veteran police official in Britain, where gun laws are extremely strict, said that there are millions of unregistered guns in Britain, and he also said that there simply was not any way that anyone could ferret out these illegal guns.

The city of Detroit probably has the strictest gun laws on this continent, yet I need not point out that Detroit is the murder capital of North America and that the majority of murders in that city are committed with guns, restricted guns—outlawed guns, if you will. By comparison, in the deep south of the U.S. where anybody can own a gun of any type, except for automatic weapons, the per capita murder rate with guns is significantly lower than in cities where restrictive gun laws are in force.

May I just put some statistics on the record, Mr. Speaker. In 1973, 474 murders were committed; in 1974, there were 545 murders. Less than half this number in each year were committed with guns. I point out that in 1973, 56 murders were committed with a handgun; in 1974, the number was 71. There were 114 murders committed with a rifle in 1973 and 122 in 1974. Sawed-off rifles accounted for two murders in 1973 and six in 1974. Sawed-off shotguns accounted for three murders in 1974 only, none in 1973. Shotguns were used in 31 murders in 1973, and in 55 murders in 1974. In 1973, 11 murders were committed using a gun of an unknown type; in 1974 the number was 15. In other words, in the majority of murders some weapon other than a gun was used—for example, beatings, stabbings, strangulation, suffocation, drowning, axing; and in some cases cause of death was unknown.

What I am trying to say is that we in Canada cannot outlaw the instruments of death any more than we can outlaw death itself. If we could outlaw violent death, then I would suggest that the government use its majority in this House to do just that. That would be more reasonable and just than to use its majority to push this bill through the House. The Minister of Justice takes liberties with our intelligence when he suggests that we are in the process of outlawing the instruments of death by agreeing to impose licensing requirements and restrictions on all law-abiding Canadian gun owners.

A friend of mine, when I was speaking to him at a banquet last Saturday night and happened to mention the possibility that this very important and contentious gun control legislation would be before the House this week, stated that he could make a weapon, which I presume could be classed as a gun. He described how he could make it out of a piece of pipe and this, that, and the other thing, at a cost of 75 cents, and that he could make it in less than an hour. This is further proof that anyone who has the desire to murder will be able to do so using some type of weapon.

Let us take the various aspects of this part of the legislation and apply hypothetical situations to them and see just how ridiculous they appear in the clear light of day. I refer

hon. members to the first step, the establishment of a nation-wide bureaucracy of gun licensing agencies employing thousands of persons. These people will be given a frightening degree of latitude by this legislation to approve or reject applications from citizens who want to keep the guns they now own or to obtain new guns. I am talking about rifles and shotguns only.

Then pile on top of that the mountains of paper work that must be processed and forwarded to central record offices. In addition we must have an elaborate appeal procedure to protect the rights of citizens from arbitrary decisions made by bureaucrats. This begins to get more and more expensive, Mr. Speaker, and will enable the government to reward more and more of the party faithful, defeated candidates, and friends ad infinitum. Perhaps this is the way that the Minister of Justice plans to justify the enormous expense.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—SEALS—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORT ON DECLINE IN POPULATION AND NEED FOR DECREASING QUOTAS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, on March 1 I asked the Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc) two questions concerning seals and sealing on the east coast of Canada. The questions related to the tabling of an interim report to the minister from the committee on seals and sealing, and the studies by his department on alternative employment for persons who would be affected by a phasing out or stoppage or serious curtailment of the seal hunt. The minister's answers to these questions, is the reason I am debating the issue this evening. I wish I had 70 minutes, Mr. Speaker, instead of the seven minutes limitation that is imposed upon me.

In the July, 1974, election campaign many Canadians obtained a written or oral commitment from most political candidates that if they were elected they would ask the government to find ways and means of stopping the senseless slaughter of the seals and, at the same time, find alternative means of income for those who were affected by such stoppage. The concerned Canadians who opposed the seal hunt had three main reasons—first, the serious depletion of the seal herd; second, the method of killing the seals; and third, the minimum income obtained by the sealers.

● (2200)

The interim report of the committee on seals and sealing, which was composed of representatives from the animal welfare, scientific, and industrial communities, and was not aligned with any government agency, studied the seal hunt in Canada with regard to conservation aspects and humane killing methods. May I quote from the report regarding some of its findings. Having regard to the conservation aspects the report states at page 2:

> The one definite conclusion based on scientific analyses of available data between 1950 and 1970 is that the stock of harp seals has been halved. The original size of the seal population although of interest statistically, is immaterial in considering this point. The population trend towards decrease is continuing. This decrease in population has been supported by observations made by vessel-borne sealers, landsmen, government officials, casual observers, and biologists. There has been some difference of opinion on the effect of reducing the size of the annual kill on the recovery rate of the seal herd. Only continuing research can ensure the herd is not eradicated.
>
> If the seal hunt is maintained at the 1972 level there will be a total elimination of the one year old animals in 2014. The harp seal would then move toward extinction as the older animals die off. A decrease in the annual exploitation of the harp seal is therefore indicated if the species is to survive.
>
> A moratorium in 1973 on the taking of seals, except for those taken by the aboriginal population (native human populations of the Canadian Arctic and Greenland), would allow the herd to start its recovery in 1975. If the seal hunt is phased out, by all but aboriginals, over the period 1972-1974 then the herd will start to substantially recover in 1976. The phase out is preferable as it has obvious advantages to the sealer, as well as to the government in allowing the latter to implement economic support for these changes.

On page 6 of the report this committee summarizes by a number points as follows:

> 1. The majority of the Committee on Seals and Sealing supports a phasing out of the Canadian and Norwegian harp and hood seal hunt . . .
>
> 3. The phase out must be accompanied by an economic evaluation of the change in income to the sealer, vessel owner and operator and the processing plant operator, so as to prevent individual hardship.
>
> 4. Intensified research, through contract and governmental laboratories, must be carried out to ensure satisfactory guidelines for protection of the harp and hood seal population, if these species are ever again exploited.
>
> 5. The sealer, when advised, has made every attempt to act humanely in the killing of seals. There is no reason to believe he is in any way different in his attitude to the killing of animals from any other human being.

What has been the response of the minister? There has been no real phase out with regard to the seal hunt. There has been a slight reduction from 150,000 to 125,000 for the 1976 seal hunt. There has been no evaluation of the incomes loss to the sealers or the finding of alternative employment. There has been no research as to other methods of killing seals. There has been no research as to the effect of the eating habits of the seals on other marine life, and there has been no indication of the termination of the sealing agreement between Canada and Norway, and the necessity of giving three years notice with regard to its termination. In other words there has been no real response by the minister to these very vital issues.

What has been the response of most Canadians? There has been disappointment at the continuation of the senseless slaughter of seals for the maximum profit of the Norwegian industry which caters to the vanity of European women in a luxury trade. There has been concern that the government should pit sealers against other Canadians regarding loss of income to sealers, instead of finding alternative methods of earning income for the sealers. There has also been the necessity of the Greenpeace Foundation to dramatize the problem to the govern-

ment, instead of the government and members of parliament finding ways and means to solve the problem.

I am asking the minister to stop dividing Canadians on the social, moral and financial issues and to direct his mind and manpower to finding a solution to the conservation of the seals, alternative humane methods of killing, and the protection of income and the safety of the sealers. If he does this he will gain the respect and admiration of all Canadians.

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, there is no single report directed to the subject of current population levels of the seal herds. There are many recent scientific reports by Canadian and Norwegian scientists on the harp seal populations. These differ in content and conclusions.

It should be noted that at least four species of seals on the Atlantic coast are being hunted. The status of the various seal populations and the regulations under which they are harvested differ for each species.

The harbour seal and the grey seal are resident in Canadian waters the year round, and their activities in destroying fish and fishermen's gear are a serious problem in some areas. For this reason the department operates a bounty program to encourage the cropping of harbour seals, and itself undertakes and annual cull of grey seals, that is, the latter herds are thinned out by departmental officers to keep their numbers in check.

The species which are hunted commercially are the harp seal and the hooded seal. The abundance levels and population biology of the hooded seal are not well known, and the harvest has been held at a maximum 15,000 for the past five years. In 1976 Canadian hunters were allotted 6,000 and Norwegian hunters 9,000.

The species which is in greatest abundance is the harp seal and the main commercial harvest is directed toward this animal. It is a significant predator of fish and thereby a significant competitor of fishermen. At current population levels it is estimated to consume about one million tons of fish and smaller marine animals annually, including a quarter of a million tons of capelin—itself a significant food item of other fish species, and also of our people.

Like the hooded seal, the harp is not present year round in Canadian waters, but is present during its breeding season in late winter and spring. During this period it consumes 10 to 15 thousand tons of herring in the gulf of St. Lawrence alone.

The harp seal has been hunted commercially for hundreds of years, not only in the Northwestern Atlantic, but in the White sea and other places near Spitzbergen in the Northeastern Atlantic. All these herds have fluctuated in size over the years, and have, at one time or another, experienced over-exploitation. In the Northwestern Atlantic the harp seal is hunted in spring by ship-based hunters from Norway and Canada, and by land-based hunters in Newfoundland and the Magdalen Islands. At other times of the year it is taken at Labrador, the Canadian Arctic, and West Greenland by resident fishermen and hunters.

The harp seal appears to have been over-exploited at several times during the long history of the seal hunt in the Northwestern Atlantic, most recently in the 1960's. The hunt came under international regulation, International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries—ICNAF, in 1967. An initial quota of 245,000 in 1971 was reduced to 150,000 in 1972 to 1975, and to 127,000 in 1976.

Excessive exploitation in the 1960's and earlier has resulted in declines in pup production in the 1970's. Lower levels of pup production may be expected until the beneficial effects of the quotas from 1972 onwards become evident in 1978 onwards, since the seals mature at about age six. Meanwhile the hunt is being regulated to prevent further decline in the herds. The herd is now estimated at about one million animals.

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

AGRICULTURE—EFFECT ON EXPORT TRADE OF REMOVAL OF TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY ON FLOUR—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question directed to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) on March 19 concerned the impact of the removal of the transportation subsidy on grain and flour shipped from east coast ports which constitutes a serious threat to an important industry and is a policy decision which, I believe, should be reconsidered by the government.

The minister in his answer left the impression that the flour milling industry for export purposes is a dying enterprise. He implied that it is better for us as a nation to ship the raw product, in this case wheat, rather than worrying about processing it in the form of flour. I must advise him for his information that some markets for grain can only be met by the export of flour. For example, Africa, and the nations in the West Indies do not have any flour milling capacity, and so therefore the exports we ship in the form of wheat have to be made in this case in the form of flour.

● (2210)

It is interesting to note that Canada mills approximately 90 million bushels a year. In the face of this the sort of shallow attitude of the Liberal government has led Canada into a major slump in manufacturing trade which is now causing us to slide into a major crisis. This attitude has resulted in our country facing a very serious trade deficit. In 1975 there was a deficit of some $8 billion in the so-called higher technology manufacturing field. That was $1 billion worse than it was the year before, and more than three times the sum of what it was in 1970. This means lost jobs, lost economic activity, lost investment activity, lost potential for technological achievement and, in short, lost opportunities for present and future generations of Canadians.

I am told that the elimination of this subsidy could mean a loss to Canada of something in the order of $28 million worth of value added processing activities, or a total economic spin-off of something in the order of $65 million.

Let us look at the flour trade and what has happened in Canada relative to the world position, and let us examine for a moment what effect this government decision will have upon its future.

First, world demand for flour has expanded from 65 million hundredweight in 1954 to 95 million hundredweight in 1974, an increase of 50 per cent. Canada's share, meanwhile, declined from 31 per cent to 11 per cent. In 1954 Canadian millers were exporting 20 million hundredweight. In 1964 we exported 24 million hundredweight on an annual basis, and in 1975 our exports dropped by more than 50 per cent from the 1954 figure, to a figure of 8.5 million hundredweight, and by 65 per cent since the 1964 figure.

The minister suggests that more and more countries are milling their own flour. Well, for his information, only Canada and Australia have experienced substantial declines in exports of flour. The U.S. share has not fallen appreciably from its level of 1954. As a matter of fact, until 1972 it was well above its 1954 level. The European Common Market, meanwhile, has expanded its exports over a period of ten years from 15 million hundredweight to 64 million hundredweight in 1974. Therefore it is categorically wrong to suggest that world export demand for flour has fallen. As I pointed out earlier, some countries have no flour milling capacity so the only way our grain can enter those countries is in the form of flour.

The actions which are proposed by the government in abolishing this freight subsidy will only serve to worsen an already deteriorating Canadian industry and will result in further declines in our share of the export flour trade. In this instance I do not believe that the government has carried out an accurate cost benefit analysis, and I suggested that it do just that before proceeding further. The result of this action by the government will increase freight costs to Canadian millers by 212 per cent. This cost will have to be added to the export price of flour.

We are told by the Canadian National Millers' Association that while the U.S.S.R. has indicated requirements for 375,000 tons of Canadian flour during 1976, it has insisted that further negotiations be conducted in the event of freight costs are to be adjusted upward. The U.S.S.R. representatives have stated further that Canada is no longer competitive in world markets and that further price increases will require them to look for alternative suppliers.

The Canadian National Millers' Association sums up its observations as follows:

> Eliminating the subsidy and the «hold-down» will visit disaster upon Canadian millers and damage a substantial export market for Canadian wheat in the form of flour. We cannot believe that these and other foreseeable consequences are in the public interest.

I urge the minister to persuade his cabinet colleagues to reconsider this policy. I suggest that an immediate cost benefit analysis be undertaken, and if it is revealed that such a subsidy should be discontinued, something which I doubt, then I suggest that it be discontinued in a phase out period over the next four or five years so that the industry can adjust over a period of time rather than be disrupted by a spontaneous government action.

I do not believe the action which is contemplated by the government in the form of restraint program is in the public interest at this time. I believe it will only serve to accentuate the speedy demise of Canada's already shaken and eroded flour industry. I must say in conclusion that the whole restraint program which has been advocated by the government plays too harshly with agriculture. I think agriculture under this restraint program is getting short shrift.

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, part of the initial rationale for the "At and East" subsidy was to keep an all-Canadian route competitive with the American alternative. American rates have increased significantly since that time and current indications are that a full compensatory level in Canada would be preferable to other alternatives. However, as the subsidy has been in effect for some time its removal will result in some adjustment for Canadian flour exporters.

As the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) mentioned, there has been a general movement in most countries toward milling their own wheat. To the extent that Canada has replaced some of our flour exports with wheat exports these markets have not been lost. The world export market for flour has been stagnant since the late fifties with an increasing share of the market going to lower quality, subsidized EEC flour. In spite of substantial PL480 activity even American sales have dropped dramatically.

Canadian flour exports fall into three categories: first, commercial; second, government; and, third, Russia-Cuba. The bulk of these sales are made to Cuba under the Russian sales agreements for Canadian grain. The removal of the subsidy will not affect sales in 1976. In the longer run it is expected that Cuba will move toward a higher degree of self-sufficiency in wheat milling. Until that time the government will continue its efforts to maintain this market.

Commercial sales and sales to the Canadian government together accounted for the balance of flour exports—about 25 per cent. Sales to the government will likely continue at present levels regardless of the subsidy. Commercial sales may be effected. However, a strong case has not been made by the Canadian National Millers' Association as to the magnitude of these effects. The Department of Agriculture is keeping a close watch on this situation and if other aspects arise appropriate action will be taken.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—INQUIRY WHETHER THERE ARE ANY PLANS FOR PORT OF PICTOU, NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I should like to pursue further the question I raised earlier this month with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard) concerning whether or not DREE has any concrete plans or projects, either by itself or in concert with other federal agencies in the province of Nova Scotia, for development assistance for the port of Pictou.

I know that we are in a time of restraint in government spending, but that, I submit, does not or should not apply to essential infrastructure projects. I realize that priorities must be constantly re-examined. However, I submit that there is a good case to be made for more DREE involvement in developing the port of Pictou. At least we must begin some systematic efforts to improve matters.

This once busy and still strategic port is immediately adjacent to a heavily industrialized infrastructure including Hawker Siddeley, pulp and paper mills, Scott Pulp,

Michelin Tire, Ferguson Industries, shipbuilding and so on, together with several small industries. These are important industrial components of the complex which ships all over the world and needs proved access to salt water in order to realize its full potential.

This is not the first time I have pointed out to the minister and to his predecessor, now the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson), that Pictou county in general and the port of Pictou have been neglected, and that DREE by itself and in conjunction with other federal departments such as Public Works and Transport ought to and indeed must make a meaningful effort to upgrade this port for the good of the area and its people.

This month the minister, in response to my request for support in my representations to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) to keep open the customs office in Pictou, stated that he was advised the volume of business would not justify my request to the Minister of National Revenue being granted. This is indeed a retrogade step because now the port of Pictou can no longer act as a ships' registry. Surely this ought to give the minister and the government an additional reason for improving the port. Once it is improved, the business will come to it.

● (2220)

Earlier this winter I got in touch with civic officials, business executives, and other prominent and interested persons in Pictou county, to ask for their opinions and support in making the government in general and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in particular aware of the need for better marine facilities at Pictou. I received that support from the mayors of several towns, and received an offer of assistance from the Pictou County Research and Development Commission.

In the limited time available I wish to put on record some excerpts from communications sent to me by some of the mayors of towns which, together, make up this important industrial area.

Mr. R. J. Murae, Mayor of Stellarton, wrote in part:

> I wish to assure you of my complete co-operation on your endeavour to improve port facilities in Pictou. It is something that is long past due. I propose to have a resolution passed by our council and forwarded to you immediately.

Walter Duggan, Mayor of Westville, wrote:

> It is our feeling that any development to the port facilities would not only benefit the town of Pictou, but the county as a whole.

M. A. Harquail, Mayor of New Glasgow, wrote:

> Pictou county has a great need for industrial and economic expansion. Industrial expansion without ready access to markets, is, as you are aware, a case of putting the cart before the horse. For this reason I endorse your efforts and offer my support.

The mayor of Pictou, Mr. Clarence McCarthy, sent out many detailed examples of how Pictou would benefit from and is entitled to more funding to increase its capability as a port. I forwarded his excellent letter to the minister as I did with the other letters. I wish to put part of his representation on public record in *Hansard* so that people of Pictou will see where he stands on their behalf. The mayor said in part:

> Mention is made of the ice locked condition of the harbour during the winter months as being a deterrent. To counteract this one should look back to the war years when the port was a most important repair depot for the Royal Canadian Navy every month of the year, and Foundation Maritime Limited were building . . . 2,400-ton steel freighters and sending them to sea, once each month, 24 in all.
>
> If we consider the freeze-up as a reason for non-use of the harbour by our Pictou county manufacturers it could be an argument that storage sheds with enough capacity to carry over this freeze-up period are needed; incorporated as well could be capacity for at least . . . 12,000 tons of feed grain which would be transported from the Lakehead before freeze-up. Surely this would allow for cheaper feed than the present method of storing a rail shipment of only . . . 200 tons at Scotsburn.

It is obvious that we are not using the port of Pictou to its best advantage.

Pictou county has recently received assistance in the form of DREE grants made to businesses in the area. We recognize this and appreciate it. As member for the area, may I, too, express my appreciation. But unlike the "grand centres" encompassing the Halifax-Dartmouth area, or the strait area of Nova Scotia, we have received little if any of the type of infrastructure aid to which we are entitled. For example, $20 million was committed in 1972 for the Metropolitan Area Growth Investment Organization in the Halifax-Dartmouth metropolitan area. To date this investment has produced little if any benefit because of the delays arising in handling. The interest paid on this money in three years would be more than enough to pay for the facilities which the port of Pictou desperately requires.

In conclusion I ask the minister to make a commitment to provide more infrastructure aid in Pictou county and to improve the port of Pictou. This will bring quick rewards in promoting a better way of life and expansion of business. The people of Pictou county have always shown an ability to respond to opportunity. They deserve a more equitable share of federal moneys spent in Nova Scotia for infrastructure assistance.

I hope the minister will give my representation favourable consideration. I repeat that this important area of Nova Scotia has not received its fair share of infrastructure aid. It has not received that kind of assistance to which I referred in my question earlier this month.

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, as usual the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) ably delineated his concern for his region. He was able to quote from letters sent by people in Pictou and neighbouring communities which support his position.

I am aware that Pictou has a great tradition as a shipbuilding centre and as an active port over the years. To my knowledge, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was not directly approached by the government of Nova Scotia about further planning or funding for port development at Pictou.

As I am sure the hon. member is aware, the development of port facilities falls under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transport. I am not offering that to dodge any responsibility from the point of view of DREE. DREE has provided industrial incentives to a number of firms in Pictou. It is my understanding also that our officials anticipate a further proposal from a firm in that area in the fairly immediate future.

It is certainly the intention of DREE to make full use of all of the development instruments available to provide co-operation and full support for initiatives undertaken by the province, by other federal departments, or by the private sector to help the port of Pictou achieve its full potential and at least some of its former greatness, of which the hon. member is well aware.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10:29 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 30, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FLOODS

SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS ON RIDEAU RIVER AND COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald):

That the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development undertake a complete investigation of the flood conditions in the Rideau River with particular emphasis on:

(a) precautionary measures that were taken by his department and the machinery for interjurisdictional co-operation;

(b) any improvement thereon that might be made in such procedure; and particularly any immediate action that can be taken;

(c) the question of compensation for damage suffered by property owners and recommendations for action by the government alone or in concert with other governments.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, such motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

MANPOWER

SUGGESTION GOVERNMENT HIRE CASUALS THROUGH MANPOWER RATHER THAN PRIVATE AGENCIES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that as an austerity measure the government has dropped a program which would have saved millions of dollars by eliminating the government's dependence on private employment agencies to provide casual labour in the government; in view of the fact that as many as 2,000 people a day are hired through these agencies to provide casual labour for the government; and in view of the fact that these people are viciously exploited by these private companies to the extent of 20 or 30 per cent of their salaries being paid to these companies who do no more work than accepting and making a phone call, this labour arrangement looking more like feudalism and indentured labour than anything else, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That to protect people from exploitation at the hands of private employment firms and to save the government millions of dollars, the government immediately initiate a policy of hiring casual employees only through Canada Manpower.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The said motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

PROPOSED DEBATE ON PROBLEMS CAUSED BY IMPORT OF TEXTILES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to discuss a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

Considering that the federal government is duty-bound to protect the Canadian textile and garment industry, in particular against low cost imports, and considering that the American policy of import limitations is proving highly successful and deserves our full consideration, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That the House initiate immediate discussions on the situation of this Canadian industry in the light of the U.S. experience and at the same time strengthen the mandate of the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce so that department officials responsible for the implementation of this policy may be asked to testify and bring forth all necessary clarification on this issue.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent, therefore the motion may not be put.

[*English*]

ENERGY

EFFECT OF ENERGY COSTS IN THE ATLANTIC REGION ON FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. I think all hon. members know the devastating effect that recent large increases in costs of energy have had on the Atlantic provinces. As 90 per cent of the energy used in that part of Canada is derived from petroleum and as energy costs in the Atlantic provinces are two or three times greater than energy costs in Ontario and Quebec, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall):

That the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion report to this House forthwith on the negative impact on federal programs of regional development which present and increasing energy costs have; and, further, that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources indicate at that time what interim programs and assistance are being provided so as to ensure the effectiveness of present federal development policies and programs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion can only be presented, pursuant to Standing Order 43, with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

TRANSPORT

PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE FERRY SERVICE BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter relating to ferry services between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, and the urgent and pressing necessity of relieving the congestion and delays which hinder commercial and tourist traffic between these two provinces each summer. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald):

That the Ministry of Transport implement the recommendations of the P.E.I.-mainland ferry transportation study steering committee which recommended weeks ago that: "A group should begin work to remove the ferry M.V. *Confederation* from Borden to Wood Island in time to carry traffic this summer": and further, that the Minister of Transport instruct those officials in the marine and ferry division of his department to proceed with all haste so that the operator of the service between Wood Island, P.E.I. and Caribou, N.S., may finalize plans for the hiring of a crew and the refitting of the ferry *Confederation* without any further delay.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES FROM DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the proposal by Canada to purchase from Lockheed Aircraft Corporation 18 anti-submarine planes at a cost of $1.1 billion is under a cloud, I move, seconded by the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That civil servants should be "quarantined" for at least three years after retirement from dealing directly or indirectly with government on any subjects for which they once were responsible, especially in view of the fact that top retired Canadian civil servants have the most generous pension scheme of any people in the nation.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

THE PERFORMING ARTS

WINNING OF ACADEMY AWARD BY CRAWLEY FILMS FOR DOCUMENTARY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of great importance to Canada. For many years we have recognized that great reservoir of talent in Canada for production in the film industry. Yesterday, for the first time in the history of the Academy Awards, a Canadian feature length documentary film produced by Budge Crawley of Crawley Films in Ottawa was not only nominated but went on to win an Academy Award. In view of the great encouragement this is to all other Canadian film producers and directors, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That this House send its warm congratulations to Mr. Crawley for his landmark achievement which has so greatly enhanced Canada's reputation in the creative arts.

Mr. Speaker: Within the terms of Standing Order 43, such a motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House having heard the motion, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion, moved by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen), seconded by the member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSITION OF COMPANY ON FINANCING

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday the minister indicated that during the initial contract negotiations the government had been told by Lockheed "that they could arrange the financing". Is the minister saying that Lockheed, which already owes $595 million, did not tell the government that it could not incur any new debt or even be a technical borrower without permission of the United States Emergency Loan Guarantee Board?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the Lockheed Corporation on earlier occasions, and again at the last of the negotiations, indicated they had these types of problems. They also indicated they could solve them and that they could, in fact, provide the financing for which we were asking. We were under no doubt about that, that they could provide the financing.

Mr. Clark: Could the Minister of National Defence tell the House precisely what information he had from Lockheed at that time as to guarantees they would be in a position the minister apparently believed they would be in? Can he give us precise information as to the guarantees he received concerning the time frame within which they would be in the position in which the minister apparently presumed they would be in?

Mr. Richardson: At that time we were negotiating with two companies, the Boeing Company and the Lockheed Company. They both indicated very clearly to officials of the Department of National Defence and, in particular, to General Allan who was in charge of the project office that they could provide the interim financing or the bridge financing to complete the difference between the funds which were available in my department and the payments set out in the payments schedule. That word was brought to us by General Allan following his conversations and we assumed it was accurate. It subsequently became apparent that the Lockheed Company was not able to provide this financing.

* * *

LOBBYISTS

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF STUDY ON REGISTRATION—REASON FOR LACK OF ACTION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary for the Prime Minister. Yesterday, the Minister of National Defence could not answer any questions as to the date on which Lockheed retained the firm of Reisman and Grandy Limited or the terms and conditions—which was precisely my reason for raising the matter of the registration of lobbyists on Friday. In the light of the Prime Minister's indication that this matter may be brought into consideration during the course of the study on guidelines for retired public servants—I am referring to the registration of lobbyists—would the Prime Minister review and then table the study on the registration of lobbyists which was carried out for the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs, now Minister of Justice, and would the right hon. gentleman tell the House why no action was taken in connection with that study at the time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I would have to refresh my mind with regard to that study; I do not, honestly, recall its conclusions and I therefore cannot say why it was not, to use the hon. gentleman's phrase, acted upon. I would point out to him, in connection with this matter of the registration of lobbyists, by way of confirming my questioning the other day the efficacy of such a course, that Messrs. Reisman and Grandy claim they are not lobbyists and that in fact they are not lobbying the government for anything.

Mr. Clark: However the Prime Minister tries to define it, we obviously face a problem here arising from that situation. Would the right hon. gentleman give immediate consideration to the registration of those firms and individuals which make money by making representations to the government or to its agencies?

Mr. Trudeau: The suggestion is far too vague to have any validity at all. I am sure every member of the House, including those on the government side, find that representations are made to them practically every day of the week. They may come from so-called lobbyists; they may come from lawyers who are passing through town, they may come from economists, they may come from university professors. A lot of representations have been made to me in the last little while by members of the Canadian Medical Association. So, surely, the Leader of the Opposition does not think it is that simple—just to ask everybody who wants to talk to the government to give their names.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ROLE OF MR. GRANDY IN SELECTION OF "ORION" AS LONG-RANGE PATROL AIRCRAFT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday, outside the House, the minister confirmed that the government, and I quote, "spent three years selecting this particular aircraft". Would the minister tell the House what role the former deputy minister of industry, trade and commerce, Mr. Grandy, played in those deliberations?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Grandy was the deputy minister of industry, trade and commerce during part of that period. I cannot say which committees he sat on. I presume he must have had some contact with the discussions which were taking place. That is to be expected in view of his position. But I have no details of his work schedule during that period.

● (1420)

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—VIEW OF PRIME MINISTER ON NEGOTIATING CONTRACT WHEN SUFFICIENT FUNDS NOT AVAILABLE TO ENSURE PRODUCTION

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the right hon. Prime Minister. I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman would comment on the fact that his Minister of National Defence was apparently authorized to announce the purchase of the Lockheed LRPA when he did not have sufficient money; further, that his Minister of Supply and Services negotiated a contract apparently without knowing that the Department of National Defence were unable to provide the necessary financing; and further, that the deputy project manager from supply and services prepared a contract calling for the Department of National Defence to provide the money although he surely must have known that they did not have any? Would the Prime Minister now indicate what steps he is taking to ensure that this utter shambles will not occur again?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, a rhetorical question which is based on a misunderstanding, a serious one, of the facts.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF FACT COMPANY COULD NOT FINANCE CONTRACT WITHOUT APPROVAL OF UNITED STATES EMERGENCY LOAN BOARD

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Considering that any Canadian who is going to buy something makes sure, first, that the company can provide it and, secondly, finds out in advance what the terms of payment are going to be, can the minister assure the House that he was aware last November that the provisions of the 1971 United States emergency loan guarantee act were on public file with the U.S. securities and exchange commission, and that these provisions, according to the secretary of the emergency loan guarantee board, Alan Vinick, make it very clear that Lockheed was not in a position to consider financing a contract such as the LRPA without the permission of the board and the 24 creditors?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am certain that my officials were aware of that last November and I have seen evidence to that effect in writing. But they were also told, as I have said on a number of occasions, that those restraints could in fact be overcome and that Lockheed could provide the financing.

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister mind expanding on that last statement. If he is about to commit the people of Canada to spending millions of dollars, indeed billions of dollars, did he not take steps to find out just how Lockheed was going to be able to get around what seems to be a clear requirement in terms of U.S. law and regulations?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that at that particular stage in the negotiations we had to accept the word not only of the Lockheed company but the Boeing company, both of whom said they could finance these interim payments. We then made our decision and entered into detailed negotiations. It was in the final negotiations that it became apparent that what Lockheed had told us they could do they were unable to do.

[Mr. Richardson.]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR CONTRADICTORY STATEMENTS ABOUT FINANCING

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that the vice-president of marketing for Lockheed, Mr. William Wilson, specifically denies what the minister has just said, and that he has said that the Lockheed corporation all along left no impression with the government of Canada that it could provide the financing that the minister says was the government's understanding? If so, how does he give any account for this flat contradiction between what he is telling the House and what a senior official of that corporation is saying? In answering that, to what did he refer in past answers in the House about a month ago when he said that there was some confusion between the government's understanding of the financial arrangements and Lockheed?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as recently as this morning, and on numerous earlier occasions, I talked with the officials who were negotiating with Lockheed and they were very clearly of the belief that Lockheed could provide this financing. They were so told and they so reported to us, and it was on that basis that we continued—

An hon. Member: By Lockheed?

Mr. Richardson: Yes, by Lockheed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

NEW DAIRY POLICY—POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT ON QUOTAS FOLLOWING MEETING WITH PRODUCERS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I shall put my question to his parliamentary secretary.

As the minister is soon to announce the dairy policy of the government for the year 1976-77, may I ask him if the minister has had talks with the management committee since yesterday's meeting with the industrial milk producers? If so, can he tell us whether some consensus has been arrived at that is acceptable to the producers with regard to the provincial quotas?

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the minister met the committee in question this morning. He is now holding discussions with them and I can say absolutely nothing at this time about what proposals may have been made by the provinces.

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

May I ask the parliamentary secretary whether sometime today, after the talks have come to an end, a statement could be made in the House, if it is indicated, to inform hon. members about the conclusions arrived at by the members of the management committee, the Canadian Dairy Commission and the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I cannot guarantee the hon. member that this can be done today but one thing is sure: the minister is supposed to announce his policy within the next two days. According to the law, it must be done each year before April 1.

* * *

[*English*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

ALLEGED CONFLICT BETWEEN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES OF MR. REISMAN AND APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF CROWN CORPORATIONS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Will he confirm that Mr. Reisman of Reisman and Grandy was elected to the board of directors of the Canada Development Corporation as a voting director on April 1, 1975, and prior to that was a non-voting member as the deputy minister of finance? He is still a director of Telsat, which dates back to December of 1970. Does the right hon. gentleman feel there is a conflict of interest in this appointment in view of the present commercial activities of Mr. Reisman?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Finance could confirm the exact dates, but I do know the first part of the facts to be as stated, that Mr. Reisman is a member of these two boards and that he was retained on these boards after he had ceased being a member ex officio by virtue of his position as deputy minister. As to the conflict of interest aspect of it, Mr. Speaker, I told the House the other day we were going to look into these matters. As stated, I am somewhat worried about the activities of upper level civil servants in the years after they leave the service. I do not see a conflict of interest just on basis of the fact that a man, now in private life, is seconded by these corporations to sit on their boards.

ALLEGED CONFLICT IN MR. GRANDY'S POSITION AS DIRECTOR OF DE HAVILLAND WHILE ADVISING LOCKHEED

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister see a conflict of interest in the appointment, until September 19, 1975, of Mr. James Grandy of Reisman and Grandy as a member of the executive committee and director of de Havilland—I understand he is in no longer in that position—while at the same time his firm was advising Lockheed Aircraft on the LRPA sale to the Department of National Defence? There seems to be a conflict there.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, once again I cannot confirm the dates, but it seems to me that the question is in reference to Mr. Grandy's position in advising two non-governmental corporations, and I do not see how that would be in conflict with the government. It is advice that those corporations are asking him to give them. There may be a conflict between the two corporations; there is none with the government beyond, once again, the serious question I raised about activities of deputy ministers after they leave the public service.

* * *

● (1430)

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO CONTRACTS WITH REISMAN AND GRANDY

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the answer given by the Prime Minister to the previous question would he consider tabling all documents involving Messrs. Reisman and Grandy and the federal government and whatever additional correspondence or documentation there is which might spell out in detail the terms of reference of these contracts? Is he now in a position to provide the House with this material or has he investigated? If not, will he do so and make a statement with respect to the matter and table the necessary documents?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I intended at three o'clock under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) to table in both official languages copies of the contracts with their former departments, contracts between Mr. Grandy and Mr. Reisman. If the House would give permission to do it now that would save the time of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the Prime Minister have the consent of the House to table the documents forthwith?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

ENERGY

REASON FOR MINISTER'S STATEMENTS ON HIGH ENERGY COSTS IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines, and Resources who will recall that on Friday last the Minister of Finance indicated the response to requests from the government of Nova Scotia on the question of power costs resulting from higher oil prices, would be on the agenda this week. In view of this why does the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources feel it necessary to take a rather negative attitude toward any such requests in public? Does he feel that the government of that area has failed to take advantage of all previous suggestions made by the government of Canada?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was asked some questions yes-

terday by members of the press referring to the serious situation in the Atlantic provinces. I answered them to the best of my ability and I think I gave a fairly accurate assessment of the situation. I think it is important that hon. members opposite recognize that the federal government has taken a very large number of steps already to assist consumers in the Atlantic region.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fairweather: Let them freeze in the dark.

Mr. Gillespie: While recognizing the difficulties of consumers in the Atlantic provinces, let us not forget there are consumers all across Canada—

An hon. Member: Thanks!

Mr. Gillespie: —who are having to face increasing energy costs. This government made it very clear in 1973 that the days of cheap energy were over.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Play it again Sam!

An hon. Member: No, but it is a cheap government.

Mr. Gillespie: We also took a number of steps at that time to cushion Canadians against the new oil prices.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to indicate to the minister that he may not be fighting so much with members on this side of the House as with the governments of those provinces. I should like to ask whether he has taken this attitude toward what is obviously a very severe problem for Nova Scotians and the islanders whose case is not like that of consumers in other parts of the country because of their heavy dependence on oil? Does the minister base his attitude in part on the feeling that the governments of those provinces have not been responsible in taking precautionary measures to the problems facing the people now?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I was alluding to the fact that there are many consumers of natural gas in other parts of the country who have found that natural gas prices increased at about the same rate and the same standard as electric rates in the maritime provinces. I think this is sometimes overlooked. The other point is the federal government placed a number of proposals before the provinces in Atlantic Canada and some of those are still on the table.

CONSULTATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND ON DEVELOPMENT OF GULL ISLAND SITE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same minister. In view of the fact that the development of the Gull Island site in Lower Churchill could provide the power that is needed throughout the maritimes and parts of the United States, could the minister inform the House what progress the government has made with regard to consultations with the province of Newfoundland on the question of development of that site?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of consultation. I met with ministers from the province of Newfoundland. There are several problems involved, one having to do with the retention and proposed buy-back of some of the power, which has been generated in Newfoundland, from the province of Quebec. Recently there have been meetings between Newfoundland and Quebec ministers. The federal government told the Newfoundland government that our offer of $343 million is on the table for them to develop an interconnection between the Churchill Falls site and the province of Newfoundland. We are very hopeful that the province of Newfoundland will be able to work out some arrangement with the province of Quebec and include us in the financing of that interconnection.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRIES INTO FINANCING BY TREASURY BOARD

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board and concerns the Lockheed-Orion matter. As I understand normal procedure, before an agreement in principle is announced, the proposed purchase would routinely go before Treasury Board which would examine the financial viability of the purchase. Can the minister advise the House in this particular case whether, before the November 27 announcement of the agreement in principle of the purchase, the Treasury Board made any inquiries into the financial viability of that purchase or into the question of loan restrictions on the Lockheed Corporation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the financial aspects of the program had been submitted to the Treasury Board and to the cabinet before the final decision. The Department of National Defence budget had been established for several years taking into account the payments to be made for the Lockheed project but obviously the problem which occurred since then which we thought to be part of the financing made by Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Limited seems not to have been understood as such by the company.

[*English*]

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I presume the answer of the President of the Treasury Board is that no inquiry was made. Under the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board was a certificate of some kind granted by Treasury Board to the effect that the proposal for purchase in principle was correct and that the proposal was financially viable? Was any inquiry whatsoever made of the United States authority by the President of the Treasury Board?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: The negotiation of the contract terms is never done by the Treasury Board itself. We set the financ-

ing parameters and it rests with the minister concerned to assume responsibility for the contract terms within the prescribed financial parameters.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY MESSRS. GRANDY AND REISMAN RECOMMENDED PURCHASE OF "ORION"

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary directed to the Minister of National Defence. In answer to the hon. member for Victoria, the minister indicated that he could not be specific about the committees that Messrs. Grandy and Reisman sat on. Can the minister be specific about whether either of these gentlemen recommended to cabinet, approval of the purchase of the Lockheed Orion? Was there any recommendation made to cabinet by either of these gentlemen for purchase of the Lockheed Orion?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker. The responsibility for that decision rested first of all with the project office, then through my deputy minister to me and from me to cabinet. That was the chain of recommendation.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—AGREEMENT ON FINANCING SHOULD BE WRITTEN RATHER THAN ORAL

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the Minister of National Defence. As someone who had considerable business experience before entering cabinet, would the minister not agree that it is against all accepted business practice to deal with such an important part of a potential contract as financing by word of mouth rather than having it committed to paper and thereby knowing exactly what is being dealt with? Is this not particularly so in view of the fact that there is such a very large amount of money involved and that the financing of this deal is a tremendously important part of it?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent to the hon. member that until the contract was signed there was not a piece of paper that was in fact negotiable with the banks. It could not be finalized until after the contract had been completed. But there were very, very full discussions with both of the companies which were competing for the contract at that time, and both of them very clearly indicated that financing was possible. The terms of that, of course, had to be worked out after the contract.

● (1440)

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—PROPRIETY OF NEGOTIATING WITH COMPANY WHICH IS UNDER INVESTIGATION

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have one supplementary for the Minister of National Defence. Does the minister think it is proper for the Government of Canada to enter into contract negotiations with a firm whose activities are now under investigation?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear in earlier answers that following our decision in principle to purchase the Lockheed, that company did run into serious difficulties because of improper payments or accusations of improper payments in other countries, and for that reason we wanted to have assurances from the United States government with regard to the viability of the company. As I indicated to the House before, we intend to have those assurances in writing before proceeding.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

ALLEGED FEAR EMPLOYEES WILL NOT RECEIVE PAY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services or the President of the Treasury Board, or perhaps the Prime Minister might want to respond because it involves the Public Service of Canada. I wonder if the minister can give some assurances to allay the widespread fears circulating this morning, particularly aroung Ottawa but also in other centres in Canada where there are large concentrations of public service employees, that they will not in fact receive their pay cheques tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reassure the House if a mistake was made yesterday. The bank misunderstood the rules of the House: the cheques presented at the Bank of Montreal yesterday were entirely valid. However, the bank does not understand well the procedures of this House and I think that there are a few members who do not understand them either.

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: I am not at all sure that I understood the response of the President of the Treasury Board. It was not at all clear whether the public service will be paid tomorrow. Will the Prime Minister, to whose attention this matter was drawn this morning, indicate to the House and the public servants of Canada that they will in fact be paid tomorrow?

Mr. Chrétien: If the cheques are dated prior to April 1, the cheques will be honoured; if they are dated after April 1, they would have to wait for the Senate to pass interim supply. I am informed that the Senators will be very diligent and that the bill will be passed tonight.

Mr. Forrestall: I wonder if I could then ask the minister if he could indicate how many people are about to fall into the category whose cheques will be dated April Fool's Day, because this is a serious matter and there is widespread concern right across the country.

Mr. Chrétien: In so many words, what I wanted to say earlier was that everyone will be paid according to the cheque they receive either today, tomorrow or the day after, because interim supply will be passed by the Senate tonight.

Oral Questions

PUBLICATIONS

SUGGESTION "MACLEAN'S" REDUCING RURAL CIRCULATION WHEN LEGISLATION ON "TIME" AND "READER'S DIGEST" INTRODUCED

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State, and although I recognize it will be slightly lengthy, I ask your indulgence. I ask the minister whether he had an opportunity to read the advertisement placed by *Maclean's* magazine in last Wednesday's *Globe and Mail,* which reads in part as follows:

> ... we wanted our small-centre and rural circulation *cut,* bringing us to a nicely honed, grand total of 675,000. Problem is, those readers are not dropping us quickly like hotcakes. They're dropping us reluctantly, like handshakes.
>
> We've tried, God knows we've tried. We doubled our subscription price. We dramatically changed our editorial appeal, slanting it directly at the city folk. We stopped all minor market circulation efforts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a question, would he put it.

Mr. Beatty: I was just coming to a conclusion there.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Beatty: I ask the minister whether he has seen the advertisement indicating that *Maclean's* magazine intends to curtail its editorial content with respect to rural issues and also its rural circulation. If so, may I ask the minister, at the time he was proposing his legislation to put *Time* and *Reader's Digest* in Canada out of business, had *Maclean's* magazine indicated that it intended to cut back on rural editorial and rural circulation?

May I further ask the minister whether the government has any—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hope that by now the hon. member has included whatever proposed supplementary he had.

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the ad. The purpose of Bill C-58 was not to drive *Time* and *Reader's Digest* out of the country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Smile when you say that.

Mr. Faulkner: That is the kind of myth hon. members opposite have been trying to perpetuate for a year and a half.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: Given the rather nasty comments made about *Maclean's* during the past year and a half by hon. members opposite, I am surprised they are concerned about the drop in its readership.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

ENERGY

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO SOUTH KOREA—POSSIBLE BARTER ARRANGEMENT FOR PAYMENT

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In an authoritative report done for the United States energy research and development administration it is indicated that South Korea will pay for some of the cost of its new Canadian CANDU nuclear power plant with textiles. I think the minister and I would agree that if such a report is true, it should be denied immediately—I am sorry. If it is true—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lawrence: It has been pointed out that the government normally denies what is true, but the question is, if it is true, I wonder if the minister would give us an explanation; and if it is not true, I wonder if he would deny it immediately.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, payment will be made in money.

Mr. Lawrence: To be more specific, is there any arrangement, subarrangement or subcontract relating to the CANDU reactor in South Korea whereby it will be paid for directly or indirectly by the importation into Canada or the export to Canada of textiles?

Mr. Gillespie: No barter arrangements have been negotiated of which I am aware.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

INQUIRY WHETHER CERTAIN INFORMATION CANNOT BE CONVEYED BY TELEPHONE

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

I have here with me a letter which reads as follows:

> In reply to your letter of March 2, we would ask you again to get in touch with us by telephone.
>
> We need some information which cannot be confirmed by letter. Therefore, we hope to hear from you as soon as possible.

This letter was sent by a high official of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, at the Department of Urban Affairs.

My question is this: is the minister aware that certain questions are asked by telephone which are so important that they cannot be put in writing? If so, why do high officials use that procedure?

[*English*]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have to look at the letter itself and go into the matter with the hon. member. I do not know the precise circumstances involved, but I would certainly be interested in following through.

ENERGY

FEDERAL PREDICTIONS ON OIL PRICES—ALLEGED FAILURE OF NOVA SCOTIA TO ACCEPT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ON POWER GRID

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Today's Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* in a lead story on escalating power costs in Nova Scotia suggests that the federal government intends to give no special help to the province of Nova Scotia when crude oil prices are raised on July 1. The story says that Energy, Mines and Resources officials warned the premier of Nova Scotia—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to interfere again with another hon. member posing a question, but all hon. members are aware that very few have had access to the question period, I think, primarily as a result of rather long preambles to questions in general, and I do not want to try to enforce a regulation against one without making it uniform.

● (1450)

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell the minister that the story says that the premier of Nova Scotia was notified years ago about the inevitability of rising fuel costs. Does the minister know that the premier of Nova Scotia said that a document entitled "An Energy Policy for Canada" issued in mid-1973 by the minister's predecessor predicted that foreign oil prices would not reach $7 per barrel until the year 2000, and in 1976 would be less than $4 per barrel?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the premier of Nova Scotia made that statement, but he quoted correctly. It goes to show how rapidly and dramatically the oil picture changed in this country.

Mr. Hogan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The same story referred to energy, mines and resources officials as saying that Nova Scotia has not taken up the federal government's offer to help finance an eastern power grid. Does the minister know that in 1971 the Nova Scotia government asked the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for financial assistance on this matter?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that particular request but I do know that we offered the province the opportunity to participate in a regional nuclear reactor. That offer was not taken up.

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF AMOUNT OF LOSS

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of reports that Canada has renegotiated the financial terms of the nuclear reactor sale to Argentina and the contract still involves AECL assuming a substantial loss on the sale, will the minister say exactly how much this project will cost the Canadian taxpayer?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that information now. I suppose we will not know until after the contract has been fully completed. I know that substantial progress was made on renegotiating the terms of that contract.

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE OF ADHERENCE TO SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister said outside the House that he sees no problems in proceeding with the sale to Argentina even after the change of government last week in Argentina, whereas the Prime Minister said in the House that he would want to make sure the new Argentina government will discharge its contractual and treaty obligations, has the minister received assurance in these renegotiations that the military junta will honour the terms of the safeguards agreement?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I see nothing inconsistent between my statement and the statement of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Hees: Alastair, you never see anything inconsistent between what you say and reality.

SUGGESTED STUDY OF EAST BRAINTREE SITE OF RADIOACTIVE DUMP—REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and has to do with the East Braintree radioactive site. As the minister said previously that the site was in a desolate, remote area, whereas it is but 100 feet from a well travelled road, will the minister now undertake to cause a complete study of the site, determine why it was chosen and make the study findings public, so that the people of the area may be assured that their present fears are unfounded?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, action on the matter is being taken.

Mr. Epp: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the site is found to be radioactive, will the minister undertake to transport the radioactive materials to a waste management site, in accordance with the recommendations of AECB officials, who suggest that is the only way to deal with such material?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that every action necessary will be taken to preserve public health and safety.

Oral Questions

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

IMPLEMENTATION OF MARIN REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS—POSSIBILITY OF RETROACTIVITY

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Solicitor General may I direct my question to the Minister of Justice? Since Judge René Marin's commission of inquiry into various aspects of the RCMP was tabled several days ago, can the minister indicate if any policy decision has been made as to when, and by what means, some of these excellent recommendations will be brought into effect? If not, when will such a decision be made?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think the Solicitor General would prefer to answer the question at the first opportunity when he returns to the House.

Mr. MacKay: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the House if some past inadequacies and inequities respecting internal RCMP procedures will be corrected in future and on a retroactive basis, so that some members of the force recently discharged or disciplined may have the benefit of more just and enlightened treatment in the form of hearings into their particular circumstances? I think particularly of officers like Don McCleery and Gilles Brunet.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer the Solicitor General to answer that question specifically.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

ORDER AGAINST ATLANTIC SUGAR REFINERY EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Hees: Donald!

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, my legislative assistant is helping me again.

How can the government justify the fairness and equity of a system whereby the Anti-Inflation Board ordered employees of Atlantic Sugar Refineries of Saint John, New Brunswick, to pay back part of a wage settlement arrived at in September, seven months ago. It is to be rolled back. Does the minister not think that this is retroactivity carried to extremes?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am struck by the elegance of the hon. member's legislative assistant.

Mr. Hees: Thank you, Don. I shall say something nice about you, too.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would have to discuss the matter further with the Anti-Inflation Board, to learn their reasons. I remind the hon. member that the concept of payment back is included in the legislation. The board obviously exercised careful judgment in this case.

[Mr. Gillespie.]

EFFECT OF DECISION IN ATLANTIC SUGAR AND IRVING PAPER CASES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance? What action will the government take to offset the obvious impression created among Atlantic province workers after the Irving paper decision and, now, this decision, that Anti-Inflation Board decisions relating to wage agreements in the Atlantic area will maintain, indeed exaggerate, the regional disparity between the economy of the area and the economy of the rest of Canada, and confirm the second-class citizen syndrome of the residents of the area, because that effect is inherent in the board's decisions.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that that impression is totally unfounded. I will take the hon. member's question as a suggestion to stress that, in future, when there are opportunities to discuss this program in the Atlantic provinces. I stress that this is a national program, with national application.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO CURB DETERIORATING INDUSTRY—LABOUR RELATIONS

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Responding to an earlier question I put to the minister about the advisability of enacting legislation designed to restore individual freedoms and rights of workers to members of Canadian unions, the minister said there was no problem. Can the minister indicate today if the government has long-range or immediate plans to curb deteriorating industrial and labour relations in our country which are causing irreparable damage to our competitive position on world and domestic markets.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, we embarked on wage and price controls in order to, among other things, correct the very difficulty implied in the hon. member's question. We hope the program will be successful. There is already evidence that it has been successful. In the meantime, we intend to carry on discussions with the labour movement, to ensure their maximum co-operation even though they have withdrawn from some federal bodies. The hon. member may be aware that the President of the CLC left the door open for multilateral discussion at other levels.

Mr. Oberle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the special difficulties created in British Columbia as a result of the railway shutdown, will the minister tell the House if his department is attempting to identify essential services and find a solution which will curb the number of strikes and shutdowns in those services by way

of legislation designed to return responsibility to the labour scene?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we hoped to work out an acceptable formula with the labour movement. Progress along those lines was being made with the Canada Labour Relations Council. We shall now have to devise other techniques for achieving those ends.

● (1500)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS FOR SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members the distinguished presence in the gallery of the minister of communications for Saskatchewan, the hon. Mr. Shillington.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order having to do with the business of the House for today. It is a point I have discussed with the government House leader, the House leaders of the other two parties on this side, and with several other hon. members. I dare to hope there will be agreement to the suggestion I should like to make.

There is a general desire in the House to get on with the second reading of Bill C-92 having to do with former prisoners of war. The government is finding it difficult to provide government time for that bill. However, at five o'clock today the private members' hour is one that has been assigned to me to deal with one of my public bills. I should like to make the offer to surrender that hour, which happens to be set aside for my bill, on the condition that it be used, instead, for government order No. 92, in other words, Bill C-92. Some of us would be quite prepared to deal with the bill entirely in the hour, but I do not make that a condition. I would just like to suggest that we agree to a House order that at five o'clock today we proceed to Bill C-92.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the desire of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre perhaps to make up some of the time we lost a few weeks ago when he moved the adjournment of the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: I am sure that was not his purpose and that he had very good intentions in mind. I would like to say, however, that it is the intention of the government, if the bill is not disposed of in that hour, to call it on Thursday.

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we in the official opposition attach the highest priority to the welfare of veterans in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): We certainly welcome the generous offer by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to proceed with second reading of Bill C-92. We also give our assurance that we will not delay passage of this bill and will ensure that it will be dealt with within the hour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, given the great importance of this bill for the veterans, we also agree to have second reading on Thursday. In no way do we want to delay the passing of this bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: It is not easy, of course, to at this moment draft an order covering both provisions, the giving over of the hour and the consideration of the bill, with the provisions attached to it. The House has certainly indicated its position. I would think the most orderly proceeding would be to make the arrangement at five o'clock, unless the House is now prepared to agree that at five o'clock private members' hour will be given over to government business on the understanding that Bill C-92 will be dealt with at that time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the President of the Privy Council whether certain times have been set aside for any debate on the objections submitted concerning the revision of the electoral map of the province of Quebec?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: We have not yet reached the regular Thursday period of time for House business. However, the hon. member has put a question about whether any arrangement is envisaged at the moment to take care of the debates under the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, there are some discussions now going on, having in mind setting aside a couple of days to deal with all the objections that have been registered with respect to redistribution. I understand that the form of the order is now being drafted. I hope to put it on the order paper within the next day or so.

ENERGY

TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO URANIUM ENRICHMENT STUDIES IN QUEBEC

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I am tabling copies, in both official languages, of correspondence relating to uranium enrichment studies in the province of Quebec. Similar correspondence is being tabled in the Quebec legislature.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

STATEMENT OF MINISTER ON FLU VACCINE

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that my department has accepted the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Immunizing Agents for a selective immunization of high risk groups of Canadians against the A/Swine strain of influenza.

The Committee recommended that:

1) Bivalent A/Swine and A/Victoria influenza vaccine be made available to those of all ages who have such chronic conditions as heart disease, chronic bronchopulmonary disease, chronic renal disease, diabetes mellitus and other chronic metabolic disorders, and to all persons over 65 years of age.

2) Monovalent A/Swine influenza vaccine be made available for persons between the ages of 20 and 50 (highest risk 20-40 years of age) with priority being given to those responsible for maintenance of essential services.

3) A/Swine influenza vaccine is not recommended as a routine for infants and children because of the increased incidence and severity of adverse reactions to the vaccine in those under the age of 16 years.

All provinces have accepted in principle the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee. Discussions are continuing with various manufacturers and the United States government on the availability of vaccine supplies.

In discussions with the provinces, my department offered to take responsibility for locating vaccine supplies and negotiating purchases. Because of a limited domestic capability to produce flu vaccine, it is anticipated that Canada may have to import the majority of doses.

While it is impossible to say for certain that an epidemic of A/Swine influenza will occur in the fall of 1976, the National Advisory Committee was of the opinion further A/Swine influenza virus infections in humans are possible and even likely to occur in the next year. On all previous occasions when a major new strain of influenza A virus has become established, epidemics or pandemics have resulted.

In mid-February 1976 a virus strain of A/Swine influenza was identified from four men at Fort Dix, New Jersey. This virus strain is similar to that which is suspected to have been responsible for the 1918-19 influenza pandemic which infected an estimated 500 million people worldwide, including one of every six Canadians, and resulted in approximately 20 million deaths, including 45,000 in Canada. Since the first isolation at Fort Dix, one of the four men has died and there is now laboratory confirmation that 21 per cent of the total personnel have been infected with this virus.

Officials of my department have been in close touch with their American counterparts and are fully informed of the situation in the United States. Contact has also been made with the World Health Organization in Geneva, the WHO World Influenza Centre in London, England, and U.K. health authorities on this matter.

Vaccines to prevent influenza have been available for 40 years, and with technological advances, their efficacy has increased. A specific vaccine will provide maximum protection only against the virus strain from which it is prepared, and less protection against closely related virus strains. Protection commences approximately three weeks after vaccination.

During the past winter, influenza B, which is considered to be a less severe illness than influenza A, has been common in Canada, and is, therefore, not anticipated in epidemic proportions in the 1976-77 season. However, clinical illness due to A/Victoria/75 is currently being experienced in Canada, and it is too early to determine how many will have been infected, and conversely, how many Canadians remain susceptible. For this reason it is likely that a further outbreak of A/Victoria influenza may be experienced in Canada during the 1976-77 influenza season. It is therefore important that those high risk population groups for whom influenza vaccine has been recommended in the past, should be offered protection against the A/Victoria strain.

Similarly, the apparent absence of A/Swine influenza infection in humans in Canada since the 1918-19 pandemic has led to the development of a large population susceptible to the A/Swine virus. The New Jersey experience has demonstrated that this virus now has previously unrecognized capabilities of human-to-human transmission.

Influenza vaccine is prepared from fertilized chicken eggs infected with influenza virus. The virus in the vaccine is inactivated with formalin and thus the vaccine is known as a "killed vaccine". Immunization with a killed vaccine does not involve injection of live virus into the recipient. In the past, adverse reactions to influenza vaccine have occurred with some frequency, particularly in infants and young children. Although these reactions have been considerably reduced by new production methods, it is not advisable to recommend large scale routine immunization in this group.

In the light of the 1918 influenza pandemic experience in which individuals 20-50 years of age experienced the highest mortality rates, such persons are again considered to be at similar risk to infection from A/Swine and in need of protection.

The elderly and chronically ill require routine protection annually against the prevailing influenza strain—in this case A/Victoria. In addition, the elderly, who either escaped infection in 1918-19 outbreak, or whose immunity levels are inadequate, should receive protection against swine influenza. Hence the recommendation for the use of bivalent vaccine in this group.

A selective immunization program for high risk groups of Canadians should provide adequate protection for the public and, in addition, help to reduce the potential of worldwide spread of influenza A/Swine virus. The high degree of cooperation already evident in federal-provincial discussions on this matter indicates that the immunization program should be successful in achieving these goals.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House and in view of the exceptional circumstances of this case, I would like to table in English and in French, a copy of the report of the National Advisory Committee on Immunizing Agents.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, before I get into the meat of this statement I want to express some displeasure about the fact that the minister provided a copy of his comments only very shortly before the sitting began. It is impossible to make a detailed study of the announcement in such a short space of time. Further, it is rather strange he should have chosen not to let us see the report of the National Advisory Committee on Immunizing Agents, but that he should simply have tabled it at the end of his comments. The minister points to the report now, but he sees I am on my feet and obviously I cannot look at the report or study it.

Having said that, I agree that a vigorous national immunization program should be undertaken. I am somewhat confused by a number of statements the minister has been making on this subject in the past few days as well as today. He tells us a selective program was chosen, but he does not give us the reasons for making this choice rather than opting for the innoculation of the total population as the Americans have decided to do. Had I seen the advisory committee's report in advance, I might have got the answer from that report. But since I did not have that opportunity I shall have to make my comments on the basis of the statements which the minister made.

On March 25, in response to a question from my hon. friend from Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) the minister told the House that Canada has the capacity to produce 300,000 vaccine doses by next fall. That number coincides, incidentally, with a press report suggesting that the Armand Frappier Institute, University of Quebec, is capable of producing that number of doses. The minister also suggests that the majority of the vaccine to be used here would have to be imported from the United States. Yet in a telephone interview with Dr. Salk, the man famous for having developed the polio vaccine—he is now the director of a large U.S. government viral research establishment—expressed the opinion that the United States would not have any of this vaccine available for export until November, which would be too late for us. Another press report suggests that the United States might find it difficult to find enough vaccine to meet its own needs.

Further to this, I have information from Connaught Laboratories suggesting that if the department of national health gave them the go-ahead, so to speak, they would be capable of obtaining machinery which could produce between five million and ten million doses in this country by the end of the year. It is strange the minister chose not to mention anything about that. Perhaps we can conclude from his utterances in the past few days that he only went to the Armand Frappier Institute and did not bother to ask Connaught what they could do. Apparently Connaught has an option on some special machinery which could produce these large numbers of doses for us; this machinery could be purchased. They had some reservations about the availability of eggs, and we could possibly enlist the help of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) as far as eggs are concerned; he has recently had some problems disposing of them.

The statement made by the minister is woefully lacking with respect to certain information. Additional information must be provided in order that the House might appreciate the problem the hon. gentleman is facing. Perhaps we could then understand why the figure he has given us seems to be at such variance with the figures I have been able to obtain with respect to our production capability. The minister suggests that those between the ages of 20 and 50 would be given A swine vaccine and that those who are suffering from debilitating illnesses, and all those over 65, would be given a combined vaccine of A swine virus and A Victoria virus. This leaves a substantial segment of our population unprotected—all those between the ages of 50 and 65 and all those under the age of 16.

In the same statement the minister says the vaccine is not being given to those under the age of 16 because of the possibility of adverse reactions. Yet children under the age of 16 who are ill will be given it. This suggests to me that perhaps the danger from an adverse reaction is less than the danger of the disease itself. Maybe an explanation should be given us with regard to this point. We know from past experience, from the experience in New Jersey, that this virus is transmittable from human to human, and it is therefore important that all who live in this country should be protected to the best of our capability. We find in the minister's statement the suggestion that there is a large reservoir of susceptible people, a situation which calls for the placing of greater emphasis on a more comprehensive immunization program.

One of the questions I want to put to the minister is this: Who is to bear the cost of the administration of this program? I believe the minister told us earlier that the federal government would pay for the vaccine and that perhaps the provincial governments would bear the cost of administration and distribution. But he made no further comment on that aspect today. He told us, however, that in addition to those in the various age groups who would be protected, those responsible for the maintenance of essential services would also be vaccinated. I wonder what he means by that, precisely.

When we talk on other subjects and try to determine what essential services are, the government always pleads total ignorance. I am interested in finding out what these essential services are. I wonder whether members of the government of Canada will be included. It occurs to me we might find the country runs much better without the government of Canada than with it. In any case, we shall have an opportunity to question the minister a little later. In the meantime, perhaps he will give serious thought to the questions I have raised so he can deal with them in a few minutes' time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to express our approval of the decision the government has made, and in particular our approval of the announcement being made at this time, so that the necessary preparations can get under way for the immunization which is anticipated. I suppose that this is one of those occasions when a member ought to declare his interest. I happen to be one of the millions who suffered through an attack of swine flu in December, 1918, but I was one of the lucky ones; I survived. Perhaps I should say, luckily for this House I survived!

● (1520)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That halo is hanging heavy.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am glad to know some hon. members are listening. My other interest, of course, is that now that I am over 65 I am in the group that is to get this vaccination universally. However, having declared my interest, may I go on to say that we were hoping that there would not be undue delay in making and announcing this decision. We hope that suggestions such as have just been made by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) will be considered, particularly with respect to finding sources in this country for producing the vaccine so that the program can go ahead.

I note that there have been consultations with the committee referred to whose report has been tabled. I note there has been consultation withh the provinces. I should like to suggest to the minister that even though relations between the government and the medical research community of Canada may not be of the best at the moment in view of what is being done to grants for medical research, perhaps there should be close consultation on this matter with those of that community.

We anticipate the possibility that some of the decisions in this announcement might have to be modified, and I hope close study will be given to that. There are a great many people in the left-out group—all those between 50 and 65, a considerable number of those between 40 and 50, and even those between 20 and 40 are not covered on a universal basis. When you leave out all those below 16 except those who have the disease, it means that this program is far from universal. So it is really only a step in the right direction. But it is being taken early enough in the year so that plans can be carried out. However, we urge that the program be reviewed, not with the thought of cutting it back at all, but with the thought that perhaps it should be extended.

Like the hon. member for Athabasca, I would be interested in a firm statement by the minister as to who is paying the cost of this program. Obviously, if it is to be of any use to the people of Canada it will have to be paid for at the government level. Is it being paid for by the federal government, or by the provinces; or is it being divided, with the federal government providing the vaccine and the provincial governments providing the services?

I think nothing more needs to be said at this time. As I say, we welcome the fact that this announcement is being made early. The minister and his department can be assured of the support of this House in proceeding with this program so that an epidemic in Canada of either of the kinds of influenza referred to by the minister, in the latter months of 1976, can be avoided.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement that the minister just made, concerning the intentions of the government of Canada as to the A/swine influenza, I wish to point out that I am glad to hear such statements today. This shows that the Department of National Health is concerned at this moment about the problem raised by the reappearance of that virus which seamingly was responsible for the pandemic called the Spanish flu in 1918-19.

The minister points out in thinly veiled terms the possible severeness of the situation, especially if it were to make any progress, since every time there was that A/swine influenza, epidemics occurred whith the terrible effects we know. It must be considered that our bodies no longer have the necessary resources to fight effectively that disease, for it has disappeared for a long time. We know that the virus may be conveyed among human beings, but science still does not know how the disease is conveyed.

For the moment, it seems very difficult to obtain a useful stock of vaccines for Canadians. If we depend on other countries to obtain the vaccines that we lack, what will happen if those countries need them for themselves?

To emphasize the seriousness of the situation, I would like to mention two other facts. The United States have announced their intention to prepare for massive inoculation. The World Health Organization is now concentrating its energies on the problem of the reappearance of this virus. There is certainly no cause for alarm, but before such a situation, which I believe to be even more serious than the minister suggests, we must take some action. It is not unthinkable that it would become impossible to vaccinate everyone who needs it if the disease really took epidemic proportions next fall or next winter. This could certainly greatly worsen a situation which is already difficult in Canada in various aspects.

We must in fact wonder if there are not very specific causes for all this. At any rate, I urge the Minister to continue to examine this problem very seriously and with all the energy required. I believe that our governments, like the rest of Canadians, have to realize that we must unite before this problem and concentrate our efforts and allocate the money required. Later might be too late.

We hope that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) will study very closely the age and group selection made and recommended by the advisory group whose report has just been submitted to the House and which I have not read. In any event, we are certain that this is not a matter of politics or of saving money. We are all aware that there are much more important things at stake, and that the health of Canadians is involved.

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister can clarify what, in his view, is Canada's capacity in terms of producing this flu vaccine at the moment.

Mr. Lalonde: The capacity is exactly as I said it was, Mr. Speaker—300,000 doses. With the purchase of additional equipment, the Armand Frappier Institute in Montreal could produce perhaps up to a million doses. As far as Connaught is concerned, they have indicated to us in the last few days that by purchasing equipment and running a sort of crash program they might be able to produce between five million and ten million doses. But here again, in both these cases this capacity does not exist at the present time and would have to be developed. We will have to look at this in terms of the supply and the price of what we can get, and at what price from abroad, and what would be the cost and capacity of delivery of domestic supplies additional to the 300,000 doses that we expect it is possible to produce.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Dr. Salk of the United States has indicated that it is not likely that there will be exports from the U.S. until November, can the minister indicate why he has not given the go-ahead to Connaught to purchase this new machinery and start immediate production, since this could turn out to be a very grave matter for the country?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Salk is not a spokesman for the U.S. government on this matter.

Mr. Gilbert: Would the minister tell the House who is going to bear the expense of this program, whether it will be the federal government, the provincial government, or is it going to be shared?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, this program is going to be administered on exactly the same basis as any other drug program. Some administration might be eligible for cost-sharing under medical care or hospital insurance; some might not. But there is no different administrative set-up for this particular program than for any other vaccine program in Canada at the present time. It is standard administration. We have been in touch with all the provinces in this respect. There will be no special administrative set-up for this particular purpose.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another question which is supplementary to that of my predecessor.

Could the minister tell us if he has met provincial representatives to form a medical task force which would look after medication and manufacturing of vaccines in cooperation with provincial health departments?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, it might be useful to the hon. member to know that the advisory committee is made up of distinguished epidemiologists from all parts of Canada including provincial representatives. For instance, the chairman of the committee comes from the University of Alberta and other members are from the Toronto Hospital for Sick Children, some from my own department, from the British Columbia Department of Health, from the Ontario Department of Health, from the Quebec Department of Social Affairs, from Sherbrooke University and from the Manitoba Department of Health. It is quite representative of various areas in the sector of the scientific community and of different provincial health departments.

Flu Vaccine

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister rejects the statement of Dr. Salk who is the leading authority on this subject in the United States, will the minister indicate what information he has, how many doses are available from the U.S. for Canada, and at what time they will be exported to Canada?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, it would be easier for me to provide the answers to some of these questions if the hon. member did not always distort what I have said. I did not say I rejected Dr. Salk's statement; I said he was not the authority to speak on behalf of the American government. That is a very different thing. In addition, before answering the question I might tell the hon. member that I sent a copy of my statement to his leader at 12.50 today. If he did not get it until a much later time, I am not responsible for that. If it took him more than two hours to read 4½ pages, there is not much I can do to help him understand the issue.

● (1530)

As far as the question itself is concerned, we are in touch with the United States government. Traditionally, we have been able to obtain between 7 per cent and 9 per cent of U.S. production. We have discussed this with United States officials. The question is being raised at a very senior level of the United States administration and I hope to have an answer on the subject in the next few days. There is no reason to believe we will not be able to count on roughly the same proportion of supply as that which we have received in the past. Frankly, there is not much point in the United States immunizing the majority of its population if there are millions of people up north of it who are not immunized at all and who might be subject to this particular influenza. It is to the advantage of all of North America to immunize as many people as possible. The selective approach within Canada has been set out by the national advisory committee on the subject.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the minister feels there is going to be a sufficient supply if the United States comes across with the amount he thinks it will, will he indicate why he has chosen to be so selective in this program, rather than providing the vaccine to people between the ages of 50 and 65, for example, who are also susceptible, perhaps less so than others but amongst whom deaths could also occur?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, the reason is very simple. This was the recommendation of the national advisory committee. The announcement I made today is an exact reproduction of the report of that committee, and I hope the hon. member will take the time to look at it.

Order Paper Questions

FOREIGN LAND OWNERSHIP ACT

MEASURE TO PROHIBIT ACQUISITION OF LAND BY NON-CANADIAN CITIZENS OR LANDED IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Peter Stollery (Spadina) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-429, respecting the acquisition of land by non-Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Stollery: Mr. Speaker, the bill addresses itself to the problem of non-residents of Canada holding land here for investment purposes. The bill is called the Foreign Land Ownership Act and prohibits the acquisition of land by persons who are not Canadian citizens or landed immigrants, except for residential and recreational uses, up to a maximum of ten acres, or for the purposes of a business permitted under the terms of the Foreign Investment Review Act. This is a great problem in urban areas of Canada where non-residents tie up land, thereby increasing housing prices. The bill is addressed to that problem.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,604, 3,711, 3,849, 3,851, 3,971, 4,021, 4,053 and 4,770.

[*Text*]

GRANTS TO PROVINCES FOR PROMOTION OF MINORITY LANGUAGE

Question No. 3,604—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

1. How much has been granted for the promotion of the French language as part of (a) bilingualism (b) multiculturalism in (i) Newfoundland (ii) Nova Scotia (iii) Prince Edward Island (iv) New Brunswick (v) Ontario (vi) Manitoba (vii) Alberta (viii) Saskatchewan (ix) British Columbia?

2. How much has been granted to Quebec for the promotion of the English language within these programmes?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State and the minister responsible for multiculturalism as follows: 1. (a) Newfoundland: 1970-71, $123,485; 1971-72, $173,-419; 1972-73, $224,891; 1973-74, $193,331; 1974-75, $498,993. Total: $1,214,059. Prince Edward Island; 1970-71, $101,490; 1971-72, $128,905; 1972-73, $227,429; 1973-74, $243,128; 1974-75, $405,845. Total: $1,106,797. Nova Scotia: 1970-71, $733,615; 1971-72, $847,585; 1972-73, $951,235; 1973-74, $794,088; 1974-75, $1,450,149. Total: $4,776,672. New Brunswick: 1970-71, $3,694,660; 1971-72, $6,664,993; 1972-73, $5,769,933; 1973-74, $6,542,304; 1974-75, $6,212,141. Total: $28,884,031. Ontario: 1970-71, $12,164,400; 1971-72, $21,438,234; 1972-73, $18,230,841; 1973-74, $22,240,455; 1974-75, $23,142,093. Total: $97,216,023. Manitoba: 1970-71, $885,557; 1971-72, $1,133,693; 1972-73, $1,189,253; 1973-74, $997,812; 1974-75, $1,721,733. Total: $5,928,048. Saskatchewan: 1970-71, $597,863; 1971-72, $432,-914; 1972-73, $784,269; 1973-74, $570,889; 1974-75, $980,064. Total: $3,365,999. Alberta: 1970-71, $865,359; 1971-72, $1,075,-811; 1972-73, $1,026,007; 1973-74, $884,404; 1974-75, $1,342,045. Total: $5,193,626. British Columbia: 1970-71, $883,558; 1971-72, $1,018,744; 1972-73 $819,857; 1973-74, $1,019,025; 1974-75, $1,669,663. Total: $5,410,847. (b) Direct support for the promotion of the French language is not the focus of this programme's activity.

2. Bilingualism, Quebec: 1970-71, $29,986,813; 1971-72, $42,600,236; 1972-73, $34,165,243; 1973-74; $39,486,575; 1974-75, $50,441,472. Total: $196,680,339. Multiculturalism: Nil.

CONTRACTS AWARDED TO KODAK CANADA LIMITED, TORONTO

Question No. 3,711—**Mr. Reynolds:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 1,956, of the over $5,000,000 spent on contracts awarded to Kodak Canada Limited, Toronto, Ontario for 1974, how many dollars in goods purchased were directed to (a) the Department of Veterans Affairs (b) the Unemployment Insurance Commission (c) Statistics Canada (d) the department of the Solicitor General (e) the Department of the Secretary of State (f) the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (g) the Department of Public Works (h) the Public Service Commission (i) the Post Office Department (j) the Department of National Revenue (k) the Canadian International Development Agency?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by several departments as follows: (a) $21,581.00; (b) $134,701.04; (c) $4,583.98; (d) $283,106.78; (e) $2,052.94; (f) $18,864.35; (g) $19,794.00; (h) $620.52; (i) $5,041.39; (j) $158,104.92; (k) $16,043.17. The Department of Supply and Services placed contracts on behalf of customer departments as follows: (a) $7,000.00; (b) $111,000.00; (c) $5,000.00; (d) $19,000.00; (e) nil; (f) nil; (g) nil; (h) nil; (i) $4,000.00; (j) $143,000.00; (k) nil.

NOTE: The Department of Supply and Services also placed Master Standing Offers at the National and Regional levels for the procurement of photographic processing materials such as film, paper, chemicals, etc. These Master Standing Offers are negotiated with suppliers in order to establish a fixed price for commodities and services, against which individual customer departments can obtain their requirements throughout the year. As the Department of Supply and Services does not obtain copies of the customer departments' requisitions, it is not possible to determine the value of procurements made by individual customer departments. Replies submitted by the various departments or agencies mentioned indicate the value of purchase.

PEI COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,849—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, have any experiments been conducted with the use of trawlers possessing an icebreaking capability in order to lengthen the effective fishing season for offshore fishermen in PEI and (a) if so, what are the results (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the

Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: Due to a steady stock decline in offshore ground fish, plans for experimentation with trawlers possessing ice breaking capabilities were suspended.

PEI COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,851—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, have specific measures been taken since the Plan's inception to increase the aggregate catch for PEI fishermen and, if so (a) what were they (b) on what date was each measure introduced (c) what was its cost (i) per year (ii) in total (d) what affect has it had in terms of increasing the aggregate fish catch?

2. Are new similar measures planned or under consideration for Phase 2 and, if so (a) what are they (b) do they represent a change in objective from Phase 1 (c) for what reason were new measures felt to be necessary?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Yes. (a) The development of aquaculture for the raising of oysters was the only specific measure taken because the aggregate catch of most species of fish traditional to Prince Edward Island inshore fishermen has reached or is approaching maximum yield. (b) 1971. (c) The precise cost of this specific measure is not kept. However, total expenditures for the research and investigation project (which includes oyster aquaculture) were as follows:

Fiscal Year	Total Expenditures
71-72	$118,945
72-73	147,699
73-74	202,947
74-75	326,608
Total	$796,199

(d) The full effects of the aquaculture program cannot be measured until the oysters have grown to market maturity which normally takes five to seven years from the date of seeding.

2. No specific measures are planned or under consideration for Phase II. However, if the search for fish species of market potential is successful then measures can be designed to fit the opportunity.

NEWFOUNDLAND—VETERANS' HOUSING

Question No. 3,971—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Has the Minister of Veterans Affairs or the Minister of State for Urban Affairs received the final report on the condition of veterans housing in the Province of Newfoundland?

2. Has either Minister received a proposal from the Newfoundland Command of the Canadian Legion proposing a programme to allow the command to implement a programme to repair or rehabilitate housing for veterans or widows of veterans in the Province and, if so, has it been (a) considered by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (b) brought before the Cabinet?

3. Has any decision been reached by the Cabinet to provide the financial assistance necessary to support the survey of the Provincial Command in the Province and, if so, what was the decision?

4. Has the Cabinet approved such a programme and (a) if so, what are the details (b) if not, for what reason?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Ministers of Urban Affairs and Veterans Affairs as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Yes. (a) Yes.

2 (b), 3 and 4. The inner workings of cabinet, cabinet committees (including membership therein), and the services rendered by support staff are traditionally considered confidential matters. Canadian precedents in this regard flowed from British practice over many years. In response to a question in the House the Canadian Prime Minister of the day on February 4, 1960 in part replied: "The means by which the cabinet conducts its business are traditionally regarded as its own domestic affair, and questions on the subject are normally neither asked nor answered." A detailed answer to the question would be a departure from the traditional position that has always been taken that meetings of the cabinet are private and no information is given.

TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT FOR RENOVATIONS—CAE AIR CANADA BUILDING, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

Question No. 4,021—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. What was the total cost to the government for renovating the CAE Air Canada building at 570 Ferry Road, Winnipeg, Manitoba, which houses the Department of National Revenue Tax Data Centre?

2. What are the details of the amount the government is paying to lease the building (a) per year (b) per square foot?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. Contract cost for renovations: $1,355,684. Expenditures for current year to January 31, 1976: $1,283,230.

2. (a) $384,000 per year. (b) $4.82 rent per square foot.

LES JARDINS DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 4,053—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Has the government contributed financially, by way of loans or grants, directly or indirectly, to the termination of work and acquisition of lands and material for the tourist project Les jardins de la République, near Edmunston, New Brunswick, and, if so, in each case (a) through which departments (b) under what programme or agreement (c) in what amount (d) during what financial year?

2. Does the government intend to make other contributions to the project, either directly or through agreements with the Provincial Government of New Brunswick?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. Yes. (a) Regional Economic Expansion; (b) Agricultural and Rural Development Act III (ARDA III); (c) $150,111; (d) 1973-74, $148,309; 1974-75, $1,802.

2. No.

NUCLEAR STIMULATION DEVICES

Question No. 4,770—**Mr. Symes:**

1. Has the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources at any time held discussions or exchanged correspondence with Mr. Don Moore, or any other company official of Phoenix Canada Oil Co. Ltd., in connection with the nuclear stimulation (the use of nuclear devices) in the tar

sands and, if not, does the government intend to carry out such discussions or exchange of correspondence?

2. Has the government ruled out the possibility of using nuclear stimulation as a means of expediting the production of oil from the tar sands and, if not, since Phoenix Canada Oil owns the patents for nuclear stimulation devices, who would produce such devices?

3. Has the government carried out or is it carrying out or does it intend to carry out any (a) feasibility studies of nuclear stimulation (b) environment studies in the tar sands?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Atomic Energy Control Board report as follows: 1, 2 and 3. The Atomic Energy Control Board received a letter dated May 30, 1974 from Mr. S. D. Moore, President of Phoenix Canada Oil Co. Ltd. seeking approval to detonate a nuclear device in northeastern Alberta. The Board replied to Mr. Moore in a letter dated January 8, 1975 that after due consideration and on the advice of other government departments which were consulted, the Canadian government was not prepared at that time to approve test nuclear explosions in the Athabasca Tar Sands. The government's view has not changed in the intervening year.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 4,919 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

LIP—SUBSIDIES GRANTED IN CONSTITUENCY OF TÉMISCAMINGUE

Question No. 4,919—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since the inception of the Local Initiatives Programme, were any subsidies granted to the Constituency of Témiscamingue and, if so, in what amount?

2. For each approved project, what was the (a) name of the project (b) amount (c) year of approval (d) number of jobs generated (e) name of the municipality involved?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Monday, March 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

[Mr. Symes.]

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, when we reached ten o'clock last night I was speaking on the amendment to this bill and had pointed out that in order to administer certain parts, a great number of bureaucrats would be required both for the purpose of administration and for registration of gun owners.

At this time I should like to point out that an applicant for a gun licence must obtain the signatures of two people of good character and reputation who will vouch for his or her character and undertake to provide sort of a guarantee that the gun or guns will not be used for criminal purposes. I suggest there will not be many people who will want to go that far out on the limb even for a very good friend. We have already set out the rationale for the secret possession or illegal registration of guns by those who cannot obtain such guarantees from two citizens in their community. I am sure the minister has already thought of the difficulty this could pose for a large percentage of law-abiding Canadians who will be dependent on friends or relatives regarding a gun application. The effect will be severely to limit the application of the law.

North Americans will simply not abide by a law they consider to be oppressive or against the rights of the majority. Let us take a hypothetical case of a gun owner who has his house burgled and his gun stolen and used in a subsequent crime. This happens frequently, or at least it happens often enough for us to know that criminals do not abide by gun registration laws any more than they abide by laws concerning break and entry, theft, assault, or any other law. Criminals steal weapons from police cars, police stations, armouries, and even from policemen. Requiring law-abiding citizens to register guns will not have any effect on this type of crime or this type of acquisition of guns.

Responsible gun owners do not leave their guns around for people to pick up or steal; they keep their guns secured. I do not believe anyone would object to laws concerning the safe and secure storage of guns when they are not in use. However, criminals are not respecters of that kind of security. They pick locks, knock down doors and windows; they use axes, crowbars, screwdrivers, hammers and many other tools available in every hardware store. If a housebreaker came upon a gun cabinet or closet, or guns secured by chains, he would simply use the tools of his trade to obtain the guns, just as is done to obtain money, jewels and other kinds of loot.

● (1540)

Chains and locks can be sawed through with a hacksaw, closets can be chopped open with hatchets and axes, doors can be forced in a variety of ways by the expert criminal. My experience as an insurance underwriter convinces me that experienced and determined housebreakers or safe crackers simply will not be stopped. The only way that I can think of to stop them is to convince them that they will be caught, convicted and imprisoned and that they will not be allowed to go out for weekends.

Mr. Speaker, in my area there are a great number of summer cottages. Many of the owners leave rifles and

shotguns there, probably because they do not want to transport them back and forth to their principal residence. Even if these are well hidden, they are the things that burglars seem to find and steal. The Ontario Provincial Police have pointed out that burglars are not interested in furniture but are usually looking for guns, whisky or any other type of alcoholic beverage.

Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan): What about rum?

Mr. Darling: Rum, too. A few weeks ago there was a news item on a television news program about an upsurge in gun sales in one of the western provinces since this gun control legislation was tabled. This is a natural reaction by people who feel that their rights are being transgressed, and I would not be surprised to find that the same thing is happening right across the country. If this legislation is passed, I would also suggest that a large number of guns will not be registered.

In the Ottawa *Journal* of March 10 there was a supplement put out by the Canadian Tire Corporation. It was advertising a special price on a Winchester repeating rifle of $38.88, and also a special price for a rifle-scope at $10.88. That can be a pretty dangerous weapon, Mr. Speaker, if it falls into the wrong hands. I believe the same advertisement was run by Simpsons-Sears.

The gun manufacturers and their sales outlets are making capital out of this proposed legislation. Everyone that I have talked with concerning registration of gun owners has been in agreement, almost without exception, that some type of registration would be acceptable and even desirable for these weapons, but why should we set up an enormous bureaucracy to administer a registration process when we already have tens of thousands of police stations and detachments across the country? The police are responsible for public safety and security, and they would be better suited for the task of administering a gun law than an appointed official with no training or background in law enforcement.

On March 8, the member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) mentioned that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) had stated that crime in Canada is under control, and the hon. member pointed out, astutely, that nothing could be further from the truth. Crime is not under control. It is on the rise in Canada, as elsewhere, and we cannot just sit by and say smugly that it is not as bad in Canada as it is somewhere else, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested in crime somewhere else. I am interested, and I am concerned about the rise in crime, particularly violent crime, here in Canada.

The hon. member for New Westminster pointed out that there is no mention in this bill of the serious problem of hard drugs, of how the Minister of Justice proposes to control the importation, sale and use of hard drugs in Canada which is, incidentally, one of the chief causes of all types of crime today. It is a point well taken, Mr. Speaker. I have to ask, why there is not some mention of this serious aspect of crime in this bill? Why do we not find some slight clue that the government is as interested in the causes of crime as it is in coddling criminals after they are convicted. I do not suggest that we get as tough as some countries in the world where the death penalty has been imposed for mere possession in an effort to stamp out this insidious and pernicious practice.

More money, more personnel and more support of every type must be put at the disposal of those charged with preventing the importation of hard drugs into Canada and to those charged with tracking down drugs and drug peddlers within our country. The penalties for trafficking and importing drugs must be made severe enough to deter the most hardened and skeptical criminals. I say skeptical because this government has earned the unenviable reputation of being soft on criminals. I do not believe that the criminal in our country today really expects to be kept in prison very long if he is convicted and sentenced. We must remove the skepticism and replace it with respect for the law and our law enforcement agencies. That respect will only come with the knowledge that we in Canada are determined to stamp out crime whenever and wherever we find it.

One provision of this bill that the majority of members will object to is the one concerning wiretapping. I believe this provision should be modified. There is no doubt that wiretapping, or the interception of telephone communications, has been and will be a most important tool in the hands of law enforcement agencies, especially in their efforts to control organized crime. Those of us who live in rural areas are quite used to having our communications intercepted, as anyone familiar with a party line telephone can attest. We are not concerned one way or the other with wiretapping legislation, but in congested urban centres it is another matter.

As long as this practice is engaged in judiciously by law enforcement agencies, with the consent of the courts as prescribed by present law, then I cannot think of any reason why the law should be relaxed. I do not think it would do much in the way of hindering investigations if the persons whose conversations are intercepted are notified of this fact within a reasonable period of time after the investigation has been completed. Perhaps we can work out some plan whereby persons who have been found to be engaged in criminal activity as a result of such taps will not have to be told of the taps while the investigation is under way.

It seems to me that within a period of 90 days the police should be able to determine whether a person is using his or her telephone in the commission of criminal activities. This requirement to disclose the use of wiretaps will limit, and possibly even prevent, indiscriminate use of this practice. While I am certainly in favour of giving our police every advantage over criminals, I also want to protect citizens' rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask why the government did not see fit to include some provisions in this bill to deal with the problem of alcoholism and its related abuses, and to comment on a couple of other problems areas. Alcoholism and drug addiction have been combined as a general problem area by most, if not all, of the agencies dealing with these problem. Like my colleague from New Westminster, I am appalled that the Minister of Justice has not seen fit to tell us that the federal government is at least as concerned about these problems as the rest of us.

Measures Against Crime

● (1550)

I have some startling figures with regard to the rise in the number of collisions on our highways, many of them fatal or resulting in disabling injuries, where teenage drinking drivers were involved. In 1967, in Ontario, there were 1,089 collisions on the highways involving teenage drinking drivers. The figure rose gradually for the next four years until 1971 when it almost doubled to 2,277. In 1972 it rose to 3,623. In 1974, the last year for which complete figures are available, the figure was 5,385, almost five times the number of collisions involving teenage drinking drivers in 1967.

While I realize that these figures are for Ontario, this is not something which is limited to Ontario alone. It is a national problem and as such it deserves some attention from the Minister of Justice and possibly the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). At least we in Ontario realize that it is a serious problem, on the basis of statistics, namely, that the age of drivers involved in collisions when impaired has dropped to the 17 and 18 year old group. The provincial government is reassessing its decision to drop to 18 the legal age for drinking. However, as I have said, this is not only an Ontario problem and I should like to see some indication that the federal government is concerned about it. It has been known for many years that every conceivable kind of drug, soft and hard, is available in our schools almost on demand, not only in high schools but in schools where the average age is from 10 years to 13 years. This is certainly an area in which the federal government could do more than it is now—but there is nothing in this bill dealing with drugs or alcohol.

Violence on television is another problem area which has not been explored or examined in depth by the federal government, despite the fact that at least 90 per cent of these violent programs are available only on the two national television networks. It has been suggested, rightly or wrongly—and I am not an expert in these matters—that violence on television can often trigger a response on the part of people who are deranged and can be encouraged to act a violent scene portrayed on a television show. This does not apply in the case of television dramas. It is believed by many competent psychiatrists and socialists that when news programs dwell unnecessarily on the gory details of a particularly horrible crime, a deranged person thousands of miles from the scene of the crime might be tempted to emulate the crime to the last detail.

I believe that the whole question of the portrayal of violence on television, in all its forms, needs to be examined in depth by a competent individual or group. We should have more information and more opinions on this subject than are available to us at the present time. I would hate to have to weigh the merits of a proposal as to how we should deal with this matter on the basis of the scant information available of the effects or possible effects this type of thing could have on the minds of the young or on the minds of deranged adults.

I recently had the opportunity of meeting, with some other hon. members, the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. A. W. Johnson. I asked him for his views on this contentious subject. He admitted he had no direct solution or answer to this problem as there were arguments on both sides. Therefore, he let the matter go on

[Mr. Darling.]

that basis. But I certainly feel that this is worth investigating further. In the February edition of *Canada Gunsport* there is an article headed "Gun control fails in the United Kingdom; chief inspector admits 50 years of controls useless." In the article which follows it is stated:

> We wonder if we are not asking the wrong questions. The rise in the criminal use of firearms does not appear to have been influenced in any significant way by changes in the system of firearms control.
>
> The criminal knows that for a professional robbery the chances of detection are low and the rewards high. The maximum penalty is life imprisonment and he knows that if proven guilty he is likely to receive a substantial prison sentence. The odds against him being caught may be something like 7 or 10 to 1 in his favour. When the death penalty is applied he is not prepared to accept 7 or 10 to 1 odds on a chance of being hanged.

The article goes on—not attributing this to Chief Inspector Colin Greenwood of the West Yorkshire constabulary—to say that in Holland, where television programs such as CTV's "W-5" has held gun control up as a solution, the recent events with that train in Beilen and Amsterdam have shown that gun control has been a failure. Austria has strict firearms controls, but the attack on the OPEC meeting by terrorists in which three people were killed supports the suggestion that we are asking the wrong questions. The chief inspector also made this statement:

> Guns were always available to any criminal who chose to use them. Firearms controls do not appear to stop this class of criminal from obtaining a gun when he felt that he could use one.

Then there is another reference which is certainly of interest. Meeting on December 18, the Massachusetts police chiefs' association, comprising 200 police chiefs, unanimously went on record opposing a petition being circulated to ban hand-guns, and they gave as their reason that criminals would not turn in hand-guns because the supreme court had ruled that illegal hand-guns do not have to be registered as that would amount to self-incrimination; that the majority of law abiding citizens would turn in their guns and would then be at the mercy of criminals; that the law would make criminals out of law-abiding persons who did not turn in their guns; that crime had increased dramatically and the police cannot protect everyone; and that therefore a citizen should have the right to protect his family and himself.

As a personal observation, I point out that people tend to identify with the police force and the fire department. Apparently we are good citizens if we have fire extinguishers in our homes, because we know that firemen cannot be there instantly. Apparently we are bad citizens if we have guns in our homes, although the police cannot be there instantly. The fire department does not show up until after the fire has started, and the police do not start showing any interest until after a crime has been committed.

Along with a great many other members of parliament, I have received a tremendous amount of correspondence with regard to gun control, most of it highly critical of the proposed legislation, and some of it in favour of some form of control, so it cannot be stated that we are against any form of control whatsoever. I have here a letter from a former member of the RCMP who might take a rather stronger and more severe attitude than would be acceptable to people today, but he states very strongly the importance of police departments having the facilities, manpower and everything else available for dealing with hard

drugs. He also states, in no uncertain terms, that youth and alcoholism are very important items responsible for a great deal of crime, and violent crime. He says he has reservations about wiretapping. He states:

While I never approved of wiretapping, much, RCMP did some during the second war. It is O.K. for interception of top criminals, evidence, but to me appeared a weakness, a crutch. I secured my evidence the hard way.

● (1600)

I do not know what he meant by that. He went on to emphasize that our soft tactics must stop; we must go after habitual criminals, see they are put away and remain put away.

Firearms control cannot even be justified with the excuse that it will reduce accidental injury and death. In Ontario, accidental hunting deaths fell from 71 in 1961 to eight in 1970. This favourable statistic is probably the result of hunter safety courses run by local anglers and hunters' associations. Nationally, our accidental death rate due to automobiles was 26.4 per 100,000 persons in 1973. Although it is estimated that there are between five million and ten million firearms in Canada, the accidental death rate due to them is so low that neither the Canada Year Book of 1973 nor the Canadiana Encyclopedia even mention it in their accidental death rate tables. The rate must be less than the last entry in the table, which was one per 100,000.

All the above information and more indicates that gun control has little or no effect on the criminal. However, gun control does severely limit the legitimate ownership and use of firearms in the hands of everyone else. Presumably, these facts are well known to the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that criminals will always acquire weapons for crime, whether they be stolen, purchased, imported to the country or assembled in back-room workshops. Many first class firearms have been manufactured by hobbyists for legal purposes.

The Minister of Justice has stated that the availability of firearms is the major cause of crime. This has proven false. As an example he took gunless Japan, which has a low murder-arrest rate, but said nothing about Ireland which has the toughest gun laws in the world. He also said nothing about Switzerland, which has an extremely low crime rate. There it is the law that every male of military age shall keep a government-owned firearm in his home. We could solve our crime problems relatively easily, not by punishing and restraining law abiding citizens but simply by taking trouble-makers out of circulation. We can impose capital punishment on the worst offenders, and mandatory minimum prison sentences for the rest without chance of parole. They should be released when their sentence is completed.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member who preceded me. This bill contains a good many provisions for combating crime. I propose to restrict my remarks to one small part of the bill, and in response to representations made to me by my constitutents I will talk about the problem of gun control.

Let me make it clear that I support the principle of this bill. I shall vote for it on second reading and hope it will be referred at the earliest possible date to committee. It is my sincere hope that at the committee stage there will be extensive hearings which will deal with the very matters raised by those who feel they will be unfairly treated by the provisions of this bill. I am referring particularly to gun clubs and gun collectors. I am confident that the committee hearings will lead to greater acceptance of the bill because we shall recognize more clearly the problems which Canada faces.

On January 26 of this year I presented a petition to this House signed by 7,486 high school students of the city of Ottawa calling on this House to enact legislation as soon as possible to restrict the availability of firearms, so as to avoid another tragic incident similar to that which took place in an Ottawa area high school on October 27, 1975, and in Brampton on May 4, 1975. The fear of the possible recurrence of such events has created tension in the classrooms and schools of this area and has resulted in deterioration of the learning atmosphere. The petition which was organized and circulated by the students themselves called on the government to "act as quickly as possible" in enacting the necessary legislation. I am relieved to see the measure now before the House, as are many of my constituents who made their feelings known during the Christmas period by responding to a questionnaire which I circulated on a household basis on the subject of gun control.

The results showed that 83 per cent of those who responded—which is about 15 per cent of all households which received the questionnaire—favoured the registration of rifles and firearms; 88 per cent favoured the registration of hand-guns. Eighty three per cent favoured tests to satisfy reasonable standards of competence and safety for everyone owning a gun. There was virtually no opposition to the need to restrict ease of availability of firearms.

I recognize that I represent an urban constituency, and know that in many parts of Canada the tradition of ownership and responsible use of firearms is different from that in some of our larger cities. I can only speak in this House for the people who elected me and express views that I believe they would want me to express. At the same time, like other hon. members I have received a number of well prepared briefs from organizations representing gun clubs and hunters arguing that any new legislation should not violate their rights, namely, the rights of those individuals who have traditionally demonstrated respect for the proper use of firearms in the enjoyment of sport.

Responsible collectors maintain that they may be penalized by the new legislation. Collectors say they will be forced to give up all their operative automatic rifles and machine-guns under the new prohibited weapons clause. Many collections include museum pieces worth a great deal of money to their owners. Collectors have maintained to me that the firing mechanisms, if kept separate from the weapons, are almost impossible for potential thieves to obtain or duplicate. Actually, criminals invariably steal either hand-guns or high-powered rifles which they prefer to machine-guns. I shall return to that in a minute.

Some automatic rifles will not be covered by the prohibited weapons clause. It has been brought to my attention

that semi-automatic rifles can be converted to automatic guns with relative ease by people with only limited training. I am referring specifically to the M-1 semi-automatic rifle which can be obtained at many locations across Canada. I have in my possession a number of catalogues advertising semi-automatic rifles available both through mail order and for personal shoppers. For example, I have before me a supplement distributed by the Ottawa *Citizen* earlier this year. In it, a well known local store advertises a .22 calibre target pistol. You can go and pick it put. It suggests that a B-B gun is a nice present for a teenage son.

I am looking, as well, at a Sears' catalogue containing a section on rifles, including automatic rifles, which can be readily purchased. The advertisement says that guns and ammunition will not be sold to persons under 17. I suppose that is intented to salve someone's conscience. Yet it is clear that the public, certainly that part of it which I have the honour to represent here, wants us to restrict the ease with which firearms can be acquired.

I have another announcement in my hand which surprises me. The *Globe and Mail* of March 4, 1976, reports that the Sudbury police were offering pistols for sale. According to the article, the Sudbury regional police were selling about 100, .32 calibre revolves for about $25 each. The police chief said that the revolvers were originally issued to constables formerly employed by area municipalities. With the amalgamation of the forces into a regional force, the .38 special became standard, so that the .32 calibre became the property of the regional police. They were surplus, and a dollar being a dollar, why not sell them?

● (1610)

It is clear that we have a situation which calls for some kind of legislative restriction. I am not prepared to say that the bill in its present form cannot be improved. It will be the responsibility of hon. members who serve on the committee which looks at this bill to go over it clause by clause, to hear representations from organized groups of citizens and to ensure that the bill represents the best possible protection of the interests of the public.

I am surprised at some of the mail I receive. I have a constituent who is a postman, a letter carrier. He is a man of excellent character. I would have no hesitation in writing a character reference for him at any time. His name is Mr. Wayne Green. Mr. Green has a specialty. He has been collecting machine-guns over the past many years. He has a collection that has cost him approximately $25,000. He described to me in great detail the care that he takes, how he has registered every one of these guns with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and how he keeps them in an inoperable form in his home: the firing mechanisms are stored separately.

I am surprised really at this hobby, although I respect the right to a hobby. There has certainly been nothing illegal about this gentleman pursuing this kind of hobby to date. I said earlier that generally, when thieves steal guns, they do not go for this kind of weapon. I think there is a limit in terms of what the public is prepared to endure. If an underground organization wanted to acquire machine-guns, I suspect that with the use of trained people who could be placed at their disposal they could adapt these guns by reproducing the firing mechanisms. If advertised, this kind of collection could be a target for some kind of illegal activity.

The problem of dealing with collectors will be very complicated. It may well be that there should be some phasing-out period, that the trading of guns between collectors will have to be restricted and should take place only between those who are registered and recognized as professional collectors. There may be some means by which the investment and savings of those who have chosen this kind of hobby can be given some protection. However, I have to say that I support the principle of the bill and that the public demands this kind of restriction on the availability of firearms. We have a responsibility, in light of the changing conditions of our cities and the pattern of violence that is emerging, to create for at least these parts of our country an environment in which firearms are not so readily available.

I recognize that this is a big country. I know that in the frontier, the northern areas and rural areas, the use of firearms is a very different thing. However, it is clear that for our large urban areas a measure like this will have to be enacted.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I see the hon. member for Villeneuve trying to get the floor after he has adjourned the debate on March 9 or 10. Unfortunately the hon. member for Villeneuve was not in the House yesterday when we resumed the debate, and he lost the time alloted to him, even if there were about ten minutes left. He will not be able to get the floor without the unanimous consent of the House.

Does the House agree to let the hon. member continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for allowing me to continue the speech which I began on March 11 last and which I had not finished.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, if the minister wants I can give him lots of evidence. I shall read a letter I received from the Hunting and Fishing Association of Malartic:

> We are against the project to control guns. We think that such a measure amounts to a lack of civic consideration towards all our sportsmen.
>
> François Ferron, chairman of the Hunting and Fishing Association of Malartic.

Another group representing hundreds of sportsmen from northwest Quebec is violently opposed to the project of the Minister of Justice.

If the minister wants more, I have other examples to give him. I received a letter from Mr. Jean-Claude Bouchard, of Val-d'Or, the chairman of the Hunting and Fishing Association of this municipality.

In that letter, he asks me to help him fight Bill C-83. I was pleased to answer him that he could count on me.

I could give more examples of representations made by people from Senneterre, Chibougamau, Chapais and Cadillac, all towns where most people hunt big and small game.

And I could list several other municipalities of my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, when I comment on this bill today, I speak on behalf of the great majority of the people I represent. I know that they entirely support my efforts to bring the Minister of Justice to understand what common sense says about this Bill C-83. I speak on behalf of all those who love hunting and outdoor sports when I ask the minister to withdraw his bill and remove from it the clauses concerning the control of firearms.

As do all other Canadians, people in northwest Quebec want to be protected against criminal activity. They want more severe punishment to be given to habitual criminals. I am sure they approve of the clauses of Bill C-83 which deal with the protection of society against hard-core criminals. But they do not want gun control. They know that honest citizens will be the only ones to suffer from such a measure. They ask that the residents of urban areas, where there is no hunting, make an effort to understand and respect their wishes to practice their favourite sports without being subjected to a thousand and one controls by officials.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to this House on behalf of all sportsmen and hunters. I ask hon. members of all parties to forget their party differences and vote against this bill which, in my estimation, will not contribute in any way to the protection of honest citizens.

Our fellow citizens are following with great interest the debate on this bill and I can assure hon. members who vote for gun controls that they will have to give accounts of their conduct in this regard. I shall be pleased to let their electors know they voted for this bill and constituents will take note of their vote.

● (1620)

Their constituents will not forgive them for that vote, which will penalize the sportsmen and the hunters of their regions. Mr. Speaker, government members are embarrassed at having to support such a bill. They know their voters, particularly those who represent rural constituencies, will not forgive them for supporting a bill which will oblige people to register their firearms, to wait for hours in civil servants' offices, while inspectors will check their past record to determine whether they can get a licence for their rifle or shotgun.

It is not without reason, Mr. Speaker, that many government members have tried to interrupt my speech on March 11, by making noise and putting non identifiable questions. They know I am speaking the truth and I am talking on behalf of the majority of Canadians.

Controlling firearms is not a good means of reducing crime. Let us take for instance Switzerland. In that country, all adult citizens must keep a firearm, it is provided by law. Yet that country's crime rate as regards qualified thefts and homicides is very low. Still, far from controlling firearms, Switzerland requires its citizens to possess guns and rifles.

In England, on the contrary, where gun control laws have been very tough for more than 50 years, a study conducted by Inspector Colin Greenwood of the British police force indicated that gun control did not help reducing the number of crimes involving firearms. As a matter of fact, statistics show that the violent crime rate has increased by 400 per cent since 1963 in England, gun controls notwithstanding.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that such controls will not help reduce the number of violent crimes. This has been proven. The countries where there are no gun controls have very low crime rates, whereas the countries enforcing strict controls suffer increasing crime rates.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring forward one last argument at this point in the discussion, that is the excessive cost of this control for Canadian taxpayers. An army of public servants will be needed to register all firearms. Tons of paper will be needed to keep up to date the necessary files. Hundreds of public servants will also be needed to check whether people do have their permit and whether this permit is in fact valid. The government is now suggesting that we have to tighten our belt, and that it will reduce its own expenses. It has even announced the discontinuance of several programs aimed at helping students, old people and the unemployed to take part in useful projects.

Now he is asking us to let him spend millions to set up a program as ridiculous and as useless as gun control. If the government wishes to be consistent, it must revise its position and be aware of the fact that there is an obvious discrepancy between the stated view that government expenses will be curbed and this expensive gun control bill.

In closing, I would like to remind the House that a cabinet minister recently told Canadians that they should give up their usual life style. That minister may be right. One of the habits people ought to get rid of, and I hope for ever, is that of electing a Liberal government in Ottawa.

If the government puts forward more legislation like the gun control bill, it can be sure that Canadians will be cured of the habit they had to vote liberal.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my hon. friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) in support of the amendment in the name of my hon. friend from Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) asking that the bill be not now read a second time but that its subject matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for study.

I should like to preface my remarks on Bill C-83 by making reference to a letter written by Mr. Vair, chairman of the Alberta Fish and Game Association. This letter was sent to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and to every member of the House and the Senate. I refer to this letter for one reason only, that is, to draw attention to the arrogance of the government. It will not be necessary for me to read Mr. Vair's letter because all members of the House have received a copy. But I think I ought to bring to the attention of this House the kind of letter which was written to my constituent, Mr. Vair, who, incidentally, represents 23,000 sportsmen. The letter is dated March 3, 1976. It starts out with the words "Mr. Vair", not "Dear Sir" or "Dear Mr. Vair". The letter goes on to say:

Your letter and bumper sticker have reached my office. The impression you intend to leave with the public that guns will be outlawed is

the kind of narrow, distorted extremism which spreads nothing but confusion and hatred. Have you nothing better to offer as a positive contribution, or do you know what the word means?

An hon. Member: What a politician.

Mr. Hurlburt: I do not intend to reveal the name of the member who had the nerve to write such a letter. I would have hoped, however, that he would have learned by now that, regardless of political affiliation, it is incumbent to act in a manner becoming a member of parliament.

Bill C-83 embodies proposals to screen out potential misuse of guns and restrict the general availability of firearms. Some of the changes in, and additions to, the provisions of the offensive weapons section of the Criminal Code are as follows: The addition of a licensing system to apply to all persons who possess or propose to acquire firearms or ammunition, other than persons under the age of 18 and those who would be subject to special temporary permit provisions. A general strengthening of the offence provisions relating to the importation, possession, carriage, handling, storage, transfer and use of firearms and other offensive weapons and of related search and seizure provisions. Strengthening and extension of the permit provisions applicable to businesses which deal in firearms or ammunition and strengthening of the registration certificate provisions in relation to restricted weapons.

If this bill is passed, applicants for restricted weapons will in future be required to justify the need for such weapons before a certificate is granted. Police will be able to seize a weapon without a warrant in cases where there is reason to fear danger to human safety. Every possessor of a firearm will require a licence, good for five years. Such a licence will be issued only after the licensing officer finds there is nothing in the applicant's background to make him unfit to bear a weapon. Persons under 18 will require special permits issued only for target practice, game hunting and firearms instructions. One of the guarantors must be a parent or legal guardian. All firearms and ammunition dealers, traders and importers and manufacturers will be required to obtain permits and keep records of all their transactions.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now review our present gun laws with the object of showing they already meet our needs adequately. The Criminal Code lays down the law concerning the use of firearms. Weapons are defined under three categories—prohibited, restricted and unrestricted. Prohibited weapons include certain instruments used in self-defence sports. Also prohibited are silencers, grenades and explosive-filled bottles and canisters, along with weapons that discharge gas, mace or any liquid or spray capable of incapacitating a person.

● (1630)

Restricted weapons include all manner of pistols and hand-guns—basically any weapon that can normally be aimed and fired by the action of one hand—and any firearm that is less than 26 inches in length or that can be adapted to be fired when reduced to a length of less than 26 inches by folding or telescoping. Restricted, also, are automatic weapons.

There are at present a number of methods of regulating restricted firearms. Firstly, with regard to criminal penalties for illegal use, in common with all firearms there are sections of the code attaching a penalty to their improper use. For example, it is an offence to possess any firearm "for a purpose dangerous to the public peace or for the purpose of committing an offence", to use the words of section 83, or while attending or on the way to attend a public meeting—section 84—or to point at another person a firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, as per section 86. Secondly, with regard to prohibiting possession of firearms, another provision applicable to all firearms is section 95 of the code which allows the court to prohibit any person convicted of an offence involving a firearm from possessing a firearm for up to five years. Thirdly, all restricted weapons must be registered. This means that the RCMP commissioner keeps a central registry of all restricted weapons. That provision is made in sections 98 and 99. The commissioner operates through local registrars who, according to the code, have no authority to refuse registration unless there is no serial number on the gun.

The discretion to refuse registration is, in law, exercised only by the commissioner who may refuse to issue a registration certificate where he has notice of any matter that may render it desirable in the interests of the safety of other persons that the applicant should not possess a restricted weapon. This provision is to be found in section 99(4). In practice, however, some local registrars refuse to register an applicant's weapon. Moreover, the techniques of registration also vary across the country; for example, in one city a fee is required.

The mechanics of registration are, in the typical case, as follows. Firstly, a hand-gun is selected at a sporting goods store. Secondly, the would-be purchaser goes to the local registrar of firearms and applies for a registration certificate and a special permit to bring the gun to the local registrar. Thirdly, the purchaser then goes back to the store with the permit and returns to the local registrar with the gun. Fourthly, the local registrar then causes inquiries to be made into the character of the applicant. The gun is often kept by the registrar during this period. Fifthly, the registration application is then sent to the RCMP commissioner with any recommendations from the local registrar. Sixthly, if the commissioner issues a certificate after further checks by the RCMP—the RCMP checks on whether he has a criminal record, whether there is an order of prohibition against him and whether the gun has been stolen—the owner of the gun returns to the local registrar to pick up his gun, if the gun has been held there.

Registration certificates are granted to anyone who wishes to have a hand-gun in his home or business unless, as previously pointed out, the commissioner knows that it is "desirable in the interests of the safety of other persons that the applicant should not possess a restricted weapon". Subject to this condition, a person can keep a hand-gun at home if he wants it for protection, or because he is a collector or is simply starting a collection.

Permits to carry restricted weapons outside the home are much more carefully regulated. Here, the local registrar, assuming he is the person authorized to perform this function under section 97(1) of the code, has discretion to refuse to issue a permit. The section says "may be issued". No appeal can be taken from a refusal to grant such a permit, although an appeal to a magistrate can be taken if

a permit is revoked or if a registration certificate is not granted, as set out in section 99(6). The registrar will, of course, consider the character of the applicant. The registrar must also be satisfied, under section 97(2), that the applicant requires the restricted weapon for one of four stated purposes: to protect life or property; for use in connection with his lawful profession or occupation; for use in target practice under the auspices of a shooting club approved by the attorney general; or for use in target practise in accordance with the conditions attached to the permit. The practice varies from province to province. For example, some provinces make it very difficult to obtain a permit to carry a hand-gun "to protect life or property"; others are less restrictive.

A permit is needed to sell, repair or take in pawn a restricted weapon. Again, discretion is given to the registrar to refuse to issue a permit, as provided in sections 97(4) and 99(3), if he "has notice of any matter that may render it desirable in the interests of the safety of other persons that such a permit should not be issued to the applicant". In this case, if a permit is refused an appeal can be taken to a magistrate. Unrestricted weapons refer to all shotguns and rifles of a kind commonly used for hunting or sporting purposes. Neither registration certificate nor permits are required for these weapons, although a provincial licence is necessary in order to hunt game.

The aim of more gun control as advocated by the government and certain groups is to make Canada a better place to live in by reducing the violent crime rate. In this regard, the following extract from the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police position paper on gun control is interesting to note:

> Few authorities will dispute the statement that crime with violence is generally on the increase virtually throughout the world. Such crime with violence is identified with the use of explosives and weapons of all kinds, particularly firearms. For this reason, governments and individuals have shown increased interest in the control of firearms as one remedial measure probably because reported crime frequently associates the use of firearms.
>
> What is identified today as being "the problem" is the number of violent crimes that are being committed and with which wrongly or rightly a firearm is being identified. There is no doubt that revolvers, pistols, "sawed-off" shotguns and "Saturday night specials" as well as any other kind of firearm imaginable have been involved in the commission of violent crime. The traditional sporting rifle whether suitable for high-powered shell or shot has also been involved. It must not be forgotten that violent crime is also committed with stilettos, butcher knives, chains, hammers and lead pipes, to name but a few other instruments.

● (1640)

> The problem at hand is the high incidence of crime and the search for the methods of reducing it. If this can be achieved by the elimination of a weapon from the market then so much the better but this approach can be discarded from the very beginning because violent crime can be committed with any number of weapons.
>
> Any restriction or control of firearms may in effect lessen the safeguards of society.
>
> It is claimed that registration, control, prohibiting the sale of firearms or, as a most drastic step, stopping the manufacturing thereof would prove to be a safeguard to society. In the first instance a good proportion of legitimate users would be deprived of a rather enjoyable pastime; secondly, the firearms manufacturing industry would suffer considerably and the armed forces as well as security services would have to establish other means of procuring weapons in any case; thirdly, the highly desirable training facilities for the younger element, which facilities are yet grossly underdeveloped, would be eliminated thereby depriving society of a potential reserve of qualified marksmen.
>
> The strongest support of this point can be found in Switzerland where is no restrictive legislation whatever to curb the general use of firearms of any kind. In no country of Europe is the use of firearms more common and general. Every able bodied adult male is required by law to possess and know how to use military rifles. In addition, he may own as many pistols as he likes. In no country of the world is rifle and pistol shooting more universally indulged in by all classes of people. In spite of all these facts in no country in Europe, with the possible exception of England, are crimes of violence so rare as they are in Switzerland. This fact must give pause to the advocates of pistol prohibition as a crime preventive. Inanimate objects such as pistols, knives, axes or clubs do not and cannot cause crime. They do not and they cannot supply the motive or the impulse. The causes of crime must be sought elsewhere, in greed, hatred, jealousy and general moral depravity—and the remedy—if there any be, is more likely to be found in morals and education in improved police methods of detection, and in the more prompt and certain imposition of punishment. This is safeguarding society.

Although gun control proposals pretend to be directed toward the laudatory objective of reducing the incidence of violent crime, they tend in fact to aggravate the very conditions fostering crime by diverting attention away from the dismal failure of the criminal justice system to adequately cope with criminality. In point of fact, as a society we have simply failed to provide an efficient means whereby criminals can be apprehended, speedily prosecuted, reliably convicted, jailed and kept in jail.

The glaring failure of gun control laws significantly to affect the criminal element, as well as the reasons therefor, can be graphically portrayed by examining the experience of the city of Chicago. It has been estimated that there are presently some 20,000 gun laws in the United States, a number of which are operational in Chicago. The national federal firearms acts were on the federal books since their enactment in the 1930s, and the federal gun control act of 1968 eliminated interstate mail order sales of guns. Since 1968, Illinois has required a licence to purchase or possess either firearms or ammunition; additionally, Chicago residents have been required to register with the city authorities every firearm they own.

In 1965, before there was either a city registration ordinance of a state licensing law, 395 persons were murdered in Chicago. In 1973, five years after the enactment of those two new laws to "control guns", a record number of 864 persons were murdered in Chicago, and 1974 recorded nearly 1,000 murders. Anti-gun proposals are based on the faulty assumption that the increased sale of firearms in recent years constitutes, in and of itself, a basic cause of crime, when it would be far more rational to conclude that the sale of guns is to a significant degree merely an effect of the public's fear of rising crime.

The public has become increasingly alarmed and apprehensive over what it perceives as the open and notorious contempt shown by lawless elements, not only toward the law but toward the police and even the courts, all of which contributes toward the determination of law-abiding citizens to restore to themselves the means of doing that which they fear government either can no longer, or will no longer, do for them, namely, protect the safety and lives of their families as well as their property. Criminals will always manage to find guns. Stricter gun control laws may only provoke the existence of a black market for guns used for criminal ends.

The views of generally decent and law-abiding citizens are easy to describe. People have the right to bear arms for pleasure and self-protection, without interference from big

government. Criminals will get guns, despite gun control laws. All gun control proposals—whether they advocate registration, licensing, record-keeping or anything else—are undesirable because they will inevitably lead to other, more restrictive measures.

As we have noted, Canada does have sufficient legislation already in existence to regulate legitimate firearms' use and traffic, and the police have interpreted and enforced the laws in a manner consistent with the attitude of the Canadian public. Because of the discretion of the police forces, relatively few Canadians are actually aware of the comprehensive manner in which firearms' usage has already been legislated. The present system regarding restricted weapons appears to be working reasonably well. Most police forces conduct a careful examination of the applicant before forwarding a recommendation to the RCMP for a registration certificate. The RCMP themselves make a routine check. Moreover, many local registrars tend to make it difficult for a person to obtain a permit to carry a hand-gun unless he is a bona fide target-shooter. The very fact that relatively few hand-guns are used in crimes in Canada, in comparison with their use in the United States, is some indication of the effectiveness of the system. The number of hand-guns in Canada is still relatively low.

● (1650)

Since we in Canada already have so many laws governing the use of offensive weapons, one must be reminded that no matter what possible strategy for control may be suggested, any further registration would require a considerable increase to an already overburdened administrative structure and would further tax the capabilities of police forces and the judicial system. Thus, it is emphasized in the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police position paper on gun control laws that if there is to be any further legislation instituted for restricting the use of firearms even more than presently exists in Canada, its administration must be given first consideration, and if it be found that it cannot properly be administered, then it is far better to remain with the legislation that presently exists.

What effect would this compulsory licensing system have, for all persons who possess or propose to acquire firearms or ammunition, in keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals? The effect would be so insignificant that it would not begin to compensate for the expenditure of police time. Furthermore, good citizens, hunters, farmers, trappers and competitive marksmen would be forced to comply with an irritating, time-consuming and useless regulation.

It is contended by some that registration of rifles and shotguns, and the application of a permit system, would reduce certain types of manslaughter or murder such as those arising from domestic quarrels, property disputes and the onset of insanity. But it should be pointed out that people involved in such killings are usually those who have not been looked upon or recorded as criminals. They would have had no trouble in registering their firearms and securing permits to carry them.

In conclusion, the questions surrounding firearms and the correlation of violence are extremely complicated and often ambiguous. The available literature on the subject indicates that research results often have been conveniently misinterpreted to suit the needs of those holding opposing points of view. The relationship between firearms and violence, however, does tend to obscure two other important facts bearing on the firearms question. First, it must be recognized that the vast majority of gun owners recognize the desirability of the proper use of firearms. It is indicated in the literature that most gun owners are law-abiding sportsmen and exemplary citizens who deplore the criminal use of firearms; and this being the case, their needs must sensitively be taken into account. Second, one must never lose sight of the fact that the root causes of violence may well go much deeper than mere widespread gun ownership. It must be recognized that firearms merely facilitate, rather than cause, some forms of violence.

[Mr. Hurlburt.]

Mr. Peter P. Masniuk (Portage): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the debate on a very important government bill, Bill C-83, to introduce the Criminal Law Amendment Act (No. 1), 1976. This is an important bill because it is a law bill, specifically the criminal law, and it affects matters of a highly emotional nature. In fact, this is precisely what is wrong with some of these amendments—they are long on emotion, but short on logic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Masniuk: This afternoon I would like to give some of my observations on the amendments in the bill which deal with gun control. It is interesting and revealing that the major portion of this bill is actually called "gun control." The government literature on this legislation calls it "gun control." I think that reveals a great deal of the government's real intentions on this subject. Maybe "gun control" sounds better than "people control", which is what this bill is really about. But it is odd that the advocates of gun control of one sort or another hardly ever talk about crime control or criminal control. This bill and this debate is really about gun control, even though the government has tried to pretend that it is about measures to protect society from crime. The gun control provisions make up 39 of the bill's 73 pages and actually constitute a new gun control law. Therefore, I am gcing to talk about gun control for a few minutes.

The fact is that Canada has some of the toughest gun control laws of any country in the world for certain categories of firearms. Nor are they new. Gun registration was introduced in Canada in 1935. The notorious hand-gun is a restricted weapon in this country and it is difficult to imagine how it could be any more controlled. A hand-gun must first be registered with the RCMP. This registration is not automatic, and can be refused. To remove the gun from the place of purchase, the owner must next obtain a "convenience permit" which only authorizes him to transport the gun to his home or the place of business for which the gun is registered. To transport the gun, again he must be issued with a "carrying permit" which will only be issued under strict provisions such as that the gun is necessary to protect life and property, that its use is in connection with the applicant's lawful profession or occupation, that it will be used on the premises of an approved shooting club, or that it will be used for target practise in accordance with the conditions attached to the permit.

These types of provisions governing certain restricted weapons, including hand-guns, were written into our Criminal Code over 40 years ago. At that time, so we are told, those who instituted this program had high hopes, although it is not exactly clear just what the hopes were for. Maybe they were negative hopes. Maybe they hoped that these controls would prevent the emergence of a Canadian John Dillinger or Ma Barker; I do not know.

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

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard)—Health—Measures to ensure adequate supply of swine flu vaccine—Consultations with provincial ministers; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Agriculture—Proposed elimination of transport subsidy on flour to east coast ports—Alleged conflict in minister's statements; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Request for more local programming—Government action.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to order made earlier this day, the House will now proceed to consideration of government order No. 92.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR AND THEIR DEPENDANTS

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that Bill C-92, to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war and their dependants and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

● (1700)

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I speak today on a bill designed to improve the lot of those members of the armed forces and certain civilians who were unfortunate enough to have been prisoners of war during and after World War II. All members of this House agree that Canada owes a debt of gratitude to those men and women who answered the call and served so

gallantly for the preservation of our freedom. We are all agreed that Canada has some of the world's most advanced veterans' legislation. I consider it a privilege, and it gives me great personal satisfaction, to speak to this bill which puts Canada in the forefront in providing compensation to former prisoners of war.

Hon. members will remember that in 1971 the Pension Act was amended to provide special benefits of the equivalent of a minimum of 50 per cent pension to former prisoners of war of the Japanese because of the long-term after-effects which they suffered as a result of their imprisonment. Prisoners of war of European powers in World War II also suffered indignities and maltreatment and many of them have residual disabilities which cannot be recognized or identified. A study was made by Dr. J. D. Hermann and he reported on the deleterious effects of prisoner of war incarceration. His report, in turn, was studied by the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs which was unanimous in its recommendations to this House.

The bill as put forward will adopt, almost in their entirety, the recommendations of the standing committee related to prisoners of war. Hon. members will be glad to know that the principles of this bill have been discussed with veterans' organizations and that they support it fully. The basic principles of the bill provide that former prisoners of war of the Japanese who were captives for one year or more will receive compensation equivalent to a 50 per cent disability pension and that they will receive any disability pension to which they may be entitled, as well, to a combined maximum of the equivalent of a 100 per cent pension. For those who were incarcerated from three months to one year, the rate of compensation will be the equivalent of a 20 per cent pension.

It is recognized that the current problems of former prisoners of war of the Japanese are worse than those of other prisoners of war. It is for this reason that the recommended compensation for those who were captured by other powers during or after World War II is on a sliding scale related to the length of time of incarceration. On this basis, the men captured at Dieppe would be compensated at the next highest amount. The bill establishes the following rates for these groups: in captivity for 3 months to 18 months, 10 per cent; 18 months to 30 months, 15 per cent; over 30 months, 20 per cent. Like the others, this compensation will also be added to any disability pension payable, subject to a ceiling equivalent to a 100 per cent pension.

The legislation provides that in the case of death, compensation will be available to dependants on the same basis as under the Pension Act. For example, if the combined compensation and disability pension totals 48 per cent or more, widow's pension would be payable and other dependants benefits would be available.

I must point out that prisoner of war experience does not relate to any other civilized kind of incarceration. It is a mixture of inadequate food, exposure, disease, physical abuse and emotional torment. In some instances it entailed being shackled for long periods, having to undergo forced marches and being forced to suffer personal indignities. The relative intensities vary from man to man and time to time, but it is impossible to separate any one aspect of this complex indignity and experience from the whole.

I am sure that the measures proposed in this bill will be welcomed by every hon. member of this House as further evidence of Canada's awareness of the special contribution made by our veterans to their country. I also want to pay special tribute to all those who have been involved in the studies which led to this bill: the veterans' organizations, Dr. J. B. Hermann, the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, other hon. members of this House, officials of the Canada Pension Commission and of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I am very pleased today to have this opportunity to respond to the many interested requests which I have received from former prisoners of war, both of Hong Kong and other powers, and also veterans' organizations and many members of parliament, on their behalf, with the interest at heart of those who served.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, naturally, it is with great pleasure that we have an opportunity today to debate second reading of Bill C-92 which has been introduced into the House. It was given first reading yesterday, March 29, and we certainly welcome it. We welcome it because of the long delay which occurred before the report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs could be put into legislative form. There were questions on points of order and questions to the minister dating back, I suppose, to October of 1975 by hon. members on all sides but by opposition members particularly, and more particularly by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) and myself who bear the responsibility of veterans' legislation for the official opposition, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) as we all continued to press for an early introduction of this bill and to have it printed so that we would know at least what we were talking about. Prior to the introduction of this bill the minister made a statement a few weeks ago indicating that the legislation was ready and would be introduced soon. The word "soon" became a bit of a headache over the weeks and months, and that is why I say we welcomed the introduction of this bill yesterday.

In fairness, I suppose I should say that hon. members on the government side who are veterans were equally concerned about this, but they just did not have the opportunity to express themselves, perhaps, with the same freedom that we have. Perhaps that is the reason they should move across to this side of the House, so they can have greater freedom.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): From the sound of it, I think we have some offers to come over. Today, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made an offer which the government—or at least the House leader—simply could not refuse, and that was to set aside private members' hour which was to be considering his topic and devote it to bringing in this bill. We have to give credit to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) for being prepared and willing to come forward at such short notice. We welcome his statement at the opening of this debate on second reading.

[Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan).]

Perhaps it might be well just briefly to recapitulate what has gone on prior to today. To do that we must go back to Dr. Hermann's report which was studied by the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in great detail. In addition to that, there were numerous witnesses representing veterans' organizations who appeared before the committee to give their views on how the Hermann report should be implemented and what they thought the legislation should contain. I refer to the Hong Kong Prisoners of War Association, the National Prisoners of War Association, the Dieppe Prisoners of War Association, the Royal Air Force Escaping Society—not to mention the legion, the army, the navy, the air force, and so on. The views and beliefs of all these people were invaluable in assisting the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs in preparing a report to present to this House. Then, of course, there were the long sessions of the standing committee in an attempt to bring about a consensus as to what the government should bring forward. There were wide variations of opinion. Some wanted everything included; others, strict limitations with regard to the recommendations. We must give credit to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) who is present today and wants to speak to the bill. He was instrumental in bringing about the consensus which led to the report on which this legislation is based.

● (1710)

We must not forget the work done by the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs in bringing forward this legislation. They stood behind the minister and helped him to look good in committee and in the House. Some of them now sit in the gallery. We ought to pay tribute to them for their work in bringing forward this legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): The minister outlined the contents of the bill. It contains many provisions which the standing committee recommended ought to be included. The committee said that Hong Kong veterans ought to be treated more fairly. When last we gave them a 50 per cent across the board pension, we forgot to say that added to that pension should be any other permanent disability pension they might receive. That omission has been corrected.

I shall not mention in detail the sliding scale of benefits available to prisoners of war of European powers. These are based on the time of incarceration and benefits received are to be added to other disability pensions which the veteran might be in receipt of, up to the maximum of 100 per cent in the case of Hong Kong veterans.

The bill omits important recommendations. One concerns those who escaped from prisoner of war camps, evaded recapture and found their way back to the allied forces. The committee recommended that they should be included in the same category as that applying to prisoners of war of European powers. The government saw fit not to do that, for reasons which have been explained and accepted. In the not too distant future we should consider including this category.

I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in a previous debate said that the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) escaped from a prisoner of war camp. After

being shot down over Europe he was captured, then escaped and, using the European underground system, finally returned to the allied forces. His story is well documented in a book called "The Evaders". An entire chapter is devoted to the hon. member's exploits. He is particularly interested in that recommendation of the standing committee. For that reason we ought to keep it in mind.

The government also did not accept our recommendation suggesting that pensions should be paid to widows of veterans whose disability pensions were assessed at less than 48 per cent. The minister explained why that provision could not be included this time. We accepted his explanation in the all-party discussion of a few weeks ago. We know that it would entail the spending of several millions of dollars, money which the government claims it does not have at this time. If its priorities were different, I am sure that money could be found.

I will not infringe upon the time of others who want to speak on second reading. I said earlier that I want to expedite passage of this bill, and I know that colleagues on my side and hon. members opposite also want to speak on it. I commend the minister for finally bringing forward this bill. We all sincerely hope that it will receive early passage so that veterans will not have to wait long before receiving benefits.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, although it has taken us a long time to reach this day, we are delighted that it is here at last.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The first word I wish to use in my brief comments is "unanimity". Hon. members have heard some of us ask many questions about this matter and have heard some of us pressing for this legislation to be brought down. But the real story behind it has been one of unanimity, particularly on the part of the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

A long time ago we requested an inquiry into the experience of Canadian veterans who were prisoners of war in Europe. That request led to the appointment of Dr. J. D. Hermann who was to undertake that task. When we made that request it was unanimous. Later, the Hong Kong veterans appeared before us and asked for certain improvements in their status. The committee supported their request and that decision was unanimous. Likewise, when the standing committee, on June 12, 1975, tabled the seventh report, which in part is now being implemented, that report was unanimous. As the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles) said, that report was in the nature of a consensus: we compromised between two extremes. The unanimity of the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs provided the pressure which helped the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) to get his cabinet colleagues to agree to the introduction of Bill C-92.

That unanimity was also shown when my colleague and namesake on this side of the House paid tribute to various veterans' organizations, those directly representing prisoners of war and others, for the part they played in this and when he thanked the deputy minister and other officials in the Department of Veterans Affairs, the chairman of the Canadian Pension Commission and the other officials who worked with him for the work they did in drafting the legislation and bringing it before the House.

The second thing I want to say is this: I think the time has come to shorten speeches, or to eliminate them altogether, and pass the legislation. The minister and the previous speaker cut their speeches short. I shall keep mine brief as well. After all, it is almost 34 years since the raid on Dieppe. Those of us who come from Winnipeg well remember that day. Men we knew were involved in the raid. It is even longer than that since the Hong Kong experience, which included many men from my city. So let us not lengthen the time which survivors of Hong Kong or other prison camps in Europe must wait before getting the compensation they deserve. I hope that hon. members who will not get the opportunity to speak, especially members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, will feel that they have been spoken for by those taking part in this debate.

Like the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand, I regret that some things were not put in the bill. We had recommended that in the case of prisoners of war in Europe the lowest rate, 10 per cent, should apply to those who were prisoners for any period from one day to a year and a half. The provision in the bill before us starts at three months. In other words, the lowest rate will apply to incarceration for between three months and a year and a half. I am a little concerned about the numbers that may be cut off by that three months requirement, but we can deal with that later. I am also disappointed that the recommendation we made regarding escapees and evaders has not been included. However, if we get the legislation on the books and the case is a strong one for them to be included, perhaps later on we can get the government to bring in an amendment.

● (1720)

Also, I am disappointed that our very worth-while and, I thought, very humanitarian recommendation about widows is not in the bill. As the previous speaker pointed out, we asked that in the case of widows of veterans where the disability pension of the veteran was less than 48 per cent, a pro rata widow's pension should go to such widows. I understand the battle there was in cabinet to get this legislation through and we have to accept the bill as it is. However, I hope that after this is out of the way and the smoke of this battle has cleared, we can have another one to win yet a better provision for the widows of veterans where veterans' disability pensions were below 48 per cent.

Having indicated my disappointment that those things are not there, and my dedication to carry on the struggle to get them, that does not detract from my pleasure that this bill is now before us. It will mean a great deal to the Hong Kong veterans that the change that is in this bill is being made. Instead of getting just a 50 per cent basic and having that include any disability pensions that were less than that, they will now get the 50 per cent plus any assessable disability, except that there is a ceiling of 100 per cent. It will mean a great deal to them.

It will mean a great deal to Canadian veterans who were prisoners of war in Europe and have waited all these years for consideration to get even the amounts of compensation

that are involved in this bill. When you add these percentages to the percentages that some of them may have for disabilities, there will be protection for widows that may not be there at the present time. As the bill and the schedule point out, we are making provision not only for widows but for children, dependents, and so on. This is a long overdue step. However, this is not the time to complain about the time that has been lost or to complain about the things that are not there. I am just glad that this bill is before us. Coming, as I do, from Winnipeg where we have many who were involved both at Hong Kong and Dieppe, I speak particularly for the people of my city in saying that we are glad this legislation has been brought in.

With all that I have had to say about this matter over the past many months, I certainly do not need to make the point that I could go on. I have already said that the time for speeches on this matter is over. The time has come to get the bill passed and to get it into effect. I am a little concerned that there is not a date in the bill. I had hoped there would be a reasonable period of retroactivity. The date is to be fixed by proclamation. I am afraid that means an effective date that is after the bill gets passed. Therefore, I would like to see the bill passed right now, today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Just a few words, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) for having introduced Bill C-92 now before the House, at the express request of several government members, and of course, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

I congratulate the minister who has obtained quite a few things for the Hong Kong veterans and Dieppe prisoners. I am sure that my brother, who disappeared at Dieppe in August of 1942 and who saw several married fellow-soldiers fall at his side, if he can hear me now, will be happy to hear—though it did take a long time—such a good ending.

However one thing worries me in this bill. I know the committee members did their share, everything they could, as well as the government, to achieve a reasonable objective. But, once again, one thing troubles me: I would like to see the amounts given on pages 7 and 8 indexed on the cost of living. If the cost of living increases—

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, they are in the main bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: They are. I am sorry. I was not a member of this committee but if they are indexed, it means that the long nurtured dream of these families has been fulfilled, in particular these widowed women and these men who, as the minister said earlier, lost most of their joy of living after a 24, 30 or 35 months confinement.

Finally I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in particular whom I heard at each meeting of the House leaders to which I had the honour to assist. He never missed a single opportunity to push for introduction of this bill. This is a concrete example of the concerted action of the opposition parties with the party in power do something in favour of veterans and of the people for whom life had hardly any meaning. I think this is all to the credit of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and of the minister.

[*English*]

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, this a great day for parliament. It is one of the days when politicians of whatever political stripe can be proud of the fact that they are members of the House of Commons, and to indicate that when the chips are down and there is something well deserved we can all work together without any friction.

I do not wish to single out too many people. However, I think it is appropriate to say to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald) that we all feel this legislation is long overdue and we are particularly proud that at this time of restraint he was able to overcome even that. This is one battle that is not going to be fought on the backs of the veterans as the minister has brought forward a piece of legislation that is long overdue. Most assuredly, it is needed.

On the other side of the House, I had the pleasure of serving with many of the members of the veterans affairs committee. In particular I think of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's—St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), of course the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard). We all worked together to find a compromise, a solution. We would have all liked more. We would like to have seen a lot of things happen with this particular bill. We worked together in an in-camera session. We were able to resolve this matter to the satisfaction of the Dieppe prisoners of war, the Hong Kong veterans, the Legion and other organizations which made representations before us.

It may be necessary for Mr. John Mellor to change the title of his book "The Forgotten Heroes". That book spells out, probably as clearly and precisely as possible, the difficulties faced by the prisoners of war in Europe. I do not think I have read a better book. I read "The Shame and the Glory". It probably has more length and more individual statistics, but in so far as putting it all together, I think Mr. Mellor in his book "The Forgotten Heroes" has told the story very graphically.

There is one other thing I should like to say. It comes out of the book and is one of the things about Dieppe veterans. When the men were taken prisoner they were put in railway cars and moved inland in France. They had just come out of the shock of the terrible tragedy of Dieppe and were herded into these railway cars and taken long distances without any food. Finally, they were given some very meagre rations.

The Vichy French, for whatever reason, thought they could alienate the French Canadians from the English Canadians by offering additional food and benefits to the French Canadians. To Canada's eternal pride, the French-Canadians said, "We are one as Canadians, and that is why we fight". And they shared the additional food which was given them by the Vichy French. There was no question then of French and English being divided. They set a standard then and I believe that we, in peacetime, should

look back and remember what the French-Canadians were telling the Vichy French at that time.

● (1730)

It is a real honour and pleasure for me to take part in this debate. I know there are others who would like to speak, and that there are some who are not here today but who would like to speak on this bill. This is an effort of the House of Commons, not of any political party.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I need not add many words to what has already been said this afternoon. I would only commend the minister and his staff, all the service organizations, and all members of the veterans affairs committee.

This bill will help those who are on partial pensions, those who may be in receipt of war veterans allowances through pre-aging; it will give them a few additional dollars to help compensate for the increasing cost of living.

There are only two or three points I wish to make now because of my interest in allowing others to take part in the debate. One concerns the clarification of compensation and pension arrangements. This is a subject to which we ought to address ourselves in committee. Suppose a war veterans is in receipt of war veterans allowance and will qualify for 10 or 15 per cent. How will that affect his war veterans allowance? There is nothing in the bill to say that it will not affect the allowance and therefore the extra money might be of no benefit to a WVA recipient who is already getting the maximum.

Second, take the case of veteran who is over 65 and who is in receipt of GIS. If he qualifies, will the compensation affect his GIS? Again this is a point to which we might well address ourselves in committee.

One of the good features, and this may have been overlooked, concerns the 48 per cent maximum for qualifying for widow's allowance. If the compensation is included, if the disability pensioner, for example, is getting 40 per cent and gets 20 per cent compensation it will bring him up over the 48 per cent line so his widow would indeed benefit.

As the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) have pointed out, it is too bad that escapees were not included. It is obvious from the experience of those who escaped that in some cases they suffered more than those who were incarcerated in prisoner-of-war camps.

In closing I would once again commend the minister. He keeps us in suspense a lot but he always comes through in the end. I should congratulate him, his officials who do the detailed work, and all the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have reserved to myself, I trust, possibly the last word other than those of the minister in reply. First of all, as I have indicated in the past, I have an interest in this legislation. It is possible I am the only one in this Chamber who has a personal and direct interest in it and for that reason, of course, I have had to lie back at times and let others get to the forefront on this particular issue.

I recall private legislation going back eight or ten years, trying to get ministers of veterans affairs subsequent to myself—predecessors of the present minister—to look at this situation and bring the men in for treatment. It was not so much that I was interested in monetary compensation as it was to get the men in and study the effects of what everyone has been speaking of, but from a medical point of view. There would have been many other benefits. I did not think solely of my confreres in the prison camps whether of Dieppe vintage or whether of longer-term Navy or Air Force personnel; I was considering primarily the non-Hong Kong or non-Japanese prisoners of war.

I was not happy about the settlement reached with regard to the Hong Kong prisoners. There is one fundamental point which has been lost sight of, as is evident from the restrictions in the bill before us, and it is that we have since the first world war granted war disability pensions up to 100 per cent in compensation for war wounds or injuries arising out of war service. It is inviolate, not subject to tax, not assignable, not attachable. In certain cases survivor benefits accompany it.

As far as Hong Kong people are concerned, unfortunately there was the 50 per cent ceiling put on which mingled both disability and compensation for the privation they had suffered. It was unfortunate it was done that way, and I believe it was right of the departmental officials on this occasion to insist that the question of POW compensation be taken out of the service disability legislation entirely and that it be recognized as POW compensation. I must say, though, I find it disappointing, even though I realize and speak with gratitude on the part of thousands of my colleagues who were prisoners of war that this action should now be taken. But I do find that having recognized the injustice, the inequities which were imposed on Hong Kong prisoners of war who were really entitled to between 75 per cent and 80 per cent disability pensions, they were cut by the 50 per cent or else they gave up the 50 per cent.

If they were in receipt of a disability pension in excess of 50 per cent there was no compensation for the Hong Kong veterans category. That is a matter of fact and that was where the rub came. I know some prisoners of war who are 90 and 100 per cent pensionable. They made the sacrifice and the country gratefully granted them this disability pension. Now, when we go on the other side and deal under another heading entirely with prisoner of war compensations, this legislation unfortunately tells those men that if they have, both in the Hong Kong category and in the non-Japanese POW category, a disability pension of over 50 per cent their compensation is going to suffer and that if their compensation were upgraded as a result of a re-board in future their compensation will go down. This is because the limit under the act is 100 per cent.

I have spoken to the minister privately about this, and in committee I hope we can agree that the continuation of this inequity should be removed. There is one head of compensation. There is another head of disability benefit. Surely we are not going to continue this inequity to the bitter end. No man will get in excess of a 100 per cent disability pension. He will get a 100 per cent disability pension if he is entitled to it; he will then get, in addition, compensation for being a prisoner of war.

● (1740)

There are other provisions of the act which I think could stand some improvement. However, on behalf of those from Hamilton, Toronto, Windsor, Montreal, Winnipeg, Weyburn, Calgary, Red Deer, Stettler, which I think are the principal areas the troops who took part in the Dieppe raid came from, including prisoners of war who died, such as Sandy Shusterman, who was, shall I say, the moving spirit or founder of the Dieppe Prisoners and Veterans Association, as well as many others who pioneered outside of parliament a strong movement that has culminated in this measure, I say thank you to the government and thank you to members of the House. Naturally they have said thank you many times to the members of the veterans affairs committee.

While attending last year's national conference of prisoners of war in Red Deer I had expressed to me, by all prisoners of war and their dependants who were there, their heartfelt thanks for this consideration that was being given and which hopefully will now come their way.

I also hope that the provision that this legislation shall come into force on a date to be proclaimed is not just a matter of deferral. I would have thought that a generous gesture to these men would be to make it retroactive to the date on which the minister made his announcement that the government had accepted the principle of this measure and that preparation of legislation was going forward. That was the date of the cabinet's decision and it was the date the minister made the announcement. To me, it is only fair under the circumstances to have the legislation made effective from that date.

I note that there is the question of a supplementary estimate or something like that, but why do we always have to look at administrative convenience if we want to make things tidy from the bookkeeping point of view? We are dealing with compensation paid to men, and perhaps to women too who were prisoners of war since the measure will apply to civilian war prisoners. Yet we clutter up our gratitude by bureaucratic tidiness. It would have been far better for the minister and all of us had this legislation been effective from the date of the announcement of this favourable decision that has been taken by the cabinet.

I also regret that there could not be included those who are called escapers. They too went through very trying times, possibly more difficult than others who were prisoners of war. It is hard to measure the relative degree of suffering and privation they endured. Monetary compensation is a very poor measure, but it is the best we can give those who managed to survive, both prisoners of the Japanese, and others. Looking at them today, Mr. Speaker, you wonder how on earth they could ever have been prisoners of war and have suffered any privation at all.

On the other hand, there are people living in Canada, men and women, who went through the horrors of Dachau, Auschwitz and Buchenwald. Some came out from there less than skin and bone and today are not the same people. You would hardly believe that they could have gone through such privation and cruelty, and yet survive. They managed to keep their minds, and apparently that is the best thing.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

It may be said of some that they may get stout. They may round out. But so long as they do not get fat between the ears, that is what counts. I hope that this House will not be too fat between the ears and will compensate these people justly, and that the minister will accept some of the kindly suggestions made by various members in their comments on this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Saint-Henri): Mr. Speaker, I would not want at this stage to be accused of trying to kill the bill. I only want to offer my best wishes to the members of the committee; among all the House committees on which I sat, this is one of the most interesting because there is not political partisanship. All parties cooperate in order that veterans be better understood and protected by the government.

I also want to congratulate the members of all parties sitting on the Committee on Veterans Affairs for their devotion and their willingness in discussing the veterans' problems and I would also thank the various associations which submitted briefs. There is also the department officials from Ottawa and Montreal with whom I discuss veterans' problems from time to time. I wish to thank them for their comprehension and their diligence in discussing and understanding the problems put forward. On befalf of the veterans, I would like to thank them and assure them of my devotion.

I would like to mention what happened to me last spring when I had the opportunity to visit the cemetery in Hong Kong. The brother of a friend of mine lies buried there. I visited the burial grounds and can vouch that it is impeccably maintained. I was with a colleague and I was astounded on seeing how beautifully cared for that place is. I spoke, with the help of our guide who acted as interpreter, to one of the maintenance staff. He was very dedicated to his task, it is almost a vocation which urges him to work in the cemetery. I took a snap of the grave stone of my friend's brother.

To all of you, hon. members of this House and departmental members, I offer my thanks and I am sure everyone will cooperate—there is no doubt about that in my mind—so that this legislation may be passed as quickly as possible for the benefit of our returned soldiers.

● (1750)

[*English*]

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I have had very little time to peruse this bill, but I pretty well know what it contains and I want to say a few words about its effect or lack of effect on a certain group of ex-servicemen.

Generally speaking, in Canada and in most western countries we go to a great deal of national expense to see that justice is not only done but appears to be done, even in individual cases. We have a very elaborate and expensive system of justice.

I know of several cases regarding a governmental attitude where bureaucrats look at things in the bureaucratic way, with the result that very rough justice is done. They take the attitude that if there are only a few exceptions to the general rule, or relatively few that do not fit into the

general pattern, there must be some very exceptional circumstances before they can be accommodated.

The few I am talking about in relation to this bill are those people who, in some cases because of luck, or their own efforts, succeeded in avoiding capture and becoming prisoners of war. More important still is that small group who were prisoners of war for a period of time and escaped and made their way back to allied territory. I do not know what the number is of those who served in the navy or the army of Canada, but those who served in the air force and escaped successfully number perhaps 150 or 200 at the outside. They are the exceptions, and are not covered by this bill. They should be covered, and I hope when the bill goes to the committee this matter will be looked into with the possibility of amending the definition of a former prisoner of war to include those who had been prisoners of war, escaped, and were in enemy territory on occasion for long periods of time.

I have a friend who was in the RCAF, was shot down, was captured, and became a prisoner of war. He escaped three times from prisoner of war camps. The third time he avoided recapture. The only way he could do this was to move to the east. He eventually arrived in Poland and commenced fighting with the Polish underground, and continued to do so for some two years. As I read this bill he would not qualify unless he was a prisoner of war for a certain length of time before his escape.

There are many others who were never prisoners of war for very long but escaped and avoided recapture. Many were shot down and were never captured. They were in enemy occupied countries for long periods of time under very difficult conditions, and at very high risk to themselves and to the people helping them. They were often living under very bad conditions when food was minimal. That period of their service is a complete blank as far as their medical documents are concerned.

Some of these individuals were wounded, injured, and stayed with friends in the underground or members of escape organizations, or perhaps with just individuals on whose mercy they had thrown themselves. At very great risk they were nursed back to a sufficient level of health so that they were able to move on.

It is very unreasonable to exclude this small group of people. I do not know how many there would be in all services, but perhaps 500 at the most. In this situation these exceptions should be taken care of by this legislation. They should have been treated in the same way as others who had the misfortune to be prisoners until the end of the war.

After all, as everybody who served in the service is aware, one of your obligations was to try to escape if taken prisoner. That was one of your obligations and duties. We now have a situation in which a fellow is disqualified because he was able to fulfil that duty by escaping successfully, at great risk to himself, and in some cases after months making it back to allied territory to serve again. To me this borders on the outrageous. The very least that can be said about it is that it is an injustice. The only reason I know of that they are not included is that they represent an awkward exception to the general rule. They do not fit conveniently into the category of those who were made prisoner of war and remained so until the war was over.

I see it is six o'clock. That is all I wanted to say on this bill now, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, earlier today the government House leader said that if Bill C-92 were not concluded by six o'clock it would be called again during government time on Thursday. Would he tell us now whether it will be the first item of business on Thursday?

Mr. Sharp: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would not call any other government bill before this. It will be the first bill, but I cannot say it will be the only business.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed the following bills:

Bill C-90, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1976.

Bill C-91, an act for the granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1977.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the following communication has been received:

Government House
Ottawa

30 March, 1976

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Jean Beetz, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 30th day of March, at 9.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière,
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violence and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Peter P. Masniuk (Portage): Mr. Speaker, when I called it five o'clock I was talking about the provisions governing certain restricted weapons, including hand-guns, which were written into the Criminal Code over 40 years ago.

I should like to leave my notes for a moment, however, and respond to some of the comments made by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) this afternoon. I was interested in what he said about gun collectors who have invested a considerable amount of money in what were—and will be until this bill goes through the House—restricted weapons. These collectors apparently invested in machine-guns of one sort or another. They went through the process of registering a weapon, removing the firing pin, and placing it in another part of the place where they kept their gun collection. They are now very concerned that passage of this bill would prohibit ownership of these guns.

I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about what will happen if the bill goes through in its present form. These machine-guns are only part of a collection. If the owners comply with every phase of the law and then a gun becomes a prohibited weapon which has to be turned over to the RCMP or some other agent of the government which will confiscate them, will the owners be compensated? There are a lot of other things in the bill that I disapprove of, Mr. Speaker, and as I proceed I will show why I cannot vote for the bill in its present form.

To return to my notes, I should like to say that a former commissioner of the RCMP, Mr. L. H. Nicholson, has stated that the registration program failed miserably. This short assessment of the former commissioner merely stated an old truth about gun controls, and that is that one simply cannot control crime or criminals by controlling guns.

● (2010)

What has been the result of almost 40 years of these tough hand-gun controls in Canada? An examination of the statistics with regard to hand-guns used in shootings does not provide much of a recommendation for controls. More than ever the statistics only tend to confirm former Commissioner Nicholson's assessment.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

In 1973, according to the statistics, there were 214 shootings in Canada. Of these the second largest number, next to the rifle, were committed with the restricted hand-gun, 56. There were 114 rifle shootings that year. A year later, in 1974, there were 272 shootings in Canada, a 27 per cent increase in one year. During 1974, however, although the restricted hand-gun was still second to the unrestricted rifle in terms of its popularity for shooting people, the number of shootings committed with hand-guns had risen to 71. The number of shootings with the far more easily obtainable and completely unrestricted rifle only increased by eight in the same one year period.

I know that on the one hand statistics do not necessarily prove anything and, on the other hand, they can be used to prove anything one wants them to prove, but the very least that statistics like these should tell us is that so-called gun controls have no control at all over the use of guns to commit crimes.

An examination of the situation in other countries suggests that their experiences with gun controls are similar to Canada's with hand-gun controls. Anti-gun laws and regulations are actually quite prevalent in most countries of the world. However, crime statistics for practically all of them seem to indicate that gun controls have relatively little, if any, effect on reducing or eliminating crime.

The toughest gun control in the United States is New York State's Sullivan law. In the city of New York, out of a total population of some seven million plus, less than 25,000 qualify legally to possess a firearm of any kind. This law has been in effect for over 60 years. Yet in the 12 year period from 1960 to 1972 the homicide rate in the city of New York increased from 3.7 per 100,000 people in 1960 to 19.1 per 100,000 in 1972. In the one year period from 1971 to 1972 there was an 11 per cent increase in armed robbery, and a 37 per cent increase in aggravated assault.

A mid 1960's Interpol sampling of the murder rate in 30 countries ranged from a high of 177 murders per 100,000 population in the Arab country of Yemen to a low of 0.13 per 100,000 population in Norway. All the countries in the sample had gun control laws of one kind or another, either gun registrations, purchase permits, licences to carry, or various combinations of these. Obviously, however, they have no effect whatsoever on the murder rate.

It is interesting to note that this 30 country sample includes some countries whose gun control laws are not for the purpose of disarming the nation's citizens but, rather, are just for the opposite reason, for ensuring that the nation's citizens are adequately armed. Switzerland is the most well known country in this regard. In Switzerland there are no restrictive laws on the general use of firearms, but every able bodied adult male is required by law to possess and to know how to use a military rifle. Adult males must undergo throughout the year periodic short drills in the use of their military weapons. It is quite

possible that it was the existence of this armed and prepared citizen army which caused Hitler to think twice about trying to invade Switzerland during the second world war.

Quite apart from the required military drill, rifle and pistol shooting as sport are quite widely indulged in by the Swiss. Yet in spite of large numbers of all types of guns in the land of the Swiss people and their widespread availability and generally unrestricted use, Switzerland has one of the lowest crime rates of any country in the world. In fact violent crimes of all kinds are rare in Switzerland. The same Interpol sample I mentioned a few moments ago shows that in the late 1960's Switzerland had a murder rate of 0.70 per 100,000 population, one of the lowest in the world.

There is an often repeated and rather trite expression to the effect that guns do not kill people, people kill people. Those in the office of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) responsible for this legislation must have had this expression in mind when they were drafting this bill. The response of the government to the fact that it is not guns, but people with guns, who kill, is to license people.

Bill C-83 is entitled measures to protect society against crime, but the one major and fundamental measure which the government has come up with, and which takes up more than half of this bill, is one which will have the least effect in protecting society against crime: licensing gun owners. I fail to grasp the logic in this type of legislation, that crime can be controlled by controlling the lawful activities of law abiding people. That is what this gun owner licensing law will really do. It is estimated that there are about eight million firearms in the hands of private citizens in Canada. Yet the number of shooting crimes in the country each year, even if we include those committed by criminals who have previous criminal convictions, and therefore possibly including those shootings committed with illegal firearms, is not more than a few hundred at the very most.

Less than 1 per cent of all the firearms owned in Canada are misused. The simple fact is that gun owners are law abiding people who are no more likely to shoot someone with their guns than they are to stab someone with their kitchen knives or to club someone to death with a garden rake. Yet now we have a government which wants to license all gun owners. Why? Well, because it might prevent someone who might otherwise obtain a gun from doing so and thereby prevent an unnecessary shooting death, the government says. I say possibly, but the number of such cases is too few to justify the massive bureaucracy which will be required for this gun owner licensing scheme.

The apologists for the government say that even if gun licensing prevents one unnecessary shooting death it is worth while. Is it not strange that a government which will not execute a mad dog killer but instead permits him to go free and kill again is now so concerned about the one or two shooting deaths which might be prevented by gun owner licensing?

Crime and shooting incidents cannot be affected by controlling law abiding people, which is what gun controls are for. They are not for criminals or political terrorists who will not obtain licences for their guns. Gun controls must therefore be for the potential, future criminal amongst the law abiding, but how can he possibly be identified in advance? An individual who at some time in his life might commit a murder of passion in most cases could probably qualify in every way for a gun licence. So could someone who was suddenly to go insane; there would not necessarily be a history of insanity which would prevent him from obtaining a gun licence.

● (2020)

Gun owner licensing might have some effect in preventing tragedies like those which occurred in Brampton and Ottawa last year—I say might. On this chance, this possibility, is owner licensing now going to be imposed on perhaps five million law-abiding Canadian gun owners who have no connection whatever with the Brampton and Ottawa tragedies? Where is the government's logic? It now proposes to set up another government bureaucracy, when all previous gun control schemes in this country and in other countries have proved to be unworkable, cumbersome, tremendously expensive, and completely ineffective in controlling crime and shooting deaths.

This new Canadian version of gun control is not really a gun control program at all, of course. It is people control. The government calls it the bill on peace and security. That title alone sounds suspect to many Canadians. It certainly raised plenty of eyebrows in my constituency of Portage when it was announced last month. How anyone on the government side can even say it without wincing, I do not know. Many of my constituents are beginning to feel that their own peace and security are more threatened by the government's people-control schemes than by any criminal element or mentally unbalanced gun owners.

I do not think that it is much of a secret, Mr. Speaker, that this Liberal government does not have much support out west on the prairies. It certainly could not have done more to make itself less popular in the rural areas of western Canada than to introduce this legislation. Gun ownership in rural Canada is high, much higher than in urban Canada. That is something which I know for a fact—I come from and live in a rural area. Most people from the cities who probably do not know the situation very well will very likely accept that as a fact. We know that farmers and rural families are more likely to own one or more guns than are city dwellers. Yet the incidence of crime in rural Canada is very low. Spectacular shootings are not very common in the small towns, villages, and farming areas of our country, This seems to be more of a urban phenomenon.

Gun violence is to a very great extent an urban phenomenon. This bill, in seeking to combat it, will fall most heavily on those innocent people who have nothing at all to do with the problem, the small town and rural dwellers. Here we have a very clear case of a law penalizing the innocent and doing nothing to control the criminal. Most big city dwellers do not own guns. The government, in its frantic desire to appear to be doing something about increasing urban violence, has brought in this bill, which is really a new gun law which will most affect those who have absolutely nothing to do with urban crime.

How will requiring a farmer to obtain a licence for the gun which he uses for killing rodents or shooting ducks or

other game affect urban violence? How will requiring a gun collector to obtain a licence for his gun collection have any effect on the muggings or assaults in the dark alleys of our major cities? How will licensing the members of a gun club or shooting federation possibly have any effect on the incidence of armed robbery?

This law will require the statements of two guarantors before an applicant will be able to obtain a gun licence. This should not be a problem for any normal, law-abiding person; but what possible effect can it have on controlling the psychotics and mentally unbalanced individuals in society? How can owner licensing prevent a normal and well balanced individual from shooting a relative or neighbour in a fit of passion during a period of temporary insanity?

This bill makes provision for the establishment of a licensing officer, one of whose functions it seems will be to see that gun licenses are not given to undesirable people. This is absurd. The function of a licensing officer cannot be any more than a bureaucratic function. He should not be given the power, the authority, and the responsibility to make a judgment about something as important and as personal as one's character. This is something which only a psychologist or phychiatrist is adequately trained and competent to do.

This evening I have tried to give some of the reasons why I am opposed to the gun licensing provisions contained in this criminal law amendment bill, Bill C-83. I cannot believe that the defects inherent in any system of gun control or gun owner licensing are not apparent to the government. I cannot believe that the government really believes in the effectiveness of gun control laws. Yet here we have what is in effect a new gun law mixed in with other measures which may be very effective in controlling crime. These include new provisions for the treatment of dangerous offenders, changes for the handling of prison inmates, provisions for establishing special crime inquiries by the provinces, amendments to the wire-tapping laws which might make them more effective in investigating organized crime, and some proposals for the prevention of crime.

I support most of these measures, as do many of my colleagues on this side. But I cannot support these new gun control provisions which establish a new gun law in Canada. In the circumstances, all these proposals being grouped together in this one bill, C-83, opposition to the bill means that one must oppose what may be very worthwhile measures to combat crime. Support for this bill means that one must support an unnecessary, unworkable, and ineffective gun law, which I am unable to do. I therefore support the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) calling for the gun control provisions to be separated from Bill C-83 and treated as a new law in a new bill.

In conclusion I say that the deviousness of the government on this legislation is totally unacceptable to our party. The gun control provisions are the major and fundamental part of this legislation. They cannot be treated as just another crime prevention measure. They constitute a major revision of the criminal laws of our country. Gun control is far too important an issue to be treated this way, in this bill, by this government. I urge that the proposal of the hon. member for Calgary North be considered and that the gun law amendments be severed from Bill C-83 and incorporated in a new bill. Only in this way can this House clearly and forthrightly address itself to such a serious and important issue, one which has so many profound implications for the operation of the criminal justice system in our nation.

[Mr. Masniuk.]

Mr. Ross Milne (Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, on May 28 last year, it was my sad responsibility to rise and inform this House about the tragic shooting which had just occurred at Brampton Centennial high school in my riding. In a few brief, shocking moments two people were killed; one a teacher, the other a 17-year-old student. Thirteen other young people were wounded, some so seriously that they were to endure long and painful periods of recovery. Indeed some of them still bear and will continue to bear the indelible physical reminder of this ordeal. Finally and equally tragically, the troubled assailant turned his highpowered rifle on himself, adding his own name to the tragic toll of that afternoon.

That was a terrible time for the bereaved, a most difficult time for the injured, and an emotional time for the people of Brampton and the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who were shocked by the tragedy.

The Brampton tragedy and the later, equally tragic event in Ottawa served as a catalyst in the minds of citizens, police, and governments. It was felt that legislation must be forthcoming to deal more adequately with the increasing proliferation of guns, the rising crime rate involving guns, and the rising toll of domestic and domestic related gun killings.

● (2030)

Over 25,000 people in the Brampton area took the time and effort to drive to the local radio station to sign a petition in support of more effective gun control legislation. I am sure all members were in receipt of letters from all over Canada in support of effective gun legislation. Following the tragedy last July, the coroner's jury charged with the responsibility of investigating the shooting made the following recommendations. If I may, I would like to read them into the record. I quote:

(i) We recommend raising the legal age to 18 years before one can obtain a hunting licence.

(ii) We recommend raising the legal age for a minor's permit from 14 to 16 years of age to be used only in the accompaniment of a person holding a valid licence.

(iii) We recommend requiring the purchaser of a rifle or shotgun to firstly obtain a gun licence which must be produced prior to the purchase of the firearm.

This licence should be issued solely by police departments upon receipt of documents stating the applicant's reason for desiring the licence, training courses taken and a brief certificate of health. The application should be then subject to police approval.

(iv) We recommend that this same licence be produced upon the purchase of ammunition.

(v) We recommend that the vendor record the sale of all firearms and ammunition.

(vi) We recommend that all offences involving firearms come under the Criminal Code and be dealt with severely.

(vii) We recommend that all firearms currently in households be securely locked up within the home.

As I shall show later, it is exactly the spirit and content of these recommendations which the government seeks to put into law through Bill C-83. It is the same spirit, the same plea for action that underlines the words of Mr. Slinger, father of the 17 year old student who was shot at that school. If I may quote a couple of paragraphs from the letter he sent to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) after the incident, they are:

> Violence is ever present in our society and the contributing factors to its apparent increase may be debated unendingly. Changes in standards and values, pressures of urban living and many other causes are cited, but surely permissive attitudes, which have been so favoured and so common in the last 20 years or so, must be a major contributor to the unacceptable social behaviour of some members of society today. These things cannot be changed quickly by any legislative action, but changes can be made in our laws governing all aspects of the use of firearms and ammunition, the results of which should reduce the use of such weapons in acts of violence, particularly by people who are not generally regarded as criminals.

I would very much like to thank and to congratulate the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) for listening to these ideas and to the many other proposals put forth by myself and, I am sure, by most other members of the House. The result, in my opinion, is an excellent bill, one which deserves the support in principle of all hon. members from all parties in this House.

May I extend a particular and personal note of appreciation to the Solicitor General for the gracious and understanding way in which he discussed the tragedy and the need for remedial action with Mr. and Mrs. Slinger and members of their family. Their trip to Ottawa to discuss their feelings, to relive their experience, to share with officials and with the media the depth of their loss and their hopes for change, was indeed a courageous undertaking. I wish to congratulate them for their reasonable approach to the issue and also for their continuing leadership in this issue.

The need for action is clear. The Brampton incident, while unique in many aspects, is but symptomatic of growing and more general problems. Indeed it will interest the House to know that a teacher at Centennial High School, the same high school, after the tragedy did a survey of surrounding high schools. He found police records of seven other incidents involving guns in those schools.

The need for legislation is vividly demonstrated in the dimensions of the over-all national problem. If we check the period 1965-74 there has been a 115 per cent increase in crimes involving violence. Murder and manslaughter are up 115 per cent, rape 185 per cent, robbery 204 per cent, wounding and attempted murder, 183 per cent, and assaults 113 per cent. The most disturbing factor, however, has been the extent to which firearms have come to be used in crime.

Deaths caused by firearms in murders, suicides, and accidents are up 30 per cent since 1970. Suicide deaths involving guns are up 28 per cent. Guns are now used in over one third of all suicides. Last year 50 per cent of all murders were caused by firearms. Canada now has a gun homicide rate second only to that of the United States. In 1974 firearms were found to be used in two thirds of all armed robberies. The number of robberies involving guns is increasing at almost two times the rate of increase for robberies as a whole.

In fact if you take the first quarter statistics of 1974 versus the first quarter of 1975, armed robberies with firearms increased some 73.5 per cent, armed robberies with other weapons by 44 per cent, and armed robberies with or without weapons 40 per cent. Surely the root cause of these startling trends lies in the increasing number of firearms present in our society and in the proliferation of certain types of firearms which have no legitimate social purpose.

If we look at the inventory of guns we should all be concerned. The number of weapons owned by Canadians is increasing at a rate greater than the rate of growth in population. Over the short period from 1970 to 1974 the average increase has been 3.8 per cent in gun inventory and only 2.2 per cent in terms of population. Canadians are buying guns at the rate of 1,370 a day. In 1960 there was roughly one gun in Canada for every 2.6 Canadians. That is now roughly one for every two Canadians.

We often hear the comment that we hope we will not resemble American society. When you talk about the level of guns, the fact is we are almost a society like that. The United States has about .7 guns per person; Canada has about .5. It is true the United States has about five times more hand-guns per capita, but Canada has proportionately the same number of long guns.

It is an irrefutable conclusion that the rate and number of crimes committed involving firearms are intrinsically related to the availability of guns. When more and more guns are being purchased without stricter controls placed on their use, we can only expect that associated crime rates will continue to escalate. The government, however, can neither condone further increases nor condone the current unacceptable levels of gun related offences.

I am convinced that Bill C-83 will go a long way to reduce the crimes involving guns, to reduce the proliferation of guns where there is no legitimate use for them, and to help ensure that guns are bought only by people who will respect them and use them properly.

The bill sets out provisions that fulfil these three objectives well in terms of reducing crime. There is a proposal for higher maximum sentences for crimes involving offensive weapons, a mandatory one year term and up to 14 years to run consecutively where a person uses an offensive weapon while committing an indictable offence.

There has been a lot of controversy about the seizure of weapons. New authority has been granted to police to seize a weapon, without a warrant, where danger to safety of some person is likely and where obtaining a warrant is impractical. We can all recall reading in the newspapers of situations where this would have been very desirable.

In terms of proliferation of guns the move from a restricted and prohibited firearms class has been expanded to include formerly restricted fully automatic guns, sawed off guns, and "Saturday night specials". I do not happen to be one who believes that people should be collecting operative fully automotive machine-guns.

The tightening of control on restricted firearms is such that applicants would be required to justify the need for such a weapon before being granted a registration certificate. That is one of the key provisions put forward in this bill.

The recall program, again in terms of proliferation, is important. I am pleased that in both Brampton and Ottawa, where the two tragedies have occurred, police forces in both those municipalities are setting up a program so that people can bring guns to them and they will destroy them without any questions.

I do not need to pursue the provisions that will be or are set out for the licensing or legal responsibility. However, I think the legal responsibility is very important. Surely if a person owns a gun he should accept responsibility for the use of that gun while it is under his ownership.

● (2040)

I should like to conclude by making one or two comments concerning the objections raised by some hon. members and shared by sports clubs, rifle owners, and hunters. The basic argument they put forward is that there is really no need for Bill C-83 to involve long guns. When this question was previously discussed many people proposed that individual guns should be registered. Hon. members will note that the bill before us does not propose to follow this course. Instead, the people who own the guns are to be registered.

Many concerned citizens have written to me suggesting a central storage should be set up where all guns would be located; a person wanting to use his gun would have to go there to get it out, and return it there after use. Such a provision was not put into the bill, for good reason, nor was the extreme provision of making the ownership of firearms illegal. Some of the legitimate concerns felt by sportsmen and hunters have been answered inasmuch as those provisions I have mentioned are not in the bill.

The statistics with regard to the relationship between the use of long guns and crime are interesting. For instance, rifles are used in about two thirds of all domestic shootings, which indicates that the need for secure storage of such weapons within the home is important. Rifles were used in well over half of all murders committed between 1961 and 1974. Without doubt, rifles and shotguns are used in the majority of accidental shootings which occur. This would lead to the conclusion that to ignore the need to supervise the use and ownership of long barrelled weapons would be a failure to address ourselves to a large proportion of related incidents, particularly those of a passionate nature involving family, friends, and innocent bystanders. Rifle owners must accept responsibility to stem the misuse of their weapons; they must accept the requirement that all rifle and shotgun owners be duly licensed.

The provisions having to do with the confiscation of firearms will be set out in detail in the regulations. I know there are many who wish that all the regulations could somehow be incorporated into the bill. I do not think there need be any real concern on this score because any regulations which are published will have to go before the appropriate committee. This will provide an open forum at which anyone may review the progress which is made there.

I should also like to deal with the criticism that intervention by the government represents an unconscionable violation of civil liberties. I find it difficult to accept this proposition. I do not think any inherent legal right exists in common law in this country which guarantees free ownership of weapons. It is, however, an irrefutable responsibility of government to provide for the peace and security of citizens while respecting fundamental civil rights, and while providing equitable appeal procedures from any of its decisions or actions.

From the very beginning of this country's history we have always vested responsibility for personal and private security with the police forces. If anything disturbs me, it is the recent trend of people purchasing firearms for their own safety. The greatest hazard in following this practice is to the purchasers themselves, because I believe more people end up victims of gun incidents than would ever need to use them in the circumstances they have envisaged. I often wonder why sportsmen in the gun clubs do not show leadership in talking about gun safety and providing education in the use of guns. If there is any threat to their continuing ability to own guns it is simply the recent tide of public opinion against guns in private hands.

Many people are asking whether this legislation will be, or can be, effective. I would draw attention to the situation in Japan where the law, in effect, prohibits private gun ownership and prescribes a strict five-year penalty for possession. Last year in Japan, where there is a population of 100 million, there were 37 homicides involving the use of firearms. That is about equal to the number in Toronto last year, a city which has a population of about 2.5 million. So Japan has about 1/40th of the gun crime rate that Toronto has. I say this to back up my point that gun legislation can be effective in cutting down crime.

I conclude by calling on members in all parties to support the reference of this legislation to committee. I know there are many groups of people who wish to appear before the committee to express their points of view, and that is fine. But we ought to send the bill to committee as quickly as we can so that we can hear these various points of view and evaluate them thoroughly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, the bill now under discussion recommends the adoption of legislation to provide better protection for the Canadian people against violent and other crimes. In the recommendation to the House I read provide that, quote:

to increase the number of members of the National Parole Board to not less than twenty-six members . . .

Like most legislation introduced in this House, this bill is worded in a very intricate way and if enacted, the implementation procedure would cause delays and hitches in the enforcement of the law.

We all know that many Canadian sportsmen who possess hunting-guns might be searched by officials empowered by law to do so, even if it could be proven that the firearms which they own are used only for shooting during the hunting season.

Obviously criminals will not bother to check whether their guns are registered or not when they decide to use them for any theft or crime. As a result of interviews with many people from my region, I found out they were far from being in favour of these new controls. For instance, a gun collector wrote me a letter dated March 22, 1976 after

reading the provisions of Bill C-83 that I had given to him. Here is what he states in part:

> In every country where prohibitive laws have been enacted, they had the effect of reducing the people's freedoms to the advantage of those who could not care less about legal matters.

He adds that controls of this kind would create hardships for a large number of Canadian citizens, and he makes a comparison with the registration of motor vehicles, which does not prevent accidents. It would be more useful, he adds, to stop giving free publicity to criminals, and describing terrible crimes in newspapers, in movies and on television, which cannot but rouse already disturbed minds. He goes on to say that we had better enforce existing laws before drafting others that are still more ambiguous and with which anyway, those who do not abide by the present legislation would fail to comply. In his view, this kind of prohibition will have no effect whatsoever on criminals and he goes on to say that he has never heard of a criminal being arrested in possession of a gun registered in his name.

According to a booklet published by an association responsible for the guidance in the safe training in the use of firearms, I read the following passage which I believe appropriate to quote:

> We know that many politicians today prefer to blame the availability of firearms for the continuous rise in crime, rather than face the economic and social causes which are the roots of crime . . .

I insist on this: rather than face the economic and social causes which are the roots of crime, and I continue the quotation:

> . . . such as the failure of our penal system, the diminishing authority of our police forces, the moral and spiritual decline of our society and the general tolerating attitude prevailing today.
>
> We firmly believe that any gun enthusiast must comply with the law in a responsible manner when participating in these activities. Most firearm fans comply with the law and are prepared to conform with the normal legal restrictions allowing every citizen to use firearms in a responsible way.
>
> We know that the criminal disregards altogether any restriction about firearms.

● (2050)

Under present legislation, criminals can be severely punished, and so they should. Additional restrictions concerning firearms would only increase the pressure already imposed on the law-abiding owner of firearms. In my opinion, this is not the best way to protect the Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crimes.

A booklet published by the Law Reform Commission of Canada points out the problem of guilt by asking questions which call for consideration because, in some circumstances, guilt has to be determined. I quote a paragraph from this booklet:

> What does being guilty mean? Most people think a person is guilty of an offence only if he was wholly aware of what he was doing and that he knew it was an offence.

But this is not what the law says. Ignorance of the law is not an excuse but mistake of fact can be one.

For instance, a person accused of selling drugs is found guilty even if he or she ignored that the sale of drug was forbidden by law. But if that person thought he or she was selling something else, sugar for instance, he or she is not guilty. However, the mistake of fact is not always an excuse, especially for minor offences. In 90 per cent of offences where liability is strict, the mistake of fact is not an excuse.

Elsewhere in the booklet, the following question is asked:

> What is strict liability? Strict liability is a liability whether you are at fault or not. The motorist who runs through a stop is guilty even if he cannot see the sign, and so is the butcher who has tainted meat on his stall, even if he did not know the meat was tainted. Guilt therefore is not dependent upon fault.

I bet that a man would not be punished if he could prove that he was not at fault, that the stop sign was not visible, or that the meat deteriorated due to a power failure.

But according to the letter of the law, you should be found guilty. In fact there is a discrepancy between what is stated in the law and the way it is applied. But you could find even worse. The law is so complicated that you do not know when the responsibility is strict, nor do you know what the concept of strict responsibility means. However, each Canadian is likely to perpetrate about 40,000 of this type of strict responsibility offences, which make up about 90 per cent of our penal laws. Each year they account for 1,300,000 condemnations. One person out of 25 in Canada is condemned. This is a tremendous problem, especially when, on top of that, it is impossible to know what the law requires or what it prohibits.

This shows that I have very good reasons to insist that the laws and regulations should be written more clearly so that we may not be likely to condemn people who are not guilty at all.

I should like to make a few remarks on the subject of parole, a problem which is inevitably linked to the lives of the inmates in the penitentiary institutions of Canada.

Having had the opportunity to participate in discussions and work done in the committee which studied penitentiaries, I will say also that this participation gave me the advantage of a group visit to the St.Vincent de Paul penitentiary and the maximum security institution then being built in that area. I made interesting findings and got acquainted with all the responsibilities of those who are in charge of various correctional departments such as practical works, teaching, maintenance, supervising, cooking and clothing. I am not one of those who are prepared to admit that everything is perfect, that we have done all we could possibly do and that everything works wonderfully well. Indeed I would be in danger of being suddenly contradicted by various cases of rebellion and revolt which have already occurred in penitentiaries or cases of evasion which have enabled some reporters on the look out for sensational news to write reports which have contributed to promote the sale of their newspapers, not to mention some cartoonists who have shown in their usual style various ways to flood a rink without considering the weather when hoses are used for other purposes.

It is obvious that there is much room for improvement in the organization of our prisons in Canada and the matter is urgent. First we will have to acknowledge that the prime responsibility of the authorities of those establishments is to keep in their institutions the individuals committed to them and I am convinced that it is not always an easy task. In most cases, the prisoner does not resign himself to

accepting a way of life dictated by circumstances. He spends 4/5th of his time looking for ways to escape.

Most are clever enough to invent evasion schemes that sometimes leave the best trained guards out on a limb. For this reason, what is needed is a well disciplined staff, constantly on the lookout. Among other various responsibilities, the people in charge of those institutions must find the most adequate means of using the different methods of rehabilitation, based on the prisoner's position, his background, his good and bad points, his abilities, his preferences. A period of observation must be very closely followed by well trained people. If the rehabilitation service is to produce the results that society can expect, a number of improvements are required, despite all the efforts to date.

There is in my view an essential factor as far as rehabilitation is concerned. That is inmate classification, inmate grouping in small units. The younger and newly admitted ones should not be allowed to remain in contact with the more hardened so they do not get to learn the tricks used by experienced criminals, to prepare while detained new procedures to fool those who enforce the peace that must be maintained in a civilized society. It seems to me this is one of the basic factors that should open a better approach to the rehabilitation exercise.

Inmate grouping in small units offers a means of noting psychological reactions between people who become familiar one with the other. The guards are in a much better position to observe them objectively, and inmates get a clearer perception of it.

Small units also are a very practical work tool when it comes to discussing a particular case. When a guard has to deal with a hundred or so people, he cannot observe and note individual behaviour. When, on the other hand, he knows a small group, he sees each person as a distinct individual. In this kind of situation he is in a better position to state the observed behaviour, to discuss its explanation and the ways to implement changes he feels are needed and useful. This may also help guards find out the nature of and rationale behind the sometimes constructive criticism of their own behaviour towards inmates. This helps them exercise a better control over themselves, to the point they sometimes can use their personal emotions to the benefit of inmates.

● (2100)

Guiding the discussion in such a way that under certain circumstances satisfactory results can be obtained, can replace to a large extent the formal study of psychological techniques many would like the guards to have. After proper schooling, the study of specific cases, added to practical experience, can become truly professional school training. Whoever heads it can give applied instruction.

I should like to say one word about the level of comfort in prisons: it is impossible to indicate, with mathematical precision, what degree of comfort should be given the prisoners. That degree cannot be set: it varies according to the society and time involved. For a prisoner, learning to live in normal comfort is an integral part of his rehabilitation. On the other hand, keeping him in an uncomfortable environment, to which scorn is at times added, can prevent him from becoming aware that he really has a chance of returning to normal life. That can be readily understood. Before going into captivity, the prisonner could resort to all sorts of pretexts to feel hated and rejected by society. During his detention, where he would be subjected to brutality, he would have a sort of proof that he is hated. So he would feel authorized to protect himself by hatred and on the first occasion he would be ready to defend himself with more boldness and personal assurance.

I believe that the inmates must have good food and enjoy facilities to maintain themselves properly. Each and every inmate must comply by health rules. In concluding, I want to say however that the inmates should not expect to enjoy all the advantages they would have if they led a normal life. Of course they are directly responsible for the restriction of their liberty and I think that we must pay more attention to their victims.

When we listen to some supporters of liberation, we tend to conclude that they pay more attention to the criminals than to their victims. We should not reverse the roles by taking into account circumstances which provoked irresponsible actions by some individuals who could not easily adjust to a normal existence.

In the summary for the Minister of Justice or second reading of Bill C-83, we find that there will be stiffer restrictions over temporary releases without escort. Also the detention period required before that privilege could be granted will be extended and the parole board rather than penitentiary authorities will be authorized to grant that privilege.

That is to prevent decisions from being taken too hastily and so avoid the presence in the community of an individual who could be a danger for the security of people who want to live peacefully in an organized society.

[*English*]

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this evening on this very important matter, Mr. Speaker, namely, Bill C-83. Much has been said already about the controversial nature of this bill and many members have made worth-while contributions to the debate.

I was profoundly troubled at the opening of the debate on hearing the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) say that crime is under control in Canada. Surely the minister speaks in jest. Crime has been on the increase in this country for several years now, both at the highly organized level among professional gangsters and also at the street level among many of our youth aspiring toward professional criminal careers.

What is especially disturbing to Canadians though, is not only the obvious increase in the crime rate but the violence with which the increasing amount of this crime is being committed.

The government has failed miserably to deal adequately with this very serious problem. If we are to take seriously some of the speeches from the government side of the House it has not yet fully recognized that crime is indeed a very serious problem. The government, realizing it has been unable to deal with crime effectively, chooses to underplay the fact of its very existence. That is an irresponsible and rather ridiculous attitude, and it is one that is condemned by members on this side of the House.

I waited in anxious anticipation for the introduction of this legislation with the mistaken thought that at long last the government was going to embark on a significant course toward protecting better the majority of Canada's law abiding citizens. Bill C-83 is a monumental disappointment to me. I had hoped for better.

The provisions of this bill do nothing to get at or eradicate the real causes of crime. There are no drug related provisions in the bill, for example, despite the fact that the drug trade is responsible for a higher percentage of crime in one form or another, and for criminal activity in Canada. The actual process of drug trafficking and numerous crimes of violence perpetrated by drug users in fact account for over half of the criminal activities in this country. Why is this problem not being attacked?

● (2110)

What answer does the Minister of Justice have to offer to the Canadian public for not guaranteeing their protection? He well knows that these insignificant changes in the law, such as gun control, are totally useless in face of such serious omissions as failure to deal with the drug problem.

I agree that legislation pertaining to dangerous offenders, bail reform, and rules of parole is certainly necessary, but what we have here is a series of regulations which, although not objectionable, are extremely limited in scope. If this legislation is a politically expedient attempt to appease an aroused public it may be moderately successful for as long as it takes the public to realize it has been had.

If by chance, this legislation should be truly aimed at the real maintenance of peace and security, as the government wants to call it, then I am afraid it is a dismal failure. Yet these appear to be the only changes that government is now prepared to offer. In that sense I could reluctantly support some of these provisions, not because they are worthy, but because the criminal situation is becoming so seriously acute that one must grasp at whatever straw of relief is offered, regardless of how lacking in substance it may be.

Despite its obvious shortcomings I could probably support this bill both in principle and in practice except for one glaring deficiency, that is, the complete unacceptability of the provisions relating to gun control. The control of guns is an extremely controversial and complex issue in much the same way as is the issue of capital punishment. Due to this complex nature of the gun control subject I feel that legislation in this regard should be dealt with separately, as is the legislation regarding capital punishment.

My point, Mr. Speaker, and the main thrust of my argument today is that, in order to deal with this so-called peace and security legislation effectively, the bill must be severed. I submit that the bill should not be read a second time but that the subject matter should be sent to committee in order to be severed—the gun control sections to be separated from the rest.

Were we able to deal with this matter apart from the rest, we could better debate and hopefully solve many of the difficulties inherent in the attempted legislative control of firearms. I strongly support the motion put forth by my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

These provisions related to gun control have clearly been introduced in the name of short term political expediency. It is a sinister attempt to mislead the Canadian public into believing that the government is doing something about crime prevention when in fact it is doing nothing.

There has been and continues to be an outcry from the great majority of Canadians over the ever increasing trend toward murder and violence in this nation. Despite what the Minister of Justice may have to say, it is a known fact that crime is not under control in this country. There is nothing at all in this bill that attacks the root causes of crime, and too little in the way of effective punishment and restraint to give us any real hope that crime may be brought under some degree of control in the foreseeable future.

The government is now attempting to seduce the innocent populace into believing that it is moving in the area of crime prevention by its introduction of gun control. This is a sham argument. There will be no noticeable reduction of violent crime as a result of the measures proposed in Bill C-83. All that will result is another bureaucratic nightmare that serves no useful purpose other than to give the appearance of the government as a law enforcer.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police has taken the position that gun control laws of the nature of those before us now can serve no worth-while purpose. Surely this association must be regarded as expert in this field. Why then has the government totally ignored its views on this matter? Who could possibly be in a better position to comment on the prevention of violent crime and the relative worth of laws affecting the control of firearms than an association of chiefs of police, men and women who all their working lives have been dealing with crime prevention and enforcement?

The problem as seen by the police chiefs is the number of violent crimes that are being committed and with which, wrongly or rightly, a firearm is being identified. There is no doubt that firearms have been involved in the commission of violent crime. It must not be forgotten that violent crime is also committed with knives, chains, hammers, axes, and lead pipes, to name but a few other instruments. There is no doubt there is an increasing concern by society about the nature, extent, and number of violent crimes. It would not be overstating the case to declare that many of society's members now have a feeling of being unsafe.

Three categories of crime that have been associated with violence and firearms have been identified by the police chiefs. One category deals with a socio-political movement associated with the manifestation of anti-establishment thinking that has accompanied the short or long drawn out process of government change. The second category deals with an element of society which will always choose to live off the avails of normal appetites, with minimum personal effort and with total disregard of its effects toward society. This is the category of crime for profit. The third category is, of course, the crime of passion, a usually violent act committed in a moment of passion or temporary insanity.

It is essential to note that in any of these categories those dedicated to the perpetration of crime will not or cannot submit to any law, and already disregard existing legislation. It is equally as fundamental to note that the gamut of violent crimes perpetrated for any of these rea-

sons can be carried out just as easily without the benefit of firearms.

The real problem at hand is the high incidence of crime and the search for methods of reducing it. If this could be achieved by eliminating a weapon from the market, or more specifically in this case, requiring registration of its ownership, then this action would be supported. However, this action can be discarded as ineffective since violent crime can be committed with any number of weapons.

I would now like to focus my attention on another relevant aspect of this complex situation, and that is the role of our courts in the administration and enforcement of this proposed legislation on gun control. We all are aware that our courts are inadequately equipped to deal with the heavy caseloads that are before them now. If there is any one area within the system of Canadian justice that requires priority treatment it is the courts and the trial process. The delays in criminal proceedings from the time of a charge being laid to the ultimate disposition of a case are not only unnecessarily long but grossly unfair to the innocent, and much too favourable to the guilty.

If we are to have a criminal justice system that works effectively and is to be seen to work effectively, it must be a system that is able to handle cases with dispatch after charges are laid, and which will pass sentences or give decisions more rapidly than is the case at present.

I have the greatest respect for the members of the judiciary. In no way are my remarks to be seen as a reflection on their competence except that it is of a very high level. These honourable men and women who sit in judgment are overworked and stifled by a system that cries out to be corrected. The first priority of the government must be to encourage the provincial governments to bring about more uniform and more rapid reform to our legal processes.

The creation of new offences such as failure to license guns will only further encumber the courts and tax the already over burdened judicial system. Furthermore legal contests, particularly in the more serious offences, will inevitably add to the cost of the taxpayer and of the individual as a private citizen. I have grave reservations in this respect with regard to the clauses dealing with owner liability. I can envisage a countless number of non productive court cases tying up the legal processes for long and unnecessary periods of time because of this most contentious and ill thought out piece of legislation.

● (2120)

Having concentrated my efforts on the gun control aspects of this legislation, and I think successfully illustrated why it is inadequate and unacceptable, allow me to offer some constructive suggestions on the same subject. First, I restate my position that these provisions should be severed from the rest of the bill so that the gun control clauses may be dealt with more effectively. The bill cannot be properly debated in this manner due to its complexity, and adequate conclusions cannot possibly be reached.

However, with the limited means which are available to me and to my colleagues in the official opposition, I will attempt to impress upon the government some of the more useful approaches it could be taking with regard to the over-all issue of gun control and all its related ramifications.

[Mr. Wise.]

There are indeed clauses of this bill which indicate that the government intends to take a tougher stance against the perpetration of violent crime. However, these particular measures leave much to be desired if violent crime is to be substantially reduced.

Only recently a policeman was murdered and two hostages subsequantly taken in the city of Calgary by two men, both of whom were out on bail for alleged offences in the city of Vancouver. One of these men had been charged with murder, and the other with attempted murder. Public outrage has once again been expressed over this incident despite the alarming regularity with which such occurrences now take place, not only because another policeman has been shot down while attempting to do his duty in protecting innocent citizens, but also because his murderers were men already free on bail after being charged with serious offences. Registration of firearm ownership would have in no way prevented this tragedy.

I know that the government will say that those released on bail will soon not be permitted to purchase guns, but this will just be another of a continuing series of sham arguments on this subject. Violent men who are planning an armed robbery will secure firearms with a minimum of difficulty regardless of the rule, and every hon. member here knows it. What I am suggesting is that no bail be allowed for offences involving dangerous weapons where there is a previous record of violent crime.

I suggest too that guidelines be prepared in restricting somewhat the latitude allowed for the granting or denying of bail in the case of first offenders where it is obvious that the alleged offender is a potential danger to society. I realize that the inherent difficulty in this proposal is the criteria to be used in determining who is and who is not a potential danger, but surely some cases will offer obvious conclusions.

A bail hearing can differentiate between a case where the evidence is circumstantial and bail must be granted, and a case where reliable witnesses leave little doubt as to the violent nature of the accused. There will be instances where such distinctions are not clear, but that is what our honourable ladies and gentlemen of the bench are for. These decisions must remain in their hands, but some legal guidelines are desperately needed.

At this point I wish to make clear that I recognize the possible danger to the rights of the innocent in these proposals. It ties in with my previous argument, however, that the government is focusing on the wrong aspects of crime prevention and punishment. Were the court processes speeded up to an acceptable rate, it would be much easier to detain obviously violent offenders for a short period of time while awaiting trial. I quite agree that under the present ineffective system it does not seem practical or even desirable to remove such rights to bail from the accused.

With all these vital problems strangling our system of criminal justice and law enforcement, and the government reacting in its usual sluggish manner, it seems ludicrous that such useless and ineffective legislation as this gun control measure should be rammed down our throats by tying it in with the rest of Bill C-83 which, while weak in nature, is not without some merit, and with gun control removed could well be worthy of my support.

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents of Kent-Essex and, I believe, on behalf of many Canadians ranging far from that constituency, I see in this bill the answer to what has been a public need, and indeed public demand for assurance that there will be protection from those who, for whatever reason, have decided to strike out against society and declare that they have no use for it, no use for the rights of individuals other than themselves, and would deny their co-citizens even the right to life.

Although I am quick to admit that the public is looking to this legislation to determine whether it supplies the assurance of protection it seeks, I am not one who is convinced that past legislation has been grossly lacking in that protection. Rather, I would want to satisfy myself that the bill does not go so far in an attempt to provide the trappings of public protection that, in the process, it denies many of the justifiable and lawful rights our citizens generally have been able to enjoy up to this point.

I might debate, and indeed agree, with some of my friends on the other side that the sheer size of this bill precludes in some small measure a meaningful intervention on all of its many facets. I would not, however, argue that that precludes a meaningful debate and that because of its size it should be broken up into many parts. Rather, I propose to limit my remarks, as others have done, and deal with perhaps two of the issues, gun control, and electronic surveillance.

In principle I am able to agree that the bill, including the measures in those two areas, will indeed have my support. These measures are aimed at strengthening the criminal law and its administration as it applies to crimes of violence. I view as laudable the objective of the measure regarding guns, which is stated to be the screening out of potential misusage, to restrict the general availability of guns without undue harassment of legitimate users for hunting and other sports, to enforce high standards in the safe keeping and proper use of firearms, and to discourage the use of firearms in the commission of crime.

I have no quarrel with the improvisation of a licensing system, as I see this as a far fairer and more productive system of gun control than that of registration of firearms, since it is obviously aimed at the individuals who would own and use guns as opposed to the actual weapons themselves.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) earlier this afternoon was speaking about break and entry thefts in his area, and he felt that even though proper precautions might be taken for the storage of guns, they would be taken when crime was committed. I suggest that in most cases people who break and enter cottages—as described by the hon. member—or a home or a place of business, break and enter not seeking guns but money or other valuables which might be sold. When they fall upon or come upon guns within those premises they use the opportunity, having found those guns, to take them away perhaps to sell or perhaps to use later. When describing this type of occurrence the hon. member suggested that the bill before us would be of absolutely no use whatsoever. Surely the hon. member cannot argue that any law prohibiting the use and ownership of guns is not a deterrent. I cannot agree with him.

● (2130)

Intentionally or accidentally, that hon. member described this legislation as legislation requiring the registration of guns. I think all hon. members present know that people confuse licensing with registration. Many Canadians fear that a registration system will be unproductive and create a bureaucracy. It is known that police forces, hunting associations, and other associations do not support the registration system. Calling this system a registration system is misnaming it. It is a misnomer. This is to be a licensing system, not a registration system, and can be likened to the system of licensing automobiles. I invite all hon. members to consider this bill in its true light, as a licensing system, and ignore the myth perpetrated on the public by the media to the effect that this is to be a registration system. They are different and should not be confused.

An hon. Member: There is to be licensing on what basis?

Mr. Daudlin: Mr. Speaker, obviously on the basis of competence to use a gun.

Mr. Towers: How can you say that?

Mr. Daudlin: I suggest that my hon. friend should look at the legislation.

Mr. Towers: Yes, but who will decide? Will the hon. member not say?

Mr. Daudlin: I believe that it is now well established that it is not the firearm in itself that is the culprit, but the man or the woman who holds it. I believe that there is an obligation on society as a whole to assure that individuals who would use firearms have the physical and mental capacity to use those weapons in a safe and a reasonable manner. Indeed, I would go so far as to say the the hunting and gun clubs in my riding have been champions of the rights of individual Canadian citizens who continue to enjoy the use of firearms for sport, be it target shooting or hunting or, indeed, the collecting of weapons. They were among the first to indicate that a fair licensing law which would have certain safeguards to assure that the licensing officials do not have too much uncontrolled and unobserved authority would be a good thing. Indeed they have offered their assistance in terms of providing training classes and instructors for the express purpose of providing the potential gun owner and handler with the necessary knowledge to handle a gun safely.

I am supporting this provision of the legislation which would propose to put up a licensing provision for firearms, while I would advocate that great care must be taken to assure that the administration of that sort of licensing must not be allowed to become so large and cumbersome that the cost thereof becomes in itself an undue burden for those who would legally pursue the ownership and use of firearms for sport and hunting.

Having said all that, I am concerned about particular subclauses of the bill dealing with gun control, beginning with proposed section 95(1) which reads:

Every one who sells, barters, gives, lends, transfers or delivers any firearm or ammunition to a person who is not the holder of a licence

under which he may lawfully have in his possession firearms or ammunition

(*a*) is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years, or

(*b*) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

The intent of course of this particular provision is at first reasonable, apparently justifiable, and not too apparently onerous, given the thrust of the entire legislation. However, I ask hon. members to consider the occasion of a hunting foursome who agree to attend a given place at a given time in order to enjoy the sport of a rabbit shoot or a pheasant hunt.

A couple of hours and many shots later, one of the four, having expended all of his shells, requires of the other three the loan of some shells in order to complete the hunt with his friends. To complete the scenario, let us suppose that one shot later—the shot having been fired by the person who has just borrowed a shotgun shell—a lands and forest inspector appears on the scene and asks for the appropriate licences for hunting and possession of the guns and ammunition. Let us say he discovers that the individual to whom the ammunition was lent is not the holder of a valid licence lawfully to have in his possession firearms or ammunition, and an inquiry is made into the source of the ammunition. Subsequently it is determined that the ammunition was lent to the culprit by one of the party, who then is charged with an indictable offence or, at the very least, is charged upon summary conviction.

Surely this House would not agree that in setting up the licensing provisions for control of guns we must now make all hunters such as I have described inspectors of the legislation, bound under penalty to inquire whether an individual, friend or acquaintance has borrowed some ammunition. Surely it is not the intent to make them inspectors under the act. We cannot liken this to the licensing provisions of provinces for citizens to drive automobiles. Indeed ministers have themselves on occasion argued that licensing was preferable to registration; that gun licensing was reasonable upon the same basis as the licensing of automobiles. I ask you to consider for a moment whether any of the provincial licensing authorities of automobiles make it an offence to lend your automobile to an individual who is not licensed to drive.

As far as I am aware, it is not a provincial statutory offence or a criminal code offence to knowingly lend an automobile to a person who does not hold a licence. I agree that there are certain civil considerations that come into play, and certain statutory contractual provisions that come into play with respect to the insurance of a vehicle and the loss thereof as a result of an unlicensed driver operating it but we are certainly going a long way, perhaps too far, is suggesting that the individual who knowingly or unknowingly provides ammunition, as in the situation which I have described, is guilty of an indictable, or at the very least, summary conviction offence. I submit this particular provision of the legislation should at the very least require that the individual who lends the ammunition shall have knowledge that a person receiving the ammunition or the firearm is unlicensed; alternatively we should remove that particular provision completely.

I am not so greatly concerned with the individual who is in the business of providing firearms or ammunition, since I believe it is reasonable to expect in the course of a business that the seller shall require a licence to be produced before the ammunition is sold, bartered or transferred for monetary return. I do not believe that the same sort of conditions can be required of a movement of the ammunition and guns between friends.

Let me move on now to proposed section 103 dealing with seizure and forfeiture. The hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), speaking on this bill just a few days ago, drew attention to proposed section 103. It deals with search without warrant of a person, vehicle, place or permises other than a dwelling house. A peace officer may seize anything by means of or in relation to which "he reasonably believes the offence is being committed or has been committed." This obviously deals with seizure by a police officer of any weapon, used or being used in the commission of an offence. Indeed the first part of the proposed section relates to restricted weapons or firearms, so that I believe the government's position is not so onerous as to be feared, as the police have now the right to seize weapons used in the commission of an offence.

I am more concerned, however, with proposed section 105(2), which now provides:

Where with respect to any person the peace officer is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that it is not desirable in the interests of the safety of that person, or of other persons, that that person should have in his possession, custody or control any firearm or other offensive weapon or any ammunition or explosive substance and that the danger to the safety of that person or other persons is such that to proceed by way of an application under subsection (1) would be impracticable, the peace officer may without warrant search for and seize any firearm or other offensive weapon or any ammunition or explosive substance in the possession, custody or control of that person.

● (2140)

I recognize that the case of the domestic quarrel upon which the police officer arrives, only to find himself staring down the barrel of a rifle or shotgun, is probably the classic case to which this particular provision will apply. I am concerned, however, that the well-intentioned police officer will now have the right, upon arriving at the scene of a domestic quarrel, whether or not a gun be in sight, to search and seize, regardless of what place and at what time, any and all offensive weapons, firearms, ammunition, etc., thereby putting the individual in a position where he must then make application to an appropriate court for the return of those guns or other articles, whether or not the officer had justifiable grounds for making the search and seizure.

I believe that this is an unjustifiable and unwarranted encroachment upon the individual rights and liberties of our citizens, by putting the subjective decision into the hands of individual police officers; it is in my view overreaction to this admitted problem which has been faced by our law enforcement officers for some time.

I was interested in listening this afternoon to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wise). He said that this bill did not address itself to the real causes of crime. When I listened to him he seemed to say that he would relate the real causes of crime to drugs and the use thereof. He seemed to imply that gun control measures were useless. In fact I believe he went so far as to say they were useless. To argue in that manner is to argue that there is no deterrent effect

to any law passed by this House. I really cannot accept that premise.

It may appear to us here that it is impossible to place into the Criminal Code methods of dealing with root causes of crime. However, I suggest to that hon. member, and to the chiefs of police association to which he referred, that what they should not be attempting is to correct, amend or change this legislation through the media or by writing letters. We should be challenging those individuals, be it the chiefs of police, gun control lobbyists hunting clubs or gun collectors, as well as encouraging and inviting them to appear before the committee to state those changes that they see as necessary to this legislation. That, of course, cannot be done until this House puts the legislation before the committee so it can be dealt with there. Therefore I encourage all members to send this legislation on to the committee as quickly as possible.

The hon. member for Elgin described this legislation as being a registration. I suggest to him, as I suggested with relation to the comments made by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), that it is a misnomer to suggest registration. We are not registering guns, we are not registering owners. We are licensing individuals to possess a firearm.

I suggest there is a deterrent effect. There is the ability to determine whether the individual is the type of person who should or should not have the use of a firearm. There are certain deterrent effects as a result of the imposition of fines and so on if you do not comply with the regulations. To argue it is ineffectual is to argue there is no deterrent effect in legislation. If we argue that, surely we argue that the entire Criminal Code has no effect.

I would now wish to deal very briefly with the subject of electronic eavesdropping or wiretapping and I believe, shortly put, I would argue in the same manner as the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) when he states his concern that the proposed provisions would allow a judge to defer giving notice on the basis of a continuing suspicion when an investigation has, for all intents and purposes, concluded. I, like that hon. member, have substantial reservations about allowing notice to be deferred when we are only proceeding on the basis of continuing suspicion and when the investigation has actually finished.

Members have spoken of the need to balance various and competing factors, the need to protect individual privacy on the one hand and the ability by police to pursue organized crime. In reading the provisions of the bill regarding electronic eavesdropping I am concerned that we not undo some of the best features of the protection of privacy act. I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the power given by parliament in 1973 to the judges to admit secondary evidence has not been working. I fully support the admissability of derivative evidence within the confines of judicial supervision. Such supervision guarantees a rather healthy tension and a proper balance between the right to privacy and the ability to pursue crime.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka made a rather interesting comment today when he spoke of wiretaps. He suggested they appear to be O.K., particularly to those in rural areas who are used to party lines. He spoke of the acceptability of wiretapping, provided it was judicially done and there was consent of the court. He spoke about reasonable length of time and notice being given. I suggest there is a grave concern with which we must look at this legislation, that is, whether in attempting to give police officers increased ability to tap we do not in fact encroach upon the individual rights of citizens to which they are entitled.

In summing up, I am supportive of whatever measures we can reasonably provide to our police and criminal investigative forces while simultaneously assuring the individual of the right to privacy. I would be most zealous in not providing officers of the law with the legal wherewithal to erode the rights of individuals. I believe that this legislation brings with it the substantial potential for what might broadly be termed illegal wiretapping by that element of society which is supposed to be protecting us from criminals. If we cannot be assured that wiretapping is to be done and if in fact it is being done, without taking advantage of us, our position would be untenable.

The minister has made it clear that he is prepared to listen attentively and with an open mind to the submissions which are to be made with respect to this bill in committee, in the House, and I anticipate participating further in the ensuing debate that takes place in committee. May I once again suggest and invite hon. members to ensure that this piece of legislation is made available to the committee as soon as possible.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill C-83 we are dealing with a quite emotional subject, with varying beliefs held by citizens, one point of view being to the effect that if there were no guns at all, crime would vanish, and the other point of view being that if guns are controlled, crimes with violence will increase because the criminal element will have the ability to procure guns and law-abiding citizens will have no means to contest the criminal.

It seems as though reports and statistics on murders are based on overstated opinion and overworked emotions. At one end of the interest groups are individuals and lobbies taking the position that stricker gun legislation would have the effect of augmenting the crime rate. Some people at this end of the scale even suggest that the forced registration of all guns would weaken the public and make it the target for violent criminal activity. In the United States this group has gone so far as to form a strong lobby to uphold the second amendment of the U.S. constitution:

● (2150)

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

At the opposite end of the scale is a group which proposes stricter gun control legislation. Its members base their stand on a belief that tighter legislation would make it almost impossible for a criminal to purchase a gun to use in committing a crime. The fact is that legislation or none, a criminal will obtain any weapon he desires.

To cover the issue of gun control legislation fully we must look at the cause of increased violence and the relationship between that increased violence and the use of firearms. It might be advantageous to examine some of the factors on the basis of which we, as legislators, are now

called upon to make decisions. It has been estimated that there are upwards of eight million guns in Canada. Most of the owners of these firearms, probably 99 per cent, use their weapons properly, are law-abiding people, and deplore as much as anyone the use of firearms in crimes. Mass ownership of firearms is certainly not a major cause of increased violence.

* * *

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

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

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

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill C-90, Appropriation Act No. 1, 1976.—Chapter No. 89.

Bill C-91. Appropriation Act No. 2, 1976.—Chapter No. 90.

Bill C-85, An Act respecting immigration security.—Chapter No. 91.

Bill C-86, An Act to amend the Veterans Insurance Act and the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.—Chapter No. 92.

Bill C-71, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make related amendments to the Crown Liability Act, the Immigration Act and the Parole Act.—Chapter No. 93.

Bill S-10, An Act to amend the Feeds Act.—Chapter No. 94.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH—MEASURES TO ENSURE ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF SWINE FLU VACCINE—CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) in the House tonight, and to be honoured by his presence. I also want to congratulate him on the speed with which he moved after I drew this matter to his attention last week. His attitude has changed altogether since then, and I can understand why it would, because apparently he did not have many of the facts or the report from the fellows who went down to Washington and met with the U.S. president.

I should like to say a few words about this virus infection and make one or two observations about the minister's

announcement. First of all, people are asking what this swine flu is. It is an acute respiratory infection that affects up to 40 per cent or more of the population with headaches, aches, and pains generally in the same area as with other flu viruses. It can swing from the respiratory field to the gastro-intestinal field by mutation. It will keep some individuals away from work for a month or more. If the individual develops pneumonia it is a bacterial pneumonia, or a bronchial pneumonia which can be cleared up with antibiotics. The individual can get a pneumonia which can last from one to two months. As an example we have the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) whom I see sitting down there in the House. He had this viral infection and he can tell you how it makes you feel, and how draggy you become.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I didn't lose a day, though.

Mr. Rynard: The first influenza vaccine was manufactured during the second world war. It is interesting to note that the fellow who worked on that was Jonas Salk who later on developed the polio vaccine. He is now in charge of the Salk Institute doing virological work in San Diego, California. According to reports he has stated very definitely that there is need for mass vaccination.

I want to say to the minister that he is absolutely wrong when he separates the population by age groups. That cannot be done effectively, because you can vaccinate three or four in one household, with two or three not vaccinated. They will bring the disease in and give it to the others if the virus is strong enough. You only get a certain degree of immunity from vaccination, up to 80 per cent. That is why this is wrong. That is why Jonas Salk said that mass vaccinations must be carried out, and he urges speed in this regard.

The swine virus vaccination has a very short incubation period of from 12 to 36 hours, and spreads very rapidly. If it goes according to plan in the next year this will flair up and we will probably have an epidemic.

● (2210)

One interesting thing is that the flu virus is made up of several parts—up to eight. Those parts shuffle around in a process called mutation and form a new strain. Hong Kong flu in 1968 was the last major outbreak. It could be back in the process again recycling itself in 1978. You do not get immunity to virus flu as you do to measles because it mutates like musical chairs. That is why it is very difficult to keep it under control. The virus hides in the body.

I remember after the 1918 flu epidemic, about 1925 and into the 1930's, we saw many cases of people no older than the minister himself contracting Parkinson's disease as a result of the Spanish flu. We believe the virus can hide in the cells of the brain and hide elsewhere in the body, and that it may cause degenerative diseases and cancer. It is one of the diseases we have never been able to control.

It is interesting to note that the first real evidence of virus appeared in 1610. There were two severe outbreaks in Canada in 1889 and 1918. It is a killer disease, and speedy. It is necessary to utilize all the facilities and to have the total manufacturing output of vaccine under scrupulous care. I am certain that if the vaccination were carried out

for all viruses it would cut millions of dollars from our health care costs.

I visited a home the other day, Mr. Speaker, and I should like the minister to listen to this. There were 15 deaths there and none of the patients had been vaccinated. I think the minister should keep that in mind.

The common viruses are A, B, and Victoria. I believe the latter killed about 250,000 people in New Guinea. In the United States they have achieved up to 80 per cent immunity through vaccination. The incubation period is between 12 and 24 hours. It is the scourge of mankind and, as I say, we have never been able to control it. As the minister said, we have got to the point where the only way we can settle this is by total vaccination. With Spanish flu there were 50 million infected and 20 million died. Vaccination would take away some of the fear.

I hope the minister has been in touch with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) about eggs. I am sure he has and I am sure he will get lots of eggs. He must also have the rooster, however, because the eggs have to be fertilized before the virus is injected. When the virus is drawn off it is killed by formalin and then it is ready to inject.

The minister said today that there would be immunity within two or three weeks, but I want to tell him that I have never known this to be the case with a virus vaccine. He may be right, but I wish he would question that point. In the vaccines we have used to date the two shots are given two months apart, and once a year thereafter.

The minister has taken a step in the right direction but I want to prod him tonight to make it universal and in a hurry. He told us that the vaccine costs only 75 cents per person. Mr. Speaker, there is no way a doctor can collect $6 for giving the injection when, under OHIP, his fee is perhaps $3. Even at $3 or $4 it is the cheapest insurance we can buy—even if there is not an outbreak.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) for his comments. Not having the privilege of being a medical doctor myself I always attach a lot of importance to his views. He has had a long experience and expertise in the practice of medicine.

I regret that the hon. member was unavoidably absent yesterday and today when we debated the quarantine bill and discussed the announcement on the vaccination, but I am pleased he could be in the House tonight. I made a point of being here to listen to his views.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lalonde: With regard to the suggestion about mass innoculation, I remind the hon. member that I have acted and my department has acted upon the advice of the national advisory committee which is regrouping the best epidemiologists in the country, and we have tried to get the best scientific advice available in this country. We have decided to follow the recommendation of the national advisory committee to the letter. If it can be established that this advisory committee did not go far enough or was wrong, we will certainly be very happy to review the situation, but in the meantime I obviously must rely on what is considered to be the unanimous opinion of the people we consider the most knowledgeable in this field in Canada at the present time.

As I said this afternoon, we are in close touch with United States authorities, the United Kingdom, the World Health Organization, and the centre in London, England, on this subject, and there is to be a special meeting called by the WHO on April 8. Canada will be represented at that meeting, and I am sure we will follow the situation very closely. Any change in the proposed action will be communicated to the House, and particularly to the hon. member with great pleasure.

AGRICULTURE—PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF TRANSPORT SUBSIDY ON FLOUR TO EAST COAST PORTS—ALLEGED CONFLICT IN MINISTER'S STATEMENTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, now that the deputy vice regal pen has put the deputy vice regal ink to the interim supply bill—otherwise known as an act for the relief of the Bank of Montreal, Wellington Street division in the city of Ottawa—we may now turn back to a serious state of affairs which will occur unless we in the opposition are able to head it off later this year. That issue is the removal of the flour and grain movement subsidies or rail subsidies under section 272 of the Railway Act. This is not the first time I have raised this matter here. This is probably its second and perhaps third appearance on the late show. I leapfrog with the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) on this important issue. We are the east and west twins trying to co-ordinate efforts by a great number of Canadians on what I think is an important issue because it affects the export life and the port life of this country.

Before the end of the year I hope that we will have persuaded members of parliament from Montreal that—believe it or not—their port is greatly affected by what Bill C-87 proposes. I hope the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Landers) will interest himself in the issue because there are many dozens of jobs in his own port and millions of dollars at stake in the future.

I have the support of my hon. colleagues from the Halifax area. As a matter of fact, they deputed this job to me.

I can tell the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), when he brings in his restraint bill, that he has to pilot it through parliament, and it has to be passed before section 272 of the Railway Act is gone and the subsidies are gone. There will be many more than the hon. member for Vegreville and myself who will be taking part in this battle. The minister will know what full scale and total war is all about.

Bill C-87 will affect port life and the flour and grain operations of the three eastern Canadian ports. I pointed out last week, and the hon. member for Vegreville pointed out last night, that the milling industry in Canada and the miller, who was much esteemed in medieval times, are becoming part of the dodo legend because big companies are simply taking over their operations, and small milling operations are starting to dry up in Canada.

The measure which is proposed by the government will not do anything to reverse that rather tragic process. However, as I say, until the repeal of section 272 of the Railway Act, the subsidies will remain. I ventured to suggest to the

President of the Treasury Board, when we discussed this last night in the miscellaneous estimates committee, that we might enjoy each other's company until Christmas at least.

● (2220)

I ask for the support of Montreal members on this issue, and for the support of the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster. I am sure he has been working behind the scenes. Sometimes conditions are so desperate that even government members must creep out from behind the curtains and involve themselves in debate on the floor of this House. After all, this is where the action should take place and where the hon. member's voters expect the action to occur.

I request the support of others when this bill comes before the House. I particularly request the support of those hon. members in whose constituencies there are flour mills. I ask them to talk on this important issue. I request the support of western members of parliament in whose constituencies grain is grown. I hope they too will discuss this issue.

I request the support of all who think of Canada as one country in which not only the more fortunate, central parts should receive economic benefits. The area I represent was good enough to serve, as it were, as the front line trench in two world wars. Our people were happy to see Halifax in that position. I think we should also be allowed the benefits of peacetime prosperity.

I wish the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) were here this evening. Sometimes in his homespun way he has a knack for shedding light, good sense, and reason on a subject. I must say that if I had to choose between running to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) or to the Minister of Agriculture, to talk about some crippling injuries, I would be more apt to talk to the Minister of Agriculture and ask for his help. I hoped he would be here this evening.

I suggest that the government's proposal will lead to the ruination of our industry because the transport subsidy is to be swept away. It will either bring about the ruination of our industry, or the "rumination" of agriculture. I say this as the Minister of Agriculture, God bless him, said that studies were being carried on. Perhaps my question involves the most elaborate Latin based pun this House has heard for at least a couple of dozen years. It will be "ruination or rumination".

Are we depending on studies now under way in the Department of Agriculture? If so, what instruction has been given to those carrying out the studies? Will they lead to meaningful action for dealing with a pretty serious problem, one that, as I said a week ago, has ramifications involving $100 million of Canadian economic activity?

Finally, let me ask this: as the Minister of Agriculture has spoken of studies by the Department of Agriculture, should not those studies have come first, and government policy afterwards? Could not the studies have pointed to some method of substituting something for a model program inaugurated by the government of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) in 1960, and carried on and modified successfully by programs put forward by another prime minister, the late Mr. Pearson?

[Mr. McCleave.]

I ask these questions and am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not here to answer. It seems to me that somehow the late show becomes a little debased when answers are put in the hands of people to be read and no meaningful action is taken. I say that sincerely and with regret to the hon. gentleman opposite who, I am sure, is going to answer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I answered last evening the question just put by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). I would like to add that I will convey to the minister the flattering remarks that were made.

I must also apologize for the minister. He is unable to be in the House this evening because, as we are aware, tomorrow he must announce the dairy policy for next year. He is now attending a meeting, and probably at midnight he will still be discussing the dairy policy to be announced tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member. The fact that we already had to answer three questions on the late show concerning the problem raised by the hon. member tends to show how important the matter is.

Since I had to answer it yesterday and the answer has not substantially changed today, I give him yesterday's answer. Hopefully the hon. member will understand that as parliamentary secretary, I must transmit the answers given by the department. I know the minister considered the matter quite thoroughly and he may be in a better position to answer it tomorrow, with a somewhat better knowledge of the question, because he is now involved in the milk problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further answer than the one I gave yesterday. At the start, rates to that point or east of that point were intended, among other things, to maintain the competitive position of Canadian exports relative to those of the United States. The American rates have increased substantially since then, and it now seems it would be preferable to have in Canada a totally compensatory level of subsidy. However, since the subsidy has been in force for some time already, its cancellation will require some degree of adaptation for flour exporters.

As the Minister of Agriculture said, most countries try to mill their own wheat. To the extent that Canada tries to replace part of its flour exports by wheat exports, we therefore did not lose those markets. The world export markets of inferior quality flour subsidized by the European Economic Community is taking over an increasingly large part of the world market. In spite of considerable activity on the part of the PL480, even American sales have considerably diminished in recent years.

Canadian flour exports can be broken up in three categories: first, commercial exports, second, government exports, and third, Russian-Cuban exports. As we know, most of our sales are to Cuba. The removal of the subsidy will not affect these sales in 1976. On the long term, it is expected that Cuba will mill an increasing part of its wheat. In the meantime, the government will continue its efforts to keep this market.

Commercial sales and sales to the Canadian government made up the rest of our flour exports, or about 25 per cent.

Sales to the government will probably remain at their present level, whatever happens to the subsidy. Commercial sales could be affected. However, the National Association of Canadian Millers was unable to convince us of the importance of these consequences. The Department of Agriculture is keeping a close eye on the situation and if other developments occur, it will take the necessary action.

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—REQUEST FOR MORE LOCAL PROGRAMMING—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I brought to the attention of the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) the growing concern across Canada regarding the centralization policy of the CBC. I asked him whether there would be a re-evaluation of that program to allow greater latitude for local programs within the Corporation. The Secretary of State answered with his usual cynical and bombastic brevity, which is the last refuge of the insecure and inept and incompetent. He said, "Does the hon. member not know that we have just finished putting up a brand new building in Vancouver and are planning one for Regina?"

● (2230)

I came across a statement made by the president of the CBC which reads as follows—this is with regard to culture: "That is what the CBC is all about—interpreting Canada to Canadians and contributing to their cultural vitality". That is both encouraging and disturbing. It is encouraging if it means the broad exposure of the various elements which make up Canadian society, that is, the ethnic, cultural, economic, and other factors which compose our society, to other segments of Canadian life. Let the people speak for themselves; let them be exposed to every other sector of the country, and let the audiences see and hear. This ought to be the objective of the corporation, and if this is the goal of the CBC and of its president, it is encouraging. It is discouraging if it means that a few elitist directors and producers in Toronto are to decide what we can see and hear.

I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a statement made by Mr. Gordon Hill, the President of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, with regard to the cutting back of the program Radio Noon to 15 minutes from the former length of one hour. He said:

> We are tired of the fooling around by the top brass of the CBC who have allowed the citizen-owned radio and television networks to become a hive of protest for anarchists.

It seems it is the goal of the top echelon of the CBC to replace what in their estimation is the mundane and the ordinary with what is culturally proper. Maybe the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation ought to be renamed the Toronto Broadcasting Corporation.

Recently I received a letter from a farm broadcaster in the prairies who is concerned that they are losing their broadcasts there. As one writer put it, producers who want to put out programs must crawl on their bellies in Toronto; sometimes they get something, but more often they don't.

Those responsible for regional programs are continually being harassed either by interference or by being placed on a pauper's budget. For example, a program on the West Coast called "Klahanie," which is a nature program well received by the public, gets a budget of $2,000. Take the case of "The Beachcombers." Toronto writers are always being foisted on that program in the west, and old John Hirsch in Toronto wants to give that story an editor from Toronto. He even wants to bring in casting from Toronto for that totally British Columbia region program. The final disgrace is that as of April 1, 1977, British Columbia will no longer have a regionally-produced 10 p.m. regional news hour. That will come from Toronto, too. Toronto knows best.

I am sure the Secretary of State has heard of the British Columbia Committee for CBC Reform which has recently been established by friends of the corporation, people who believe in the system, who like what it has done in the past but who are fearful of the trend which is developing.

The people who belong to this organization are not red-eyed radicals but responsible Canadians, and for the edification of the parliamentary secretary who is here on behalf of the Secretary of State I should like to read a few of the names of members of that committee, to mention, for example, Barry Broadfoot, of whom, I am sure, many hon. members have heard. Then there is Roderick Haig-Brown, a writer and naturalist of Campbell River; Barry Leach, director of environmental studies of the Douglas College, New Westminster; Dorothy Livesay, a well-known writer from Victoria; Grace MacInnis, a former member of parliament and supporter of the CBC; Ian McTaggart-Cowan, professor and consultant of Vancouver; Robin Skelton, writer and editor of the *Malahat Review*, Victoria; Simon Streatfeild, of North Vancouver, a conductor who is very well known in music circles in Vancouver; Victor White, who is director, special projects, of the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra.

These people are not the red-eyed radicals usually associated with protests; they are people concerned about the direction being taken by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. They have succeeded in their work. You can call it local colour if you will, but it is legitimate local colour.

Let me come back to the minister's answer. He said:

> One of the more significant things the corporation has done in the last two years has been to decentralize, and this is manifest by new buildings in Vancouver—

Where in the world did he ever get the idea to decentralize an operation by putting up a new building? Surely even this naive minister ought to understand that the heart of any broadcasting system lies in the producers, the directors, and the casting of each of the individual programs. To think that a new building will fill that role shows the naiveté of this minister.

I challenge him to re-evaluate this "divine aegis" of the members of the staff in Toronto and to let some of the people from the regions act with the wisdom that is inherent in those regions. Let them project some of the idioms, colour and idiosyncracies, values and concerns, of the localities, and let the people of Canada know what they are.

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the

CBC that it is erroneous to say that the CBC is encouraging centralization of production. If it were so, the CBC would not have built a multi-million dollar broadcast centre in Vancouver; it would not be building new production facilities in Calgary; and it would not be planning to build a new production centre in Regina-Moose Jaw. In the next four to five years the CBC will spend $128 million to improve its production facilities outside of Toronto and Montreal. This is all being done in order to improve and increase regional and local programs and to increase regional participation in network programming.

Because of the availability of the CBC's new B.C. broadcast centre, for example, it is planned to increase the production of network television programs in Vancouver from 175.5 hours per year in 1975-76 to 208.5 hours in 1976-77. Local and regional activity can be examined from the point of view of broadcast hours and contribution to the network schedule. The figures for broadcast hours per week on the English AM radio network of the CBC show that 40 per cent of the hours of programming in the schedules of most CBC AM radio stations is local and regional.

The complexity of television is such that it is a much more expensive medium than radio, and requires less flexible scheduling with fewer local periods. Nevertheless, local and regional programming time on CBC English language television stations varies from 18 per cent to 35 per cent of the telecast time per annum of the stations, not all of which, it must be admitted, can be employed for locally produced programs, and this for reasons of budget only.

As for the contribution of CBC owned and operated stations to the national networks, in radio the percentage of network programming from all regions of Canada to the CBC English AM radio network is 44 per cent and in the case of FM radio it is 59 per cent.

In English television an analysis made for the fiscal year 1973-74 showed that the percentage of network programs produced outside of Toronto, including program inserts, came to 32.3 per cent.

In addition, the CBC has for many years encouraged the exchange of local programs between stations and the effect of this exchange is to discourage centralization. In 1975, for example, 79 episodes of four local television series produced in British Columbia were seen on up to 15 other stations across Canada. Conversely, 169 episodes from 15 locations other than Toronto were seen in British Columbia.

● (2240)

In the light of the size and diversity of Canada much has been accomplished, but further decentralization of programming, particularly in the complex and expensive medium of television, can only be accomplished with the availability of more money to be spent on Canadian talent. The CBC is endeavouring to encourage and develop talent in all parts of Canada. If more money were available for the production of quality programs, regional studios could—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please—

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I know that my time has expired. However, I should just like to say to the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) that anything further he would like to say on this he can bring to the standing committee when the estimates—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary as her allotted time has expired.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.43 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, March 31, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ENERGY

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF INCREASED COST OF ELECTRICITY IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. My motion is prompted by the incredible increase in electric power costs to the Maritime consumer and the callous attitude of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) to the plight of those who are literally being forced to sell their homes because of this punishing escalation in heating costs. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield):

That this House directs the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works to make a full inquiry into the situation concerning the rapid escalation of electric heating costs to Maritime consumers, and that in the course of these investigations the premiers of the Maritime provinces be invited to give evidence.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for such motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED CANCELLATION OF CONTRACT TO PURCHASE LOCKHEED "ORION"—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Considering that the financial position of the Lockheed Corporation is dangerously precarious and considering also that the risks to Canadian taxpayers are immense if the Government of Canada proceeds with its intention to purchase Lockheed Orion aircraft, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instructs the government to cancel an earlier multi-million dollar decision to purchase the said aircraft.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent, pursuant to Standing Order 43?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

● (1410)

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO RESIGNATION OF MR. GUY BEAUDET—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, pursuant to Standing Order 43, a motion of considerable concern to the ports and shipping communities of Canada. The prospects of the loss of the vice-president of the National Harbours Board and the more than 25 years of service to shipping interests, coupled with the impairment of the National Harbours Board capacity to function in its financial responsibilities in a legal fashion with the resulting problems this will pose for virtually all ports in Canada, give rise to the need for information. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That this House direct the government and particularly the Minister of Transport to forthwith table all correspondence between the Deputy Minister of Transport, the Minister of Transport and any other responsible minister and Mr. Guy Beaudet, leading up to his resignation so that the Canadian people will understand the reasons for this sudden and debilitating loss and that the minister take the first opportunity, later today, to advise this House on motions of the reasons behind this resignation, and of this government's intentions regarding further and necessary appointments to the National Harbours Board.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the motion must have unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REPORTS ON MERCURY IN FISH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

Considering that the federal government, through its Department of the Environment, made in its own laboratories analyses on the mercury content of various species of fish from several areas in Quebec and that the Department of the Environment and the Quebec Department of Tourism, Fish and Game can be held responsible for not having made the results public while these indicate, according to some information, that in many cases the fish analyzed contained more than .5 ppm of methyl mercury, which is the limit beyond which the fish become unsuitable for

human consumption, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the House discuss this matter forthwith and order the Department of the Environment to table all relevant reports they have concerning these analyses.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBILITY OF PURCHASING OTHER AIRCRAFT THAN THE "ORION"—VISITS OF REISMAN AND GRANDY TO OFFICE OF GENERAL ALLAN

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Several constructive suggestions have been made by the opposition concerning the replacement for the Argus. On each occasion the minister claimed that he was considering several options. Can the minister assure us now that he has kept those options open and that next week, if the cabinet has rejected his choice and if he is still in a position of authority, he will move speedily for cabinet approval of one of the other options?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member knew the rules well enough to refrain from asking me something hypothetical, if the cabinet does something next week.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister has kept his options open and I wish he would take us into his confidence to the extent of assuring the country that he intends to replace the Argus aircraft. Is the minister aware of any visits made by Reisman and Grandy to the office of General Allen, and can he inform the House of the purpose of such visits or a visit by these Lockheed consultants, bearing in mind that Reisman and Grandy and the minister have denied any lobbying type of activity or any representation made to government officials by Lockheed?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, in response to the first part of the question, it is of course our intention to have new equipment for the Canadian armed forces and to meet our commitment to NATO. We are in the process of trying to do that in the acquisition of a long range patrol aircraft.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

Until we have fully exhausted all of the attempts to achieve that which is the right purchase for the Canadian armed forces, we are not trying to look at alternatives. We spent several years looking at the alternatives and deciding on the right course.

Concerning the other question, I have said before that the relationship between the Reisman and Grandy firm and Lockheed is a matter for those two private companies. It will possibly form the foundation for discussion in a wider sense with respect to guidelines which have been suggested, but it does not in any way affect my contact with the Lockheed company, which is a direct contact between myself, my officials and that company.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—FUNCTION OF GENERAL ALLAN AS HEAD OF PROJECT TEAM

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): I think it is extraordinary that the minister should answer the second part of the question in that manner. We are in no way concerned—

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. McKinnon: —about the relationship between Reisman and Grandy and Lockheed. We are worried about the relationship between Reisman and Grandy and the Department of National Defence. Could the minister inform the House of the precise managerial function performed by General Allan vis-à-vis the representatives seconded by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Finance to the project team?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): General Allan is the head of the project team. It is an interdepartmental team and included in its membership are officials from other departments. I cannot at this moment name all the other officials but there were representatives of Finance, Industry, Trade and Commerce, DREE and others.

* * *

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

ALLEGED CONFLICT BECAUSE REISMAN AND GRANDY WERE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHEN CONSULTING FIRM ESTABLISHED

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A supplementary question to the Acting Prime Minister. According to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the consulting firm of Reisman and Grandy Limited was incorporated on March 26, 1975. Both Mr. Reisman and Mr. Grandy served in their official capacities as deputy ministers until April 1, 1975. Does the Acting Prime Minister not now consider that the setting up of a consulting firm by two senior public servants while still in office constitutes a serious conflict of interest, indeed, an impropriety on their part?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): I am not aware of all the facts. However, I suggest that if the

company was not operating while they were deputy ministers there is no conflict of interest arising.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is an important question. But according to contracts tabled by the Prime Minister yesterday, Mr. Grandy was under contract to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for a period of one month immediately following his resignation as deputy minister of the same department to advise on the "rationalization of the aerospace industry in Canada". However, Mr. Grandy did not leave the Board of Directors of de Havilland Aircraft, to which he was appointed on June 26, 1974 until December 19, 1975. Considering Mr. Grandy's range of activities, is the Acting Prime Minister now prepared to comment on the rather questionable conduct of a former deputy minister and does he not agree that a conflict of interest situation exists when consideration is given to the fact that de Havilland stood to benefit from the Lockheed contract since Lockheed agreed to promote sales of the Dash-7 if the Orion were selected?

Mr. Sharp: I neither agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, nor differ from it. As the Prime Minister has stated, an unprecedented situation has arisen recently. The Prime Minister feels it is a serious issue and is having it examined. Until that examination takes place, I would hope the hon. member would not attack the reputation of people like Mr. Grandy and Mr. Reisman by innuendo in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In view of the rather cavalier attitude expressed by the Acting Prime Minister—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In the absence of the Prime Minister, can we assume from the answers we have just received from the hon. gentleman that he does not regard this as a serious matter with respect to the public service and are we to continue to have delay in this matter of guidelines, legislation and other measures governing the conduct of public servants in and out of office?

Mr. Sharp: As I have just stated, the Prime Minister has said he does consider this to be a serious matter. The hon. gentleman is once again making statements in the House of Commons in order to affect the reputation of people like Mr. Reisman and Mr. Grandy. We on this side believe in justice, whatever the opposition might believe in.

* * *

● (1420)

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE OF FINAL DECISION—REFERENCE TO OTHER FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Considering that it was expected that the cabinet would not be making a final decision on the Lockheed Orion purchase till its meeting tomorrow, in light of a report in today's press to the effect that a decision was made last Thursday to proceed would the minister tell the House whether or not that final decision has been taken; and in the context of answering would the minister tell the House what are the further financial considerations that the government has in mind which were referred to in the same article and which will have to be met if the government is to go ahead?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the press report is inaccurate. There has been no decision taken by cabinet. The financial arrangements are of the kind that we have discussed previously. We are working with the Canadian banks and conversations are progressing, but there has been no financial arrangement completed which I can announce at this time.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ALLEGEDLY CONFLICTING STATEMENTS ABOUT FINANCING—POSSIBLE DISCUSSIONS WITH U.S. LOAN BOARD

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister said in the House yesterday that he and his officials were aware of the full financial position of the Lockheed Corporation last fall when the negotiations were taking place. Considering that his deputy minister told a committee of this House during the past ten days that he was not aware of the provisions of the United States emergency loan guarantee act which would prohibit Lockheed from proceeding with the front-end financing, would the minister explain this apparently flat contradiction between what he says and what his deputy minister says; and, more specifically, could he tell us whether he or his officials held any discussions with the U.S. officials of the emergency loan guarantee board at the time of the negotiations, or did they just take Lockheed's word regarding their financial position in this matter?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, my officials were aware of the emergency loan guarantee board and the fact that the Lockheed company had to get approval from United States bankers before increasing their loans. This was known to my officials, but the Lockheed company indicated to us that they could overcome these impediments and that they could in fact participate in the financing of the difference between the payments required and the funds available in the Department of National Defence.

SUGGESTED BUILDING OF AIRCRAFT IN CANADA RATHER THAN PURCHASE "ORION"

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since it is now abundantly clear that Lockheed is not able to live up to the commitment that the minister says they made, even though that has been denied by the Lockheed Corporation itself, and considering that the government of Canada owns and controls the Canadair Corporation and the de Havilland Corporation of Canada, would the minister not now make a commitment not to proceed with the Lockheed deal, and instead build the aircraft in Canada to meet the

technical defence requirements, using Canadian facilities that are already under the control of the people of this country?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Definitely not, Mr. Speaker. Apart from the military requirement and the commitment to NATO, there are very substantial industrial benefits to Canada arising out of this contract once it is underway. They are benefits which I think the hon. member would want to see taking place.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REASON FOR RAPID INCREASE IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Considering that for the last eight years Canada has had three times as many foreign financial institutions as before, is the Minister of Finance aware of that situation and can he tell the House for what reasons?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have followed the establishment of many such institutions in Canada. The Bank Act, which was passed by Parliament in 1967, included only very strict provisions governing foreign financial institutions. We are now considering amendments that could be made to the Bank Act this year, as well as the possibility of enacting wider regulations concerning these institutions.

REASON FOREIGN CREDIT GRANTING INSTITUTIONS HAVE ADVANTAGES OVER BANKS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

I understand the minister is going to introduce amendments about this, but considering that at present those foreign organizations enjoy rights that our own Canadian chartered banks do not have, for instance loans, credit, leasing or account farming, where those financial institutions may extend credit, buy back accounts or open credits which chartered banks are not allowed to do, I wish to ask the minister pursuant to which laws do those financial institutions enjoy more protection, more room for expansion, more facilities than our own Canadian banking system?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker. There are two questions to be considered here, first the matter of competition against Canadian banks, second that of permitting foreign agencies to conduct transactions in Canada.

As I have said, we shall put forward regulations in view of extending to those institutions the same restrictions Canadian institutions have to comply with. I must add there is a problem with some Canadian institutions such as caisses populaires and credit unions which operate very much like banks and which can also engage in many deals which are not open to Canadian banks. Thus we should consider the so-called Canadian "near-banks" as well as the foreign banks operating in Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED PARTICIPATION OF FORCE IN BREAK-IN AT QUEBEC NEWSPAPER—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General being aware of the circumstances involving the activities of an anti-terrorist squad's alleged break and entry of the premises of a Quebec newspaper in which it is suggested RCMP personnel had participated, can the Solicitor General now say to the House whether the former Solicitor General was informed in advance of this raid and, if not, who precisely authorized the participation of the RCMP in this venture?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as soon as we learned about this declaration by Mr. Samson at the trial, where it was brought to our attention, we immediately started an investigation. That investigation is still underway. We do know that there was no notice to either the Solicitor General or officials of the RCMP in Ottawa, but we will have more to announce in this respect when we have more news as a result of the investigation.

Mr. MacKay: I want to thank the minister for his answer, Mr. Speaker, and I understand he will give us further details on this as soon as they become available. In view of revelations made public by a committee of the United States Senate in respect of illegal activities of the FBI in the United States, can the Solicitor General assure Canadians, at least on the basis of his present knowledge of the situation, that no such activities have gone on in the past or are going on at the present time which would cause Canadians to have any concern about the activities of our federal police force?

● (1430)

Mr. Allmand: That is exactly the purpose of the investigation which we have undertaken and which was started as soon as this matter was brought to our attention, so I cannot answer that question right now. However, we are investigating that very point.

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in view of the very great importance which we all place on the reputation of the RCMP, I wonder whether the Solicitor General when conducting this investigation will either be able to report to the House confirmation or otherwise that the raid was carried out by an anti-terrorist squad consisting of Montreal urban police, Quebec provincial police and the RCMP and whether he will at that time indicate if he is satisfied, on the basis of his investigation, that these break-ins occurred legitimately or under the guise of state security? Would he give us that assurance when he makes that report to the House?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I hope to give as much information as possible. The hon. member is correct. This

raid was organized by either the Quebec provincial police or the Montreal police, and the RCMP assumed an assisting role. However, we are getting as much information as we can, and we will announce further action in the House as soon as that information is available.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PERSON ORDERING EMBASSY AT BEIRUT CLOSED—COUNTRY RESPONSIBLE FOR CANADIAN CONSULAR SERVICES

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, if I can have his attention. On the assumption that the news reports about the departure of embassy staff from Beirut is correct, will the minister say whether it was he who ordered the closing of the embassy in Beirut or whether the action was taken by the chargé d'affaires on his own initiative? If the latter is the case the minister must surely know the grounds on which it was done, because it occurs to me that while there are Canadians still in the area, the mission should be maintained.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sullivan, the chargé d'affaires, and I agreed that it was appropriate at this particular time to withdraw the embassy staff. In fact, at a certain point I had given instructions that that decision should be taken at his discretion based on an assessment of the situation. Subsequently, I felt that I ought to give a direct instruction, with which the chargé agreed.

The reason for the temporary withdrawal of staff is that, because of the deteriorated political situation, the embassy could not carry out any of its functions. It was virtually non-operational, as the lives of the embassy staff were in some danger. It seemed to me useless to maintain them in the area when they could not perform any function whatsoever.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Would the minister then say what arrangements have been made to ensure that consular services continue to be available to Canadian citizens who are in the area? Has he handed them over to the Swiss authorities on this occasion as in the past?

Mr. MacEachen: We have been urging Canadians in Lebanon to leave the country. We felt that advisable for some time and have urged them to do that, in their own interests. Whatever consular services are required will be provided, I believe, to Canadians by the British embassy.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Chicken! Shame.

* * *

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF PROPOSALS TO ASSIST ATLANTIC PROVINCES WITH ENERGY COSTS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It relates to the answer of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources yesterday in which he indicated that with respect to the high cost of electricity for Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island in particular, a number of proposals were still before the provinces and that some of these were still on the table. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could indicate, with respect to tomorrow's meeting with provincial ministers of finance, whether some of these proposals have been developed to the point of proposing in dollar terms to the provincial governments what forms of assistance might be provided by the federal government, and has there been any distinguishing between short-term or interim measures and long-term measures, realizing the length of time it would take to bring in some of the proposals originally suggested?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the proposals which had been put to the provinces were proposals to be operative over a longer period for the purpose of making lower cost hydro or nuclear-based power available, and indeed, the province of Prince Edward Island has gone ahead on one of these programs to set up a cable link with the mainland for this purpose.

As to the question of short-run financing of the two power utilities in those two provinces, we look forward to hearing from the ministers for those provinces. Of course, there is the difficulty that in other parts of Canada energy users, such as natural gas users on the natural gas pipeline system, also have had substantial increases and as Minister of Finance I would have to confess to being most reluctant to get into a large national subsidy program for energy users in general.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): In light of the final comments of the minister, I wonder whether he could indicate whether the federal government has taken a position, or will indicate one tomorrow, with respect to the extent of the differential which will be allowed to exist, in view of its other programs attempting to equalize the hardship created. Realizing that both Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have the highest electrical cost in the country, will the minister be prepared to put forward a statement with respect to the differentiation the federal government will tolerate?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I take it the hon. member means between energy rates in general and the two provinces in particular. I am not planning on making a statement of that kind, although I hope to have a very full review from the two ministers of their current situation and to get a reaction from ministers of other provinces with regard to whether national funds should be used in this way.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED KINGDOM ON BEHALF OF OLD AGE PENSION RECIPIENTS RESIDING IN CANADA—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Gilbert Parent (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that there are a number of British citizens living in Canada who receive the equivalent of an

old age pension from England, and in view of the fact that these pensions are not indexed and in the last six months they have lost the equivalent of $30 per month in buying power, would the minister tell the House how the negotiations with the United Kingdom on this matter are progressing and what action can be expected to alleviate this situation?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity previously of expressing my regret at the refusal of the United Kingdom to adjust those pensions. The discussions are suspended at the present time because of the requirement of the United Kingdom that there be some different arrangements with Canada, which we are not in a position to provide at the present time under the existing legislation.

However, I am pleased to advise the hon. member that in the next few weeks I expect to make a statement announcing re-arrangements in our system so that we can arrive, I hope, at a satisfactory solution, not just for British immigrants, but also for immigrants from other countries in that respect.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE OF BANK LOAN AND TABLING OF INDUSTRIAL BENEFIT STUDIES

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. In answer to an earlier question by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby the minister indicated that he and his officials are presently working with Canadian banks with regard to the difficulty in putting up front-end money. Presumably Canadian banks are unwilling to advance money without a federal government loan guarantee. Even if the U.S. loan guarantee board allows the loan to take place, is the minister asking the House to support a loan to Lockheed which Canadian banks are unwilling to undertake? Is he asking the Canadian taxpayer to undertake a risk which Canadian banks are unwilling to take on the Lockheed deal?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Leggatt: That does not completely answer the question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Leggatt: My question is this: Is there to be no federal guarantee with regard to proposed lending by federal banks?

And in order to prevent a supplementary, with regard to his previous answer concerning industrial benefits, is the minister willing to table the studies which were done with respect to the Lockheed Orion as compared with other proposals such as refitting the Argus in terms of the advantage to the Canadian economy of either proposal, the number of jobs which would be created and the money invested in Canada? Will he table that in the House so that we can examine the assessment which the minister has made in this matter?

[Mr. Parent.]

● (1440)

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of the question, we are not talking about a guarantee of the federal government to the Canadian banks. The arrangement is now being worded out. As I have said, if it can be completed, the details will be announced. I cannot say more about it at this time. Concerning the industrial benefits, I have already indicated that they are very substantial.

Mr. Leggatt: The alternative benefits.

Mr. Richardson: Again, they will be a matter of complete discussion and will be fully displayed once the contract has been completed. In round figures, we are talking about a guarantee of $420 million of Canadian industrial benefit. We are talking about structural components being built in Canada for 150 aeroplanes, which in round figures is another $160 million. That means some $580 million in industrial benefits. On top of that there is a "best efforts" plan which, if all goes well, could take industrial benefits to Canada up over $900 million, which is almost as much as the total cost of the contract. All of this will be spelled out once we can get the contract signed and get underway with the project.

* * *

FINANCE

DATE OF BUDGET—REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE STUDY OF FISCAL OPTIONS OPEN TO CANADA

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): My question is for the Minister of Finance, and I have given him notice of it. Will the minister now indicate the date on which he will present his forthcoming budget, and in an effort to remove some of the secrecy which shrouds the government's economic policy, would the minister consider a prebudget reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs to allow that committee an opportunity to review the fiscal options open to Canada in this difficult economic period?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for having given me notice of this question. In answer to the first part of the question, I anticipate the budget will be brought down some time in the second half of May. The actual date has not been selected as yet, but it is within that time-frame.

With regard to the suggestion of a prebudget review, I wish to make two suggestions. The first is that the economic review papers will be available at about the end of April, and I suggest that in the context of the work of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs we might have a review of the economic situation in contemplation of the budget in early May.

The second comment I would make is that I think it would be very useful if the House in general could give some consideration to the broader question as to whether the procedures that have been followed historically in this parliament and in Westminster with regard to budgets might be reviewed with the object referred to by the hon. member of having a more open scrutiny of the government's economic and fiscal planning, and either in the context of that discussion or perhaps with a special reference to the standing committee it would be of value if we could review the budget procedures and decide whether the time has not come now to make such changes in Canada.

Mr. Stevens: In the context of the minister's reply, I was wondering if the minister would be willing to have his department make available to either members of this House or to a standing committee the actual forecast that they see for the economy in the coming months and years based on various assumptions with respect to alternative taxation and federal spending plans.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me that the hon. member may well be asking to a substantial degree for a preview of the budget itself, and for reason of the long standing inhibitions we have had, I would be reluctant to be put in that position. I think the far more sensible course of action, if we want to have more open procedures on the budget—and I think that is desirable—is for the House to decide what those procedures should be and then to make the necessary arrangements, rather than doing it ad hoc.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON KEITH LATTA CASE

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question. I have given him notice of it. Is he able today to give a report on the Keith Latta case?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member knows, I received some time ago a petition for a new trial for Keith Latta on the basis that new evidence had been discovered by way of a statement from a Mrs. McCauley which came to light after leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada had been dismissed. As I informed the hon. member the other day, we had been endeavouring through my officers to interview Mrs. McCauley but she refused to be interviewed. Consequently I have made an order, signed yesterday, to the Chief Justice of Alberta under 617(c) of the Criminal Code ordering that the Court of Appeal of Alberta or a judge thereof take the evidence of Mrs. McCauley and advise me as to whether the testimony of Mrs. McCauley could be admissible evidence in the trial of Keith Latta and ordering that counsel for the Attorney General of Alberta and for Keith Latta be permitted to appear on such conditions as the court directs.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CUBA—SUGGESTED PROTEST OF ARMED INTERVENTION IN AFRICA

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. On March 25 I requested the Prime Minister in the interests of world peace, to send a message to Premier Castro of Cuba informing him of the concern of Canadians generally over the continued participation of Cuba's 12,000 communist troops in the African conflict, and the Prime Minister promised to give consideration to my suggestion. Six days have passed since I raised that question and tension in Rhodesia and other parts of Africa has increased. So I now ask the Prime Minister: Has the government of Canada formally protested to Premier Castro the presence of Cuban troops in areas of conflict in Africa and, if so, will the Prime Minister table a copy of his government's objections in this House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe last time when I answered the question I indicated that protests have been made publicly by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and personally by me, in the presence of Premier Castro, to him. I also said I did not see any advantage in sending a telegram repeating what was already known to be the Canadian policy, and having expressed it personally to him I did not consider that an expression in writing of the same idea would be likely to change his ideas very much.

CUBA—PURPOSE OF LEASING DC-8 AIRCRAFT AND TRAINING PILOTS

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): My supplementary is again to the Prime Minister. Has Canada entered into arrangements with Cuba covering the leasing of DC-8 aircraft to that country and the training of Cuban pilots, and what is the purpose of these arrangements?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I answered this question, I believe, in the days after I returned from Cuba and said that there have been some charges of, I believe, Air Canada planes flying to Cuba long before Cuba's involvement in Africa, but when the involvement in Africa became known we modified the agreement to make sure that these planes would not be used by Cubans outside of their territory. In so far as the training of personnel is concerned, I have no knowledge of that. I doubt if there is any, but I will look into it.

Mr. Paproski: Can the Prime Minister say how many Cuban pilots Canada has trained and are they being trained in Cuba or Canada and for what purpose?

Mr. Trudeau: As the hon. member knows, there are trade and tourist relations between Cuba and Canada and charter planes are flying from Canada to Cuba and Cuban planes flying from Cuba to Canada—

An hon. Member: And Cuban soldiers flying to Africa.

Mr. Trudeau: When we sell or rent a plane for money, it is quite conceivable that we also undertake to train pilots to fly these planes. If the hon. member objects to that

practice, I should like to know what is the basis of his objection.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REASON FOR REDUCTION OF WAGE INCREASE FOR ATLANTIC SUGAR EMPLOYEES

Mr. Mike Landers (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Has the minister had an opportunity to inquire into the roll-back of wages at the Atlantic Sugar Refineries of Saint John and, if so, what has he discovered?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The board arrived at the conclusion that it should allow a basic increase of 8.29 per cent on the basis that the previous contract had been reopened during its lifetime. Indeed, there had been an opportunity to catch up with the increase in the consumer price index. The board has indicated that it is meeting with the company today, and is likely to meet with the union tomorrow. It is prepared to consider the question again in light of the facts that either or both of those parties can bring to its attention.

* * *

● (1450)

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

KNOWLEDGE OF MINISTER OF CONTENTS OF JUDGE LAMER'S EVIDENCE TO CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Transport, following the question I put last week, March 24, to the Minister of Justice who gave me the following answer:

> The chairman designate was appointed vice-chairman some four years ago, and apparently the matter was examined at that time by my predecessor.

As the Minister of Transport was that predecessor, I would like to ask him whether he was aware at that time that Judge Lamer, who was appointed chairman of the Law Reform Commission, had appeared in camera before Mr. Justice Réal Brunet of the commission of inquiry on organized crime and whether he knows the contents of the evidence given by Judge Lamer?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think there is a standing tradition not to address a question to a minister which relates to his previous responsibilities. I am sure my colleague will take notice of the question and report to the hon. member.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED AGREEMENT BETWEEN RUSSIA AND UNITED STATES FOR ON-SIGHT INSPECTION OF NUCLEAR TESTS—REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister confirm that Soviet and United States negotiators have reached basic agreement on the need for on-sight inspection of each country's nuclear test sights?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to confirm that.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTION OF ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS THAT FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS BE EXTENDED THREE YEARS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance and I regret I have not had an opportunity to give him notice. With reference to the forthcoming meeting of finance ministers, will the minister give sympathetic consideration to the position of the Canadian Association of University Teachers that the fiscal arrangements be extended for three years. This is vital to the Atlantic provinces. Will the minister also take into consideration the inflation factor which has a great bearing not only on the College of Cape Breton but on all institutions of learning?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have had information of a similar kind from those two old friends, the hon. member for St. Boniface and the hon. member for Halifax on the same subject, bringing substantially the same message to my attention. I will take that into consideration and as the hon. member mentioned, this will be a matter for discussion in the next few days.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

UNIFORM ENFORCEMENT OF SAFETY RULES AT AIRPORTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In light of the fact that new safety regulations limiting the size of carry-on baggage for commercial air flights will be uniformly enforced tomorrow—which indicates to me that safety has been sacrificed for some time—may I ask when the government will ensure that other safety rules are enforced uniformly at Department of Transport airports? For example, on the weekend of March 19 to 21 a member of the P.C. Nationals hockey team was permitted to carry on his skates at Ottawa and Halifax airports but was denied this privilege at Moncton airport. The explanation given was that Moncton airport is the headquarters for security and some officials might have been watching.

An hon. Member: There is an empty net over there.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

ALLEGED BIAS IN PROGRAM ON TRAPPERS' FESTIVAL AT THE PAS—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State but in his absence I will direct it to the parliamentary secretary. During the 29th annual trappers' festival in The Pas, Manitoba, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation prepared a news documentary of the festival. In the opinion of The Pas town council, chamber of commerce, the festival committee, the chief and council of The Pas Indian band, as well as other northern residents, the program was malicious and deliberately distorted as to the actual facts of the festival and its bylaws. Will the minister take immediate action to have this serious charge investigated as the program made it appear to the general public that the volunteer workers of the trappers' festival were guilty of racial discrimination?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the President of the CBC that he has received a number of letters from The Pas and at the present is having discussions with CBC program management. I will take notice of the hon. member's concern and get back to him on it.

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION BY CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION OF PROGRAM "TWENTY-FOUR HOURS"

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, may I put a supplementary question to the Minister of Communications? The town council of The Pas has requested the CRTC to conduct an inquiry into the content of the CBC program Twenty-Four Hours that was aired on February 26, 1976 on the subject of The Pas 29th annual trappers' festival. Will the minister instruct the CRTC to establish whether the people of The Pas and the community in general have been unjustly maligned and accused?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I shall make a point of conveying the hon. member's representations to the CRTC, and I hope the hon. member will receive the answers he is looking for. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give directives to that control agency.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

REASON FOR SELECTIVE VACCINATION AGAINST SWINE FLU

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the widespread anxiety and fear felt by parents because of the selective discrimination toward children who will not be vaccinated with the swine flu vaccine, may I ask the minister if it is the time factor that is involved in production which may result in a vaccine not as purified as that to which we have been accustomed in

Canada? In other words, the time element might not allow sufficient purification to avoid reaction?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the hon. member that the time element did not play any role at all in the consideration of the National Advisory Committee. The recommendation from the committee, which was endorsed by my department, was based purely on the adverse reaction to the vaccine that was encountered in children under 16 years of age. I would point out to the hon. member that, in a limited study in the United States, 36 per cent of children under five years of age given flu vaccine developed fevers of 103 degrees Fahrenheit or more and 10 per cent showed convulsions. It will be up to the physicians responsible for children, in view of the high risk, to decide whether the benefits of the vaccine exceed the risks involved.

Mr. Rynard: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask why there would not be a selective classification for children and why ages 50 to 65 have been excluded for no reason that I can see?

Mr. Lalonde: First of all, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the children, this is a matter that will be left to the pediatrician involved. The National Advisory Committee said it was not recommended but it is up to the physician to make that decision in each instance. In other words, the advisory committee recommended against a general mass immunization of children. The committee did not recommend not giving the vaccine to people aged 50 to 65. What the committee did recommend was a certain priority order, the first priority being chronic disease cases and all people over 65; second, people of 20 to 50; and third, people between 50 and 65 and 16 and 20. Many people of 50 to 65 have antibodies from exposure to this flu between 1918 and 1930, and are less at risk than people of 20 to 50. However, these people can also get the vaccine if they are interested in receiving it.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

EFFECT OF INCREASED ENERGY COSTS ON DEVELOPMENT COSTS IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Has the minister made any assessments or does he plan any investigation into the effect that rising energy costs have on economic development projects in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec and does his budget now before us for approval pose an impediment to any remedial action?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the department did indicate in the reports tabled last week that the increased cost of energy in the Atlantic region and in Quebec would create some problems for the industrial development and for the general economy in these parts of Canada. With regard to specific studies on the implications for certain industries,

analyses have been initiated but we are not in a position to report on direct implications for certain types of operations. Obviously, certain types of operations are more affected than others because they require a larger consumption of electric energy.

For the second part of the question asked by the hon. member, as he is aware, budget cuts apply to all departments. It goes without saying that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is also affected because there are great needs. If more funds were available, we certainly could undertake more projects in cooperation with the private sector and provincial governments. For the time being, however, I think that we should cut our expenses and be prepared to make a better selection of projects submitted in order to maximize the return on investments.

* * *

● (1500)

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INQUIRY WHETHER MR. GRANDY RECOMMENDED PURCHASE OF LOCKHEED "ORION"

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday, referring to Mr. Grandy, the minister said that he was not sure on which committee he sat. He presumed that Mr. Grandy must have had some contact with discussions which were taking place. That was to be expected, in view of the position he held. Can the minister tell the House, precisely and definitely, if James Grandy recommended to cabinet ministers, the committee of cabinet or the project team the purchase of the Lockheed Orion?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker. I pointed out that the recommendation to purchase the Lockheed Orion was made by the Department of National Defence, and made by me to cabinet.

Mr. Nystrom: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. That, precisely, is why I asked the minister the question. I want to know if James Grandy recommended the purchase of the Orion to the project team or any committee of ministers. I know that the minister himself must recommend to cabinet. Did Mr. Grandy make any recommendation to the project team?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, in his capacity as deputy minister, he was not on the project team. I do not know of any recommendation he may or may not have made.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR NAMES OF COMMITTEES OF WHICH MR. GRANDY WAS MEMBER

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in the House, and again today, the minister implied that Mr. Grandy sat on some committees. Can he tell the House precisely on which committees Mr. Grandy sat?

[Mr. Lessard.]

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot. Mr. Grandy in those days was deputy minister; he was not a consultant. I think he was doing his duty as a deputy minister. I do not know all the committees on which he sat.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I intended raising certain matters as a question of privilege, but the information came to me too late and I could not give Your Honour appropriate notice. I now inform you that I intend to raise these matters tomorrow as a question of privilege. One involves disparaging remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway about members of parliament who happen to be medical doctors; the other, a charge of conflict of interest involving Tory members made by a CTV newsman, Eric Malling. I intend to raise these matters on a question of privilege tomorrow as such comments affect the ability to do our job as members of parliament.

Mr. Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that ministers are given the right not to answer questions. In the interest of the safety of the air travellers of Canada, I want to be sure that the minister heard the question I asked him about air safety, and chose not to answer.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the same point of order, I assure the hon. member that I heard his question. It seemed to me that because of the terms in which it was couched it neither needed, nor deserved, an answer. If he had asked a serious question I would have been glad to consider it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Such arrogance.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to the order or direction which the Minister of Justice has given, and I do this as a courtesy to him. He referred to a witness who is material to the order, Sylvia McCauley. At one time that was her maiden name. She is now known as Sylvia Novick, sometimes known as Mr. Kovack. I hope that no technical difficulties will arise because her name is now Mrs. Novick and not McCauley, alias Le Tendress. I hope that will not affect the order.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's courtesy in raising the matter. The name used is the name at the time of trial. I will check with my officers to make sure that the point creates no impediment to the matter. If it does, I shall correct the order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

TABLING OF FIFTH REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR 1975

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to lay on the table the fifth report of the Commissioner of Official Languages for the calendar year 1975.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR REVIEW OF REPORTS OF COMMISSIONER

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-430, entitled "An Act to amend the Official Languages Act (referral of reports)".

Some hon. Members: Explain!

Mr. Joyal: Mr. Speaker, in Book I of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the commission recommended that the Commissioner of Official Languages should function as the Auditor General functions respecting government expenditures and property. Now, the Official Languages Act does not allow the House to study the reports by way of a joint committee of the House and the Senate, though the reports are tabled in both the House and the Senate. The purpose of this amendment is to allow Parliament to follow the progress made by the federal administration on every levels in the realization of the Official Languages Act's objectives of equality and justice and the participation of Francophones in every level of the federal administration.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS

[*Translation*]

PRESENTATION OF PETITION BY UNITED GRAIN GROWERS

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Saint-Henri): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault):

That pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 99, the petition of United Grain Growers Limited requesting the passing of an act amending its act of incorporation to increase its capital stock and for other purposes, filed after the time limit specified under Standing Order 90, be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders, together with the Twenty-seventh Report of the Clerk of Petitions thereon, presented to the House on Tuesday March 30, 1976, for any recommendations the Committee deems advisable.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion of the hon. member. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[*Translation*]

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,539, 3,853, 4,088 to 4,092 inclusive, 4,098, 4,592, 4,603, 4,914, 4,915, 4,917 and 4,929.

[*Text*]

PEI COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN—PHASE 2

Question No. 3,539—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the recent agreement on Phase 2 of the PEI Comprehensive Development Plan, is the Joint Advisory Board satisfied with the amount of public involvement and input that preceded the drafting of the agreement?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: Yes.

PEI—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,853—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, have measures been taken since the Plan's inception to (a) add to clam stocks (b) make better utilization of Whelk stocks (c) expand rock crab catch (d) exploit sea urchin stocks (e) exploit brown shrimp stocks (f) improve inshore catch of (i) flatfish (ii) hake (iii) mackerel (g) improve eel stocks through aquaculture techniques (h) investigate feasibility of trout hatching and farming in PEI and, if so, with what results?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: (a) Stocks are being assessed; (b) measures have been considered, but are uneconomic at the present time; (c) stocks are being assessed and markets tested; (d) no; (e) stocks are being assessed; (f) (i) modern gear is being tested; (ii) modern gear and long lines are being tested; (iii) no; (g) no; (h) several salt water rearing stations have been established.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSCANADA PIPELINES

Question No. 4,088—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the National Energy Board request TransCanada Pipelines in a letter dated February 14, 1975 to (a) indicate to the Board in writing what measures are being implemented to ensure that poor construction practices do not occur in future (b) provide the Board with a statement of methods used to ensure that the actual welding and quality control practices conform to Board regulations, industry codes and company specifications (c) pay particular attention in its inspections to the area covered by the Phase I loop construction of 1971 and 1972 in its patrol of

the pipeline system and, if so, did Trans Canada Pipelines Limited comply with the Board's request in full?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): National Energy Board reports as follows: (a), (b) and (c) Yes.

SAFETY CONDITIONS OF TRANS CANADA PIPELINES

Question No. 4,089—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the Chairman of the National Energy Board issue a statement to the effect that charges, that sections of the Trans Canada Pipelines were unsafe, were without foundation and, if so, on what date?

2. Did the Board request TCP to provide them with evidence of burn throughs and slag inclusions in certain welds in the pipeline and, if so, on what date?

3. Did the Board receive the evidence it requested from TCP and, if so, on what date?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): National Energy Board reports as follows: 1. Yes, on February 10, 1976.

2. Yes, on January 28, 1976.

3. The Board received radiographs of 6 welds from CTV on February 17, 1976 and an incomplete assessment of 82 other welds prepared by an unidentified person. The Board is conducting its own evaluation of this material.

DEFECTS IN WELDS OF GAS PIPELINES

Question No. 4,090—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Do National Energy Board regulations permit (a) hollow bead (b) slag inclusion (c) excess penetration (d) burn through defects in welds in gas pipeline construction?

2. If such defects are present in the welds of a gas pipeline what is required of the pipeline company by the Board?

3. Has the Board ever ordered a company to correct any such defects?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): National Energy Board reports as follows: 1. Yes, to the extent permitted in code CSA Z184. There is no defect defined as excess penetration.

2. A defect which violates code CSA Z184 detected during construction is required to be removed by the pipeline company. Previously undetected defects which are revealed by pressure testing after completion of the pipeline, but before placing it in service, are required to be corrected. Defects subsequently discovered are required to be corrected if they affect safety.

3. Yes.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRANS CANADA PIPELINES LTD.

Question No. 4,091—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the National Energy Board issue licences to Trans Canada Pipelines Limited for the Phase I loop constructed in Northern Ontario in 1971-72 and, if so, on what date?

2. Did the Board carry out inspection and testing to make sure that the pipeline met its standards for safety before granting the licence and (a) if so, in what manner (b) if not, what evidence of safety was submitted by Trans Canada Pipelines Limited?

[Mr. Orlikow.]

3. Did the National Energy Board take steps to confirm the reliability of the evidence of safety submitted by Trans Canada Pipelines Limited and, if so, what were they?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): National Energy Board reports as follows: 1. Yes, the National Energy Board issued during the years 1971-72 a total of three certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity dated February 16, 1971, May 11, 1971 and May 4, 1972.

NOTE: The Board issues certificates in accordance with the National Energy Board Act to approve facilities rather than licences as stated in the question.

2. The Board established requirements for the "testing of oil and gas pipelines" on September 17, 1965. Leave to Open Orders were issued with respect to the pipeline constructed under authority of the three certificates referred to above on submission of evidence by Trans Canada Pipelines acceptable to the Board that these requirements had been met. Leave to Open Orders authorize the placing in-service of designated sections of pipeline. Prior to issuance of Leave to Open Orders a 24 hour hydrostatic pressure test at 125% of working pressure was conducted by Trans Canada, the results of which were checked in detail by the Board. It was the Board's practice at that time to conduct field inspections on a selected basis. In this particular case there was no field inspection by Board staff but the Board carefully checked all evidence submitted by Trans Canada including the affidavits of professional engineers attesting to the safety and integrity of the pipeline.

3. Yes, detailed engineering test data which included pressure and temperature charts, dead-weight pressure readings and temperature readings as well as other information was carefully assessed by the Board. In addition Trans Canada filed with the Board affidavits from a professional engineer attesting to the safety of each individual portion of the pipeline. It is to be noted that this line has operated at full working pressure for approximately four years without any failures or significant operating incidents.

SAFETY INSPECTIONS OF PIPELINE OPERATIONS

Question No. 4,092—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Are qualified inspectors of pipelines employed by the National Energy Board to carry out its statutory responsibilities to assure the safety of pipeline operations and, if so, how many?

2. How many were employed in each of the past ten years?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): National Energy Board reports as follows: 1. Yes, a total of 15.

2. 1966, 4; 1967, 4; 1968, 4; 1969, 5; 1970, 5; 1971, 6; 1972, 6; 1973, 9; 1974, 11; 1975, 16; 1976, 15.

WELDING QUALITY AND SAFETY INSPECTIONS RELATING TO TRANS CANADA PIPELINES

Question No. 4,098—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Have field inspectors competent to inspect (a) radiographic evidence (b) hydro-static evidence of pipeline weld quality been employed

by the National Energy Board in (i) 1970 (ii) 1971 (iii) 1972 (iv) 1973 (v) 1974 (vi) 1975 and, if so, how many?

2. Did the Board receive from Trans Canada Pipelines copies of correspondence dated June 7, 1972 and June 2, 1972 between them and Mr. Tom Arnesen relating to the quality of welding performed on a Trans Canada Pipeline and, if so (a) on what date was such correspondence received (b) what action was taken by the Board on the letters?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): National Energy Board reports as follows: 1. Yes, the Board employs field inspectors who have the ability to identify welding problems and who are competent to inspect and assess hydrostatic testing. Moreover the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has particular expertise in radiography and metallurgy plus the laboratory facilities to conduct any necessary analysis. The Board has used these services to supplement the findings of its field inspection staff when required. The following table indicates the Board's staff members who were available for inspection duties from 1970 to 1975 inclusive.

Year	Personnel
1970	5
1971	6
1972	6
1973	9
1974	11
1975	16

The CSA Z184 requires gas pipeline companies to use radiography in only 15% of field welds. Accordingly this code requirement acts principally as a check on the quality of workmanship. Because radiographic techniques were not sensitive enough to reproducibly find dangerous defects, the Board relied on the pressure test as the principle basis for operating authority for pipelines to be operated. Although the quality of radiography has increased markedly since 1972, it will continue to be the Board's policy to rely principally on the hydrostatic pressure tests to assure itself that a gas pipeline may be safely operated. This hydrostatic test requires a minimum pressure of 125 per cent of maximum allowable operating pressure to be held for a minimum of 24 hours.

2. Yes, copies of these two letters were forwarded by Trans Canada to the Board in June 1972. Similar letters were received by the Board in July 1973. All these letters related primarily to a contractual dispute between the two parties. The Board does not normally involve itself in this type of dispute. The potential significance of the very general references to welding quality and safety made in this correspondence was not apparent until a copy of Mr. Arnesen's report dated December 3, 1973 to the Prime Minister was received by the Board in March 1974. At that time an investigation of Mr. Arnesen's technical concerns was undertaken.

EXPORTS OF FOREST PRODUCTS

Question No. 4,592—**Mr. Symes:**

1. Since the establishment of the Anti-Inflation Board in October 1975, until the resumption of full operations in the forest products industry, what was the dollar value decline of Canadian exports?

2. What was the loss, in dollars, of tax revenue from exports during the same period of time?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. In the period from November 1975, the first full month in which the Anti-inflation Board was functioning, to January 1976, the latest month for which data are available, the exports of the forest industries amounted to $1,066 million. This compares with $1,304 million in the comparable period in 1974-75, and with $1,232 million in 1973-74. The level of exports in this period was affected adversely by labour disputes in many sections of the pulp and paper industry and also by weak demand for pulp and paper as well as lumber and panel products. However it is not possible to quantify the impact of these various factors with any precision.

2. This information is not available.

NEW INVESTMENT PROPOSAL

Question No. 4,603—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Was a new investment proposal made by Internote Canada Limited, wholly owned by Internote Financial Holdings of Switzerland, owned and controlled by Paoli Bontempi of Italy to establish a plant in Granby, Quebec and, if so, what is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

2. Who are the principal shareholders of Paoli Bontempi of Italy?

3. Does Paoli Bontempi of Italy control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by percent of control and value?

4. What will be the effect of the establishment of this plant on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada (b) resource processing in Canada (c) utilization of parts, components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada?

5. How many persons will be employed once the new plant is established?

6. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

7. How will the establishment of this plant be (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the new plant?

8. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the transaction?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: a new investment proposal was made for Internote Canada Ltd., wholly-owned by Internote Financial Holdings of Switzerland, to establish a plant in Granby, Quebec. The proposal was approved by the Governor in Council on February 26, 1976 (P.C. 1976-435). All information with respect to a person, business or proposed business obtained in the course of the administration of the Foreign Investment Review Act is privileged and may not be released except as provided in section 14 of that Act.

Order Paper Questions

DASH-7 PROGRAM

Question No. 4,914—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

How much has the government paid and promised to de Havilland and its subcontractors for the development and production of the DASH-7?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The information being requested with respect to the amount of government development support for the DHC-7 aircraft provided to de Havilland and its subcontractors is "commercial confidential" and cannot be made public. In overall terms the total government support for development of the DHC-7 aircraft and engines at the end of the project will be in the order of $115 million of which approximately $80 million will have been spent by March 31, 1976. With respect to DHC-7 production the government has approved a loan to de Havilland for DHC-7 rate tooling in the amount of approximately $4 million.

STOL DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 4,915—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

Has the government paid any money to firms other than de Havilland for STOL development and, if (a) to whom (b) in what amount?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): STOL development funding to companies other than de Havilland Aircraft is as follows during the 15 year period ending March 31, 1976: Canadair, $22,147,000; Pratt & Whitney Aircraft of Canada $11,802,502. The companies subcontracted portions of these amounts to other Canadian companies for the development and production of associated components, equipment and systems. A further $496,103 was provided to a number of Canadian avionics companies for STOL systems development work. No further breakdown of this figure is possible because of commercial confidentiality considerations.

INTERNATIONAL AIR SAFETY SYMPOSIUM

Question No. 4,917—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Was the Minister of Transport and members of the staff of the Department invited to participate in and attend the special International Air Safety Symposium held in Ottawa on March 2 and 3, 1976 and, if so, in each case, what part did they play in the Symposium?

2. Did the Minister and an official of the Department or some other government official give instructions that members of the staff of the Department were not to participate in or attend the Symposium?

3. Is the Minister prepared to accept full and complete responsibility for any accidents which may occur as a result of the policy of adopting bilingualism in air traffic control service?

4. Is such policy only applicable in the Province of Quebec and, if not, how many positions in Moncton have been designated bilingual and what (a) are the positions (b) is or will be the cost to provide language training and the cost of replacing the members of the staff during absence on language training?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes, I addressed the Symposium on the first morning to explain the Government's policy in phasing in the use of the French language in air traffic services in Quebec.

2. Yes, I directed that my officials should not attend because they were previously committed to participate in the National Civil Aviation Security Conference being held on the same days as the Symposium.

3. I am prepared to accept full responsibility for the safety certification of the procedures being used or to be developed for bilingual air-ground communication, but I cannot be held accountable for accidents therein anymore than I am for other aviation accidents.

4. Yes.

[Mr. Roy (Laval).]

SUBSIDIZING OF MINING EXPLORATION IN CONSTITUENCY OF TÉMISCAMINGUE

Question No. 4,929—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, did the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources subsidize mining exploration in the Constituency of Témiscamingue and, if so, what was the aggregate amount?

2. In each case (a) what was the purpose (b) who was the recipient (c) what was the amount (d) what was the year (e) what was the result?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has not subsidized any mining exploration program in the constituency of Témiscamingue since 1965. The Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act provided some funds to gold mines in the area but there was no provision for exploration in the EGMA program.

2. Not applicable.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 3,704 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

VISIT TO EASTERN CANADA BY FOREIGN FISHING FLEETS

Question No. 3,704—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Since 1968, for each (a) nationality (b) port involved, how many visits have been made to Eastern Canadian ports by foreign fishing fleets?

2. In each case, how much money (a) was earned for the ports and local businesses (b) is estimated to have been earned for Canada?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Text*]

COPIES OF ALL STUDIES OR SURVEYS OF RADIATION NEAR PORT HOPE, ONTARIO

Motion No. 84—**Mr. Lawrence:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all studies or surveys of radiation in the vicinity of Port Hope, Ontario, conducted by or for the Atomic Energy Control Board, Eldorado Nuclear Limited, or any other branch or agency of the government which show radiation to be in excess of the accepted levels for public safety, and the exact locations at which these excessive levels were found.

[*English*]

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1976, the two supporting memoranda on which the July 29, 1975, summary report issued by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was based, were tabled. In addition, the Minister of National Defence tabled a report respecting radiation levels in the Port Hope area. I would, therefore, request that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. Lawrence: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

● (1510)

[*Text*]

COPY OF CONTRACT WITH LOCKHEED AND AGREED FORMULA

Motion No. 97—**Mr. McKinnon:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the proposed contract between Lockheed Corporation of Burbank, California and the Government of Canada for the purchase by Canada of eighteen Long Range Patrol Aircraft, including the agreed formula as outlined at page 11617 of *Hansard* dated March 9, 1976.

[*English*]

Mr. Walter Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, it is deemed inappropriate to table before this House papers relating to negotiations leading up to a contract until the contract has been executed or the negotiations have been concluded. I would, therefore, request that the hon. member withdraw his motion.

Mr. McKinnon: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate. Shall the remaining notices for the production of documents be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PURCHASE OF "ORION" AIRCRAFT FROM LOCKHEED CORPORATION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the serious possibility that the cabinet will decide tomorrow to proceed with the $1 billion order of Orion aircraft from the Lockheed Corporation in spite of the fact that the financial position of this corporation is dangerously precarious and therefore could lead to a major financial loss for the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 26, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) has given the Chair the required notice. I wish to make an observation, first, concerning the importance of the matter.

There is no question that the matter is of considerable importance and is certainly worthy of consideration and discussion. However, the conditions that are contained in Standing Order 26 are quite specific. The language is worth repeating, particularly with regard to the description in that Standing Order of the urgency that is involved. That, of course, is one of the primary questions which the Chair must decide. The Standing Order reads:

Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration must be asked immediately before the calling of government orders.

The operative words, therefore, are "requiring urgent consideration". The matter is certainly specific and important, as required by the rule. The question the Chair has to decide is: Does the matter require urgent consideration and, if so, why? In that respect, it is the language of the motion which would indicate the urgency, because it states:

—for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the serious possibility that the cabinet will decide tomorrow to proceed with the $1 billion order of Orion aircraft from the Lockheed Corporation.

The matter of urgency, therefore, is the fact that the cabinet may decide and, if so, would decide tomorrow to proceed with that order. The first concern I have, although this is not the ground for the decision, is that the matter has been before the House for some time. It has now, because of the possibility of a decision tomorrow, acquired some urgency. It seems to me that the matter has had urgency all along. It has been before the House. The minister has been before the standing committee with his estimates. I have not, of course, examined the record there, but I would be very surprised if hon. members had not availed themselves of the opportunity to question the minister before the standing committee on this matter. The minister has certainly been questioned in the House.

The concern that I express, and again I say it is not the basis for the decision because I can foresee the possibility in which these circumstances might exist and still a debate

ought to be ordered under Standing Order 26, is simply this: the matter has been before the House, having first been raised, if my recollection is correct, before Christmas. It has been before the House for several weeks. It has perhaps acquired more urgency as it has gone along. Is it possible, on the eve of an important development in respect of that matter, to bring in a motion and say that that important development which takes place tomorrow now gives it an urgency it did not have two or three weeks ago and, therefore, the House ought to set aside this evening to discuss it? Again I say it is a concern that I express but not one upon which I base the decision. The one upon which I base the decision is the fact that the matter may be decided by cabinet tomorrow.

I think hon. members realize that if the Chair once accepts that as a definition of the urgency it would qualify as a subject for acceptance pursuant to Standing Order 26, this could cause a problem since, presumably, every matter which is on the regular cabinet a problem agenda for Thursday morning ought to be, and I am sure all members agree, of serious concern— otherwise it would not be there in the first place. Since it is fairly well known that cabinet meets every Thursday morning, if the Chair once accepts an imminent decision by cabinet on Thursday morning as being proper grounds for coming within the rules, then every Wednesday the Chair will have the decision of selecting which items in the forthcoming cabinet agenda ought to qualify for a Wednesday evening discussion.

Certainly, that may be a very desirable practice in the House in terms of relevant debate, but it does not seem to me that was the intention of Standing Order 26 in those matters. Therefore, for that consideration I decline at this moment, in the circumstances, to grant the debate under Standing Order 26.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Tuesday, March 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, last night when we adjourned to the other place for royal assent in order to get moneys to pay our civil servants I was speaking about the matter of gun control. I think it can be said that few issues have raised more interest throughout the country, including capital punishment. I have received a much greater number of letters on this issue than on capital punishment. For example, I have here a petition from the village of Gilbert Plains, in my constituency. It reads:

> We, the undersigned, strongly protest the legislation presently before the House imposing undue restrictions upon responsible firearm owners.

When one considers it is signed by 500 people out of a population of 1,000 it shows how important it is. Therefore, I hope there will not be any curtailment of debate on this issue. It is of great importance, particularly to those who live in rural areas. When you examine the legislation you find it will do little, if anything, to reduce the use of guns in crime. However, it will seriously inconvenience sportsmen, legitimate gun owners. In fact, it may make them more susceptible to disturbances in our society.

I mentioned previously that the taking away of guns from the general population could result in loss of the militia effect that has been a time-honoured vehicle for the presentation of liberties in western countries in times past. I have read that in Switzerland there is no restrictive legislation whatever to curb the general use of firearms of any kind, but in no country of Europe is the use of firearm more general. Every able-bodied male is required by law to possess and know how to use military rifles. In addition, he can own all the pistols he likes, contrary to our law at present, and rifle and pistol shooting is universally indulged in by all classes of people. Yet is is conceded that in Switzerland crimes of violence are extremely rare, which obviously indicates that the use of firearms does not promote crimes of violence unless the conditions are conducive to violence.

Regarding crimes of murder, the statistics are most interesting. Based on the Canadian experience, it seems fair to conclude that most murders involving firearms take place in a domestic environment. Most murders are not ingeniously planned, but occur on the spur of the moment. The people involved are not chronic criminals, but husbands, wives, neighbours and friends. I understand that of the 272 shootings in Canada in 1974, 97 took place in a domestic environment—husband and wife—111 took place in a quasi-domestic involvement, and of the balance, 19 were committed during the commission of a crime and 45 remained unresolved.

● (1520)

Because the majority of murders in Canada and the United States have occurred among families, an attempt has been made to classify these so-called intimate murders. It is interesting to note the results of one study by L. A. Rotenberg and R. L. Sodeff which appeared in two journals, "Corrective Psychiatry" and "The Journal of Social Therapy (1970)." The two authors and scientists isolated two distinct groups, an anti-social group and a schizoid group. The anti-social group was the most stable, and while those belonging to it kept guns readily at hand, whenever they committed a crime the weapons were not used unless that crime was contested.

Study of the schizoid group showed that a gun formed an integral part of unpredictable action. It might be possible to weed out the use of guns by those in the schizoid group by a requirement for registration backed by psychiatric investigation. The legislation before us is, I suggest, based on the presumption that somehow the person who issued

the licences will be able to spot people with schizoid personalities or anti-social tendencies and prevent their having access to weapons, thus lessening the incidence of homicide. It is difficult to see how this could be done in practice without denying registration to a large portion of the population.

Turning to the other group involved in the study I have just mentioned, the researchers found that before committing a crime there was nothing in their behaviour that would enable them to be distinguished from others. They conformed to normal patterns of behaviour to the extent that they would obviously be able to acquire a firearm through a licensing agency without a great deal of trouble. In other words, a screening program would be almost impossible to administer. Irrational behaviour among members of the latter group mentioned is almost impossible to spot.

Some people have maintained that access to a gun is a prerequisite to crime. But shootings occur in the case of only half the murders committed in Canada, and if guns are unobtainable it is probable that most of the murders which involved shooting would have been committed in some other way. I would point out that, as things stand, Canada's gun laws are already quite restrictive. The premise that even stricter gun laws would reduce the crime rate should be seriously questioned. It seems obvious to me that stricter gun laws will not do much to prevent violent crime. Indeed, they will likely have only a negative impact on the crime rate. For such measures to be effective, it would be necessary to abolish the use of guns completely, and it is doubtful that this could ever be enforced.

There has been some discussion about the right of individuals to be in a position to defend themselves. I would remind hon. members that a police force cannot be in all places at all times. Only a relatively small number of our citizens can be involved in actual police work. When Hitler came to power in Germany, he took away the guns from his people and whenever he occupied a country he took guns away from its population. My information is that the U.S.S.R. private citizens have no freedom to own guns. Even the few who are able to use guns to hunt for food, for example, must return them directly after use to the local equivalent of commissar or military post.

On the other hand, there is the attitude adopted in Switzerland where every able-bodied man is expected to be proficient in the use of guns and where there is extensive private ownership of guns. Surely, there is a moral in this. It is that totalitarian countries largely restrict the use of guns to the police force and the military, while democracies rely on a different approach, one which encourages citizens to use guns and to own them. I submit that in any discussion about the use of guns, this aspect should be considered.

If it is suggested that the restriction of gun ownership would prevent or minimize death by guns, why not consider the case of automobiles, motor cycles and snowmobiles? All these vehicles cause many times the number of deaths that guns do. The way to prevent such deaths would obviously be to ban these machines altogether, but no government would suggest doing so, simply because they are too much a part of modern living.

Turning to the bill itself, let me say there is obviously much to be desired. The role to be played by the local registrar interests me somewhat. Presumably, he will be expected to spot the individual of unsound mind, one who might have a tendency to act irrationally, or one who is known or suspected to be a criminal. This I suggest, is a very exacting and onerous assignment. As usual, the registrar will fall between two stools; either he will be too lenient and give out licences freely, destroying the value of the licence and the purpose to which the bill is directed, or, if he is too strict, problems will be created the other way.

Take the case of a man known to have a criminal record, for instance. It is assumed that such an individual has paid his debt to society, tha he has become a reformed citizen and is consequently entitled to the rights enjoyed by all other citizens. I can well imagine a registrar who takes his work seriously, phoning the local police office to find out whether or not a particular individual has a police record or whether he is known to the police as being a person of unsound mind. In the event, the local police as being a force might well become the ultimate arbiter in deciding whether or not an individual should receive a licence.

Then, again, the provision that an applicant must find two individuals who will permit their names to be used as a guarantee that the individual seeking a licence is of sound mind, and so on, gives rise to some reflection. The legislation describes these guarantors in clause 106.1(3)(c) as "members of a class or classes of person from time to time prescribed by the regulations." They must indicate that they have known the applicant for at least two years, that they have read the application and that to the best of their knowledge and belief there is no reason to believe the applicant is unfit to be in possession of firearms or ammunition. This is much more complex than the situation regarding passports. Furthermore, the local registrar of guns will certainly become a local czar.

● (1530)

There is another aspect of the bill that is not clear and which, presumably, will be dealt with by regulation. I refer to whether or not automatic shotguns or rifles will fall into the restricted class. I have said that fully half the rifles and shotguns that are now sold have an automatic capability, even though, generally speaking, for sporting purposes or bird and game shooting the number of shots that can be fired at any one time is a maximum of three. Many millions of these guns will not become restricted weapons.

Concern has been expressed by gun clubs, and members of clubs dedicated to shooting, that the new regulations will tend to put these clubs out of business. Even if the legislation does not do this, it will certainly make their life more complicated, and understandably they are quite upset and unhappy over this legislation. So often these people are community-minded and in most cases theirs is a worthy activity in society. Another group of individuals that seems to be hard hit by this law is the gun collectors who by and large, so far as I am aware, have not contributed to the crime statistics of this country in any way. Gun collecting seems to be a hobby with many people, a sort of link with the past, and in this day and age it is sometimes used as a hedge against inflation. I am told that the United Kingdom has reasonably sound regulations regarding people who collect guns as a hobby.

There has also been comment about the provisions of the bill removing the 90-day notification clause in regard to wiretapping, generally viewed as a serious infringement of personal rights. Also, in addition to the existing provision relating to search and seizure under the authority of a warrant, the following amendment is proposed to section 105(2):

Where, with respect to any person, a peace officer is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that it is not desirable in the interest of safety of that person, or of other persons, that that person should have in his possession, custody or control any firearm or other offensive weapon or any ammunition or explosive substance and that the danger to the safety of that person or other persons is such that to proceed by way of an application under subsection (1) would be impracticable, the peace officer may without warrant search for and seize any firearm or other offensive weapon or any ammunition or explosive substance in the possession, custody or control of that person.

This seems to be a very far reaching amendment and places in jeopardy the whole requirement that a warrant is necessary to search a home. The present limitation has been eliminated, namely, the assumption that an offence has been or is being committed as justification for entering premises other than a dwelling-house without a warrant. If approved, this amendment would provide blanket authority for any peace officer to enter any premises, including a dwelling-house, without a warrant, ostensibly to search for and seize firearms and ammunition. Hence, this gun legislation may well be opening up the way to a greater threat to civil liberties than generally thought. I think that this part of the bill contains extremely dangerous provisions and must be looked at very carefully. It seems to me that if this provision is accepted, any policeman who wanted an excuse to enter any building would now have one.

There are also many other interesting clauses in the bill; for example, the provision relating to the carrying of a weapon to a public meeting. Will the farmer who normally carries a weapon in his light truck be guilty of breaking the law when he attends, say, a 4-H club meeting? It would appear that he will. Again, the owner of a weapon who may have for some reason lent another person his gun will, it seems to me, incur severe penalties. I believe this point was made last night by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Daudlin). I suggest that a person who is normally a law-abiding citizen could incur such a penalty inadvertently.

If I may bring my remarks on gun control to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the view expressed by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, that cessation of the sale of firearms will not remove them from the hands of those who would do violence. This association came down heavily against gun registration as being unrealistic and administratively unworkable. It does not seem likely to me that an ownership licence will be any more effective than registering a gun. In fact, I think it would be less effective. An ownership would have to be renewed every five years, whereas presumably there is no need to re-register a gun unless the owner wants to sell or dispose of it.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that if the population at large has guns, more homicides will be inevitable. As I have pointed out previously, most murders are committed in the home and many of them would have occurred even without the licensing or registration of firearms. Only if all guns were prohibited would there be a satisfactory or significant drop in the number of gun murders. Various countries around the world, such as Sweden and Switzerland, have a high incidence of gun competence and gun ownership, and these countries are freer of crime than most other countries. In other words, there is nothing to indicate any correlation between the use of guns and the incidence of crime.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, may I reiterate my unhappy feeling about this omnibus bill that gun control has been introduced along with four or five other quite desirable amendments that would contribute, I believe substantially, to the fight against crime. I refer to the provisions relating to parole and those providing that provinces can institute crime inquiries, and so on. It is most important that the House allow the bill to go to committee, in accordance with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), so we can separate the very controversial gun control provisions from the rest of the bill which is generally desirable. In that way better legislation might eventuate. I am sure we will find that, as presently drafted, the legislation will be of no value whatever in curtailing homicides or crimes committed with the use of a gun. In effect, the bill will be detrimental to law-abiding citizens in this country.

Mr. John Roberts (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this proposed legislation in order to reply to one or two of the comments made from the other side of the House, to indicate one or two areas of concern I have about the proposed legislation and also to state my fundamental and strong support for the basic principles of the bill. It is important legislation, and I hope the House will quickly finish its work at this particular stage so we can get the bill to committee where suggestions for change can be made and considered.

The first argument I should like to comment on is one that is frequently made by members on the other side and which, indeed, has been made again by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie), namely, that controls do not work, that the attempt through this kind of legislative proposal to diminish deaths which take place through the use of a gun will not be effective. I would suggest to the hon. member that there is one relatively simple fact which throws doubt upon this argument. We know, for instance, that while controls applied to long-guns in Canada are similar to those in the United States, and the incidence of crime when using these guns is roughly parallel, there are much more rigorous controls in relation to hand-guns in Canada than in the United States.

● (1540)

As a result of these controls there is a rather dramatic difference in the possession of hand-guns in Canada and in the incidence of firearm incidents. I believe there are roughly 700,000 handguns in the possession of Canadians, while the number in the United States is 35 million—a ratio of 50 to 1 in comparison to the population, which is 10 to 1; and there is a much lower accident incidence in the use of hand-guns in Canada than in the United States. It is obvious that the stricter controls we have in Canada have been effective in persuading Canadians not to seek to hold hand-guns. Obviously, since 700,000 do hold them, those who feel a real, genuine need to have them do have them,

but those who have only a marginal need to have them in their possession, having to meet relatively difficult requirements, have decided not to do so. It seems clear to me from this one example that we have a situation in which gun controls have been effective in diminishing the number of guns within society and the number of incidents in which these guns have been used for violence.

The basis of the hon. member's argument—I hope I do him no injustice in paraphrasing it—is, basically, that if someone really wants to kill another person, he will do so whether he uses a gun or some other means. It may be that those who are determined to kill one of their fellow human beings will find a method for doing so. The fact is that the large number of deaths that occur in Canada as a result of gun use do not take place in situations where there is that degree of premeditation. There are accidental deaths in Canada—about 100 a year—and there are suicides in Canada of about 2,500 a year. There are a large number of deaths that take place, not in situations of great premeditation but as a result of family disputes, periods of passion and sudden anger. There are many deaths which occur because of the mental unbalance, perhaps temporary, of individuals who have access to guns and are able to use them without that kind of long, deep reflection which, say, an organized, contract killer might use.

I think it is significant that of the number of deaths which occur in Canada through the use of guns, about half stem from domestic, family incidents or incidents where close friends are involved, and not in situations where there is a long period of deep-seated determination to do away with another person. They occur in situations of passion that come upon a person suddenly who finds a gun available with which to execute the victim. That is the kind of death which these controls are likely to diminish.

Undoubtedly, murders will still take place in Canada. The fact, now, is that almost half the deaths that take place in Canada occur as a result of gun shootings. It is also the fact that the larger proportion of these could be avoided since they take place in situations of spontaneous passion or anger. This is the kind of incident to which this legislation is directed.

The hon. member for Dauphin cited the case of the automobile. I cannot understand his argument. He said, "Look at the automobile. A large number of deaths take place each year as a result of its use". Is he suggesting, therefore, that we should ban the use of the automobile? Then he dropped the argument at that point. Surely the relevant question is, would he seriously suggest that we do away with licensing of automobile drivers, and would we do away with licensing of automobiles in order to make sure they are in working order and are not a danger to those driving on our roads? Surely, he would not.

Surely, the parallel with automobiles is this: the automobile can be a dangerous instrument, and because it is a dangerous instrument we set tests for those who wish to use it to ensure that they are capable of using it wisely and properly, and we set tests to ensure that the mechanism of the automobile is safe to be on our highways. It is exactly that kind of test that we are proposing to impose in relation to guns, to ensure that those who wish to use them are licensed properly, and to ensure that they will be used safely and wisely and do not fall into the hands of those who may use them unwisely as a result of emotional disturbance, as a result of accidents or as a result of circumstances of passion that suddenly arise. This is exactly what we are applying. We are saying, here is an instrument that is capable of great danger and its use in our society should be controlled through regulation to make sure it is only the responsible who use them. That is what this legislation says.

I cannot, for the life of me, understand why members of the opposition are not able to accept that simple argument and support the principle of the legislation on these grounds. They may argue as they may wish in committee as to the details of how these regulations should be properly applied, but the principle is clear: an instrument dangerous to the person using it, and dangerous to the rest of society, should be hedged around with restrictions and controls that ensure as best we can that such instruments will be used prudently and sagely and not recklessly or irresponsibly.

I am anxious that this legislation should go before the committee. I share some of the concerns expressed by the other side that perhaps the provisions which relate to automatic weapons in the hands of collectors which would, under the proposals, become prohibited, may be too severe. We might, in committee, wish to look carefully at how we can enable collectors to maintain automatic weapons as a collection with the automatic weapon denatured, if you like, from its ability to cause damage. That is a matter which might well be considered in committee.

I should like to turn briefly to a rather different aspect of the legislation respecting which I wish to indicate to the House one or two concerns I have, in the hope that these concerns may result in changes the committee will decide to make. The first of these refers to clause 10 of the legislation which proposes to repeal section 178.23 of the Criminal Code. This is the section which ensures at present that notice will be given in 90 days to those who have been subjected to legally authorized wiretapping after the termination of the wiretap. The proposal in the legislation is to repeal that section so there will no longer be an onus upon police officers and those charged with the administration of justice to inform people who have been subject to wiretapping of what has taken place. I can understand some of the concerns the police may have, that in making a very serious investigation, when they are not able to produce immediate results or results in the short term, the provision as it now exists in the code will cause harm by alerting those people, who may very well be guilty of very serious offences, of the fact that they are under scrutiny and surveillance.

I think very few of us in this House would be happy to accept a proposal under which a police officer or member of a governmental administration would be able to open and examine the mail coming to a citizen's home, close it and send on the message, never even informing, if it were an acceptable practice at all, the individual that he was under this kind of surveillance. We in this House would not accept that. We would regard it as an overzealous intrusion into privacy no matter what the motivation by which it was undertaken.

I suggest the same principle applies to wiretapping. It is a very severe intrusion upon privacy, which I think most

of us would consider to be going too far. I would regret very much if we did not wish to ensure, through some sort of mechanism, that those who have been subject to such surveillance be made aware of it, particularly because I believe that without some sort of notice provision it would become much easier for illegal wiretaps to be conducted and not brought to the attention of the authorities.

It is my hope that the committee, when it is conducting its consideration, will look carefully at the proposition in clause 10 to repeal what I think is an important safeguard in the present legislation. It may be that the committee will be able to come up with other safeguards that meet my concern effectively. It may be the committee will decide to return to the original 90-day provision. It may be, for instance, that when applying to the judge, the judge could determine the period within which the citizen under surveillance must be informed of the fact. I suppose these questions of detail should not be disucssed at this stage, but I hope the committee will look very seriously into the concerns I have expressed.

● (1550)

With relation to the wiretapping provisions, my second concern is the proposal in clause 8 to amend section 178.16 of the Criminal Code. The effect of this amendment is to enable indirect evidence, found through an illegal wiretap, to be used in court cases. I can understand the frustration of police officers, coming across evidence which would establish clearly that a person has been guilty of great crime that that evidence is not admissible because it has been obtained as a result, not directly but as a result of further investigatory work, of information brought to their attention through an illegal wiretap. However, I do not see how one can get around the basic problem that if such evidence is to be admissible, it obviously provides an incentive to police authorities to engage in illegal wiretaps knowing that, at worst, the information they are able to collect through them would be available to the court and would be brought to bear against those they wish to prosecute.

There is no incentive in this provision to persuade police officers not to undertake that kind of illegal activity, and because of the nature of wiretapping it is extremely difficult for illegal wiretaps successfully to be brought to a conclusion. Perhaps hon. members could inform me of some, but I do not know of any prosecution or charge which has been made in relation to police officers using illegal wiretaps. I think it would be extremely difficult to bring such charges. Under those circumstances, I think we should do what we can to restrict the incentive for police officers to undertake illegal operations in a way which can lead directly to further information which will help them in the course of their work.

Perhaps I would say, parenthetically, that I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as an indication that I believe police forces regularly, or as a matter of course, undertake such illegal wiretaps. That is not my argument at all. I have great respect for our police forces. I have on occasion gone out with the police in Toronto in their work at night, and I have tremendous respect for them. That is not my point. My point is that I think it would be wrong to establish, through this legislation, any incentive which might encourage police officers to undertake illegal actions in the knowledge that such illegal actions might be helpful to them in the prosecution of their work.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: Those are my concerns, and I hold those concerns even though I support very strongly the principles of this legislation and wish to see them implemented. Therefore, I am hopeful that the House will finish its discussions at this stage as quickly as possible so we can get the matter into committee and consider some of these concerns and others raised by hon. members. I hope the committee will see fit to make some changes to take into account the kinds of concerns I have expressed. I hope we will be able to bring this legislation back into the House quickly, have it passed and operating effectively in order to assist in the provision of peace and security for the Canadian public.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, if hon. members of the House have listened to this debate, or if they listened to any of the discussions which have taken place in the House or in the committee which dealt with matters of justice in recent years, they would have heard calls for toughening up our laws and calls for dealing in a much more strict way with criminals who break the law. One cannot help being struck by the difference in views expressed by many members of parliament who are—and I recognize this—expressing the views of their constituents. However, le us compare those views with the views of every expert group, every expert committee and every expert commission which has been appointed by federal or provincial governments in recent years.

I have before me the latest report of the Law Reform Commission which was published just a week or ten days ago, entitled "Our Criminal Law". The Law Reform Commission is a very distinguished group headed by Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt of the Ontario Supreme Court. It has been studying the questions of criminal law for, I think, five years. I want to put on record just a couple of sentences from its report, as follows:

> In theory the law aims to promote humanity. In practice it is frequently itself inhuman. Canada, it has been shown, is one of the harshest western countries when it comes to use of prison sentences. Many of the terms imposed are too long, half the people in prison should never be there, and so many are in jail that those few needing real care and attention cannot get it. Indeed the whole system resembles a vast machines sucking people in one end, spewing them out the other and then sucking them back in again—a self-generating mechanism, certainly not a human process.

Then it says something which so many have said in this country, both in parliament and outside:

> For all the respect we pay to justice and equality, we still have one law for the rich and another for the poor.

Why is there this fundamental cleavage, not between do-gooders and the ordinary citizens but between experts such as those who served on the Law Reform Commission or those who served on an earlier committee headed by Mr. Justice Ouimet? Why that difference? It seems to me there are several reasons for that: first, because there has been in Canada, as in every other country, both in the eastern world and the western world, a sharp increase in crime in recent year; second, I think it is because every year or two the public reads a report from one of these commissions

with recommendations that we should have a different system, that we should have fewer people in jail, that we should have more probation and parole, and that we should segregate first offenders from hardened criminals. The public assumes that because the commissions have recommended these things, we have in fact done them, and that since we have done these things and since crime continues to increase, these recommendations have not worked and will not work. The public is misinformed; the public misunderstands. We have never done most of the things which have been recommended by these committees and commissions which governments have appointed.

Our prisons are overcrowded because our parole officers carry case loads which are so big that they cannot possibly do a good job or as a good a job as they should do in deciding who should get parole and who should not. We do not segregate first offenders who if they were not sent to jail would probably never commit a second crime. We have not really examined the problem of how to deal with the native people who are in our jails and who in western Canada at least make up substantially more than 50 per cent of the jail population. I think with regard to women the figure is probably over 60 per cent of the jail population. We have not really examined the reasons native people commit crimes for which they are sent to jail, almost all of which crimes are associated with the misuse of alcohol. We have not really thought through a method of dealing with native offenders as compared with white offenders who are in jail for entirely different reasons.

It is for all these reasons that our system is not working, and because our system is not working people are asking for tougher and tougher sentencing, which has not worked in the past and which will not work in the future. We need to change our whole approach, and in the two bills introduced—this one and the one dealing with capital punishment—there is no indication that the government has any real intention of changing its approach in a fundamental way other than just changing words and phrases. Because I believe that is so, I do not foresee any real reduction in the number of people who commit crimes and the number of people who will be sent to jail in the near future.

● (1600)

I want to spend some time dealing with two or three specific matters dealt with in this bill. First of all, there is the question of gun control. Let me begin by saying that I doubt if there is a member in the House who has had less experience in the use of guns than I have. So I make it clear that I do not speak as an expert. I speak because it is an important question, and because such a large number of my constituents have written, telephoned or seen me to discuss this matter, mostly to register their objection to the proposal which the government is making. I find it interesting that I am frequently advised by the people who speak to me on these two questions that I should vote for capital punishment—although I disagree with capital punishment—because 80 per cent or more of the people shown in the Gallup poll have been for capital punishment.

People who urge me to vote against the proposals to license guns do not tell me that 83 per cent of the people in the Gallup poll have indicated that they are for some form of gun registration. I will vote for this bill on second reading, and for the licensing of guns, although I believe a large number of questions must be answered in committee before I can be certain that I will vote for this measure on third reading. I will vote for it because I cannot help but be appalled by the large, continuing increase in the number of deaths and injuries as a result of the deliberate or accidential use of guns. Figures given to us in the material prepared by the government are pretty startling. Murders committed with firearms increased from 178 in 1970 to 272 in 1974. There are now probably 10 million long-guns such as rifles and shotguns in the possession of Canadian citizens. More and more guns have been used in the commission of violent crimes. I am appalled by those figures, and if licensing of guns will tend to reduce their use, I have to vote for this bill.

I listened very carefully to the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Roberts) who spoke before me. He put on the record some very interesting statistics showing that the number of deaths as the result of the use of hand-guns is very much lower in Canada than it is in the United States. He said that this was because—and I have to agree with him—for years we have required the registration of hand-guns and therefore we have a much smaller percentage of hand-guns in the possession of Canadian citizens than they have in the United States.

I will not repeat his statistics, but I want to put on the record the comments of the chief of police in Detroit whom I heard on a CBC radio program some ten years ago. Ten years ago Detroit was, as it is now, the murder city in the United States. There are more murders committed in Detroit in one year than there are in all of Canada. The chief of police said, during that radio interview some ten years ago, that thousands of people in Detroit are buying revolvers because they say they want to protect themselves and their families in case there is a race riot. He said that they had had very few race riots and even less deaths in Detroit, but people have the guns. What happens is that some Saturday night, two couples are playing bridge and have had too much to drink: the wife makes a particularly bad bid, and the husband—who in the old days, before he had a gun, might have reached over and hit her across the chin—gets angry, takes the gun and shoots and kills her. That is what is happening with the use of guns in Detroit.

We have avoided that in Canada, and I hope we can avoid it by what they have had in the United States, that is, by licensing guns which it is proposed should be licensed, and therefore cutting down on the use of guns, particularly the use of guns by people who have had no experience and who do not know how to use them. When I say that, I automatically exclude people who belong to game and fish clubs and people who belong to gun clubs. I am not worried about them, because they have had experience and training in the use of guns. Having said I intend to vote for the basic principle of this bill, and particularly this section, I want to raise a number of questions which I think are quite legitimate and have to be answered either in this debate or in committee before I can feel 100 per cent certain that I can vote for the bill on third reading.

I am thankful to the game and fish clubs and to the gun clubs which have raised questions and objections to this bill. Many of their objections and questions are quite legitimate—I will put some on the record—but many, I believe, are exaggerated and have been brought forward by

their misunderstanding and lack of knowledge of the bill. What are some of the questions being raised? I am concerned about the difficulties which native people, and indeed all people living in isolated areas of the Northwest Territories, northern Ontario, northern Quebec and northern British Columbia, will have in getting a licence. It will not be difficult—at least, it will be easy—for someone who lives in Winnipeg, Vancouver, Ottawa or Toronto to go to whoever is the licensing authority and get a licence, but for people who live 100 or 200 miles from the licensing authority, who may be an RCMP officer or some other appointee, I think it may be difficult. I want an explanation of how this system will work.

I see some difficulties, also, with the question of age. I am not concerned about the age of people living in the cities, because those who use guns do so largely for sport or recreation. But this law is not good enough for the people I have spoken about who live in the isolated and underdeveloped areas, farm people who have to live with various predators such as skunks, gophers and weasels. You cannot say that such person must be 16, 18 or over 14. I think we must have a good deal of discussion about this question.

I am also concerned about the question of guarantors. It may be easy to get two guarantors in a city, but I think that for somebody living on the edge of the Arctic ocean it may be difficult to get two guarantors. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of the cost of licensing. I am sure the minister will not be surprised to hear that I have discussed this question with the attorney general of Manitoba. He said, "Here is another illustration of Ottawa passing legislation which we will have to administer. We have had discussions with the police, and they estimate that in terms of manpower it will cost them $30 to $40 to get character references and issue a licence to an applicant." That is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker.

● (1610)

Before we vote on this bill, I think the minister should indicate what discussions his department has had with the provinces and who will be responsible for the costs, who will pay the bill. A farm family with three or four people likely to be using a gun would face a stiff licensing bill. At committee stage it is likely that some of my colleagues will put forward a suggestion that provision be made for a mandatory training program for all new applicants for licences, not those who already have a hunting licence or target-shooting licence. Wherever possible, such a mandatory training program should be made available under the auspices of fish and game or wildlife organizations. I intend to vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker, and for this provision but these are the questions that I believe still have to be asked.

I should like, now, to put on the record some of the criticisms advanced by FARO—the Firearms for Responsible Ownership organization. I have a document which was circulated at a large meeting in Winnipeg, and a reply prepared by the Department of the Attorney General. The latter document states on page 1:

> Everyone is responsible for his safe handling and storing of firearms and ammunition. If someone steals your gun and misuses it—you are responsible.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe this is the intention of the bill. I asked the Department of the Solicitor General for comments, and they sent me a seven-page written reply which I have forwarded to the interested parties. This reply is prepared by the co-ordinator of the working group on gun control, Mr. R. D. Gualtieri. The following is what he says on page 1:

> Responsibility for safe handling, storage, etc.—the proposed S.99(2) in the bill does not create criminal or civil liability of the owner for the misuse of a weapon by a thief. It simply makes the careless or unsafe use, carriage, handling or storage of a firearm or ammunition a criminal offence, for which an offender may be liable to up to five years' imprisonment.

I will not go over all the clauses, but the next one says that without a warrant the police can search your house and seize firearms and ammunition. Mr. Speaker, the bill does say that, but it has some very clear limitations. Here is the explanation provided for me which I want to put on the record, again quoting from the letter I received, page 2:

> Search and seizure without warrant—Under normal circumstances, police may search anyone or anywhere (except in a private house), and make seizures, only when they believe on reasonable grounds that a firearm-related offence is being, or has been, committed (S.103(1). In addition in cases of immediate or imminent danger to the safety of any person, police will be empowered to seize a weapon from the possession of a person, where it would be impractical to wait to apply for a warrant for this purpose (S.105(2). Both of these conditions must be met however. The bill does not, therefore, give unrestricted powers of search and seizure to the police, as suggested by FARO's summary.

I am sure that with my record in this House in regard to questions of police and justice no one would suspect that I would favour giving indiscriminate power to the police. I put this on the record to indicate that there are many questions which have been asked and not answered to the satisfaction of a large number of people in the country.

I now want to deal with the proposals with regard to dangerous offenders. When I read the material and listen to the speeches of the minister and compare them with the recommendations made in the Ouimet committee report of 1969, I have to say to the government that, while it seems to be following the committee recommendations to some extent, the committee's main recommendations with regard to the provision of adequate facilities and the need for study of things being done in this field have not been implemented. Let me put on record a few of the recommendations of the Ouimet committee. At page 257 the report reads:

> The committee recommends that the present habitual offender legislation and dangerous sexual offender legislation be repealed and replaced by dangerous offender legislation.

That is what we seem to be doing. At page 262 it says:

> The committee, therefore, recommends the passing of an indeterminate sentence upon persons found to be dangerous offenders, subject to the safeguards hereinafter discussed.

Again, the proposals before us seems to be directed to that end. At the bottom of page 262, this appears:

> The committee recommends that the proposed dangerous offender legislation, if enacted, provide in addition to an automatic yearly assessment and review by the Parole Board, that a person sentenced to preventive detention as a dangerous offender be entitled to have a hearing every three years before a superior, county or district court judge or judge of the court of sessions of the peace, for the purpose of determining whether he should be further detained or his sentence should be terminated if he has been released on parole.

Then page 264 of the report reads:

The committee recommends that government grants be made for research devoted to the development of new and improved methods for identifying and treating the dangerous offender.

At page 265 the report reads:

The committee recommends that further research be undertaken to determine the most appropriate way in which to deal with the persistent petty offender.

As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, most of these recommendations were not followed, and now we are starting again with insufficient knowledge of how to deal with the question. Our institutions are overcrowded. Some people who have worked in and with the institutions and regional centres, such as the one at Abbotsford, tell me the institutions are not working as they were intended to work. The original idea was to segregate special cases such as dangerous offenders. It was intended that prisoners sentenced to long terms for serious crimes could be sent to a centre like Abbotsford where they could receive treatment which, hopefully, would change them and keep them from committing such crimes in the future. But apparently, partly because of tremendous overcrowding, acute cases are being sent to Abbotsford, and I presume other centres, for short terms in order to get the kind of treatment which should be available to them in the institutions in which they are already incarcerated.

● (1620)

Because prisoners are sent to an institution a long way from home, away from friends and family, the chance of successful treatment is lessened. Also, because the staff turnover in institutions like Abbotsford is high, rehabilitation programs are not successful. We have not been successful because we have not studied the problem in the way the Ouimet committee suggested in 1969. Various royal commissions have studied this question. We now know that a certain percentage of prisoners, about 5 per cent, are hopeless cases. On release they will revert quickly to old habits and commite further crimes. If that is so, and I have no reason to doubt it, then instead of labelling these criminals as dangerous offenders and putting them away for a long time, why not recognize them for what they are, criminals incapable of change? Therefore, I submit we should build preventive detention centres where prisoners serving long sentences, say from 20 and 25 years, will be humanely treated during their incarceration. So far we have not done the necessary research and studies to enable us effectively to segregate dangerous from not dangerous offenders. So far our attempts to identify these people and sentence them accordingly have been inadequate.

Lastly, and briefly, let me talk about wiretapping. Obviously, the majority government now wants to do what it could not do as a minority government. In the last parliament, the then minister of justice, who is now Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), wanted to give the police the wide powers being proposed in this bill. He was unable to do it because New Democrats, Conservatives and even Liberals opposed him. I remember that the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and others were against the proposal, as were some government backbenchers who believe in civil liberties and the right of Canadians to privacy. Not even they could swallow the proposals of the then minister of justice. Now it is different. Now the government has a majority.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The Senate tried to do what the then minister of justice could not do.

Mr. Orlikow: As my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) reminds me, the Senate tried to do what the then minister of justice could not persuade the House of Commons to do. We let the Senate know it could not overrule the House of Commons. Now the government proposes, again, essentially what the then minister of justice proposed. The bill provides, first, that in certain circumstances the police shall be allowed to use, at trial, illegally obtained evidence; second, that persons whose conversations had been intercepted need not be notified of the surveillance during surveillance; and third, that the priod of surveillance is to be extended from the original proposal. We oppose this. There is no evidence showing the police lack powers to control crime. There is no evidence showing wiretapping is a successful tool. According to my information, evidence in only 18 of 550 authorized wiretapping cases was actually used at trial. By itself, wiretapping does not do the job and can be a dangerous weapon. I remind hon. members of the powerful testimony the former attorney general of the United States, Ramsay Clark, gave before the justice committee several years ago.

I shall now mention something that happened in my city a few weeks ago. The police and the provincial attorney general's department of my province had reason to believe that a certain judge in Winnipeg was doing things which were either illegal or improper. The police went to the attorney general for authorization to conduct electronic surveillance of that judge's conversations. They did this quite properly under the law. I am not criticizing the police. I note a Conservative member shaking his finger at me as if suggesting that I ought not to be saying these things. I tell him that I have discussed what I am about to say with the attorney general of Manitoba and have his permission to speak.

The attorney general signed the application giving permission to wiretap telephones at any address used by the particular judge under suspicion. As I say, the attorney general gave that authority. The police, who were not acting illegally, put the tap on the trunkline which went into the office of the particular judge whose conversations were to be wiretapped. Unfortunately, that telephone line was part of the trunkline serving two other judges. Under the present law, the police were required to notify the other two judges of the electronic surveillance. They learned that the police had listened to their telephone conversations, and lo and behold were annoyed, to say the least—even flabbergasted. One was so upset that he wanted to move his office, which I can well understand. He did not want anyone listening to his telephone conversations.

Wiretapping is a potent instrument and a dangerous tool. It should be used with great care only in exceptional circumstances. I presume we do not want the police to break the law. Surely we should encourage the police to obey the law and act in accordance with the law. Therefore, allowing the police to use illegally obtained evidence, or to wiretap indiscriminately, is a mistake. In all cases

involving surveillance of a citizen we should require the police to act honestly. I am not sure this new law will encourage them to act openly. It does not require the police to notify people that they are being surveyed while the surveillance is continuing; they are to be notified only at the conclusion. The previous intention of a limited period and immediate notification at the end of that period is being abandoned. We consider this to be a real danger to our civil liberties. We therefore intend to propose amendments on this and other clauses.

● (1630)

Having said that, I and most of our group if not all, will support this bill on second reading. In closing, I want to say that it is our intention to be very tough. We will ask all the questions which we believe need to be asked in connection with all clauses of this bill before agreeing to its passage at report stage or on third reading.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate on Bill C-83. I find it very amusing, listening to some members on the other side and members to my left. They go on at great length citing their misgivings and apprehensions about the bill, but still intend to vote in favour of it. I refer particularly to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) who has just resumed his seat. I hope that gun owners in his area read his speech. I am sure they will not be very impressed with the vigour with which he has pursued his argument on behalf of gun owners in Canada.

This bill touches on a number of sections of the Criminal Code. I want to deal primarily with the section pertaining to firearms and other offensive weapons. This has commonly been referred to as the gun control part of the legislation. It has precipitated the amendment advanced on behalf of our party by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). As my colleague stated in his remarks, this particular section of the bill dealing with gun control constitutes the major part of this legislation. There are very few other measures that have been brought before this House that have generated the type and volume of mail which this subject has.

In reading the mail, one finds that the criticism is harsh and the representations are numerous. It is only natural for a member of parliament such as myself, representing a constituency and having received many objections in the form of letters and conversations, to speak on this bill. There are serious misgivings and fears about this bill. I might say that the misgivings and fears advanced to me by my constituents are those which I happen to share. Quite frankly, I can speak on this subject matter in a very objective fashion. I do not own a gun, I have never owned a gun, and I do not ever intend to own a gun. I really have no axe to grind because of my position as a gun owner. I simply want to place on record some of the feelings which I share, feelings about which gun owners throughout Canada have become apprehensive.

Naturally, there are some obvious concerns in the mind of the public with regard to the ownership of guns, their handling, storage, safety, and so on. While there is a general disposition on the part of the public to demand some tightening up and the establishment of control and safety standards, in respect of this bill and to the extent it meets those objectives I must say categorically that I find this piece of legislation exceedingly harsh and very offensive.

I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North who stated we should have a separate debate on gun control and another debate on the assortment of other Criminal Code amendments. To the extent it has been possible under our rules of procedure, the hon. member for Calgary North has moved an amendment on behalf of our party which indeed contains the spirit and intent of that desire. I congratulate him on his motion and commend it to the House for support.

There are—and this is where many of us find ourselves in a bit of a dilemma—a number of provisions contained in Bill C-83 with which I am sympathetic, such as the sections which deal with dangerous offenders, parole, the special crime inquiry section and crime prevention. I think it is fair to say that we on this side of the House have been advocating some of these measures in response to the government in its constant erosion of our laws and the disregard for the obedience and respect of the laws of our land, and in general the over-all gentle stance which has characterized this government in its approach to dealing with crime and the criminal element.

The government now says it recognizes the need for some tightening up. It recognizes that the public is demanding measures which will improve their protection and security. However, in addressing itself to the problem, to a large extent the measures which are being advanced are victimizing the law-abiding and peace-loving citizens of this country. One might be able to accept that if we were convinced that it will indeed reduce crime and violence in this country, or if we could get at the root causes of crime and deal firmly and harshly with criminals and the criminal element in our society. However—and I am sorry to say this—I am not convinced that this piece of legislation will achieve that objective.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: This bill will do very little to deter the criminal. The section dealing with gun control is the government's response to the emotion and hysteria of a bewildered and frustrated society. It has addressed itself to that element, rather than engaging in a penetrating examination of the root causes of the chronic problem, that of violence in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: I submit we should be asking ourselves questions such as: What about the impact of television, the violence and filth that we see on our screens day after day and night after night? What about the dramatization and sensationalism of murder, robbing, mugging, rape and other violence on television? A recent survey conduct-

ed in the city of Edmonton revealed that more than 25 shows which were dished up on a weekend by Edmonton TV stations depicted violence.

An hon. Member: Not on the French channel.

Mr. Mazankowski: Maybe we should turn on the French channel. Is it not reasonable to assume that those who are emotionally disturbed, immature or very impressionable could be adversely affected by this professionally-packaged violence? Are not our school children prime targets for the glamour of violence? Another survey conducted in a Canadian city revealed that for 72 per cent of the students, in a general way crime had a major impact on their activities and, furthermore, they felt that crime and violence on our television screens should be reduced. The overwhelming majority have confirmed that.

What about the problem of alcohol in our society, and the problem of drugs? They are not mentioned in this piece of legislation. Surely these are integral components of the crime picture, but no mention is made of them in this bill, not even in the slick promotional propaganda which these two ministers have packaged for the Canadian public.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: We have been presented with a professional public relations document, and a vast number of the people in this country are simply not buying it. I might go further and say that a lot of the contents of the emotional material are little more than emotional fluff. Moreover, in my view the material is based on biased statistics.

● (1640)

What else is at issue? In the minds of many Canadians there is a genuine feeling of cynicism, a feeling of mistrust about the motive of the government and exactly where it intends to lead us.

Mr. Paproski: We are all worried.

Mr. Mazankowski: Law-abiding citizens are concerned that their rights and freedoms are being whittled away under the simplistic guise of peace and security measures. Why this overkill? Are there sinister motives? Many people are apprehensive. Many are asking this very question. The bill is introduced by a government which has adopted the stance of coddling the criminal. Now we are presented with a package of legislation which would suddenly transpose this attitude into a policy of dealing more harshly with criminals. The government is listening to public opinion in the area of gun control, but not in the area of capital punishment. It disregards the polls which have been taken throughout the country in that connection. There is a glaring inconsistency in the government's approach.

The public is not buying this legislation, and rightly so. The bill addresses itself, not to the criminal but to the law-abiding citizen. In my view, the government is, and will continue to be, an administration which extends its compassion, not to the victim but to the criminal. It is the victims of crime who are being punished by this government, not the criminals. It is the innocent, the law-abiding citizens who will be the victims of this bill.

What is the issue before Canadians today? It is the issue of law and order, and to the extent that this package of legislation addresses itself to peace and order I suggest it is a misnomer. We require positive steps to establish an environment which will create greater respect for the law. Looking at the bill before us, we have to ask ourselves: Will it result in a greater respect for the law? The answer to that question is "No". Indeed, I suggest it will do exactly the opposite.

The latest edition of the report of the Law Reform Commission has been quoted from on many occasions during this debate. Reading through it, one finds such phrases as "The more laws, the more offenders", and "Assembly lines of dime-store justice". On another page the report says "our picture of the criminal justice system bears little resemblance to reality". In my view, those phrases are an adequate description of the legislation before us.

Furthermore, I believe the application of this gun control legislation would be weighted unfairly against the rural population, against the youth of our country and against our native population. In this connection I should like to place on record a letter which was forwarded to the editor of the St. Paul *Journal* and appeared in the edition of March 24. I should like to quote a section of the letter which outlines the apprehensions felt by the Metis Association of Alberta. The letter is signed by the association's president, Mr. Ambrose J. Laboucane. It reads in part:

> This type of legislation violates our rights as native people and disregards the democratic process that we, the people of this country, are so proud of and fought so dearly for in two world wars.
>
> I personally feel our government is violating the God-given laws that have been effective for centuries.

I say, further, that the bill will not be enforced fairly in the case of the poor and the underprivileged. Again, we need only look at the document which was tabled here last week, "Our Criminal Law," to find confirmation of this impression.

> In practice, the penalty (for crimes) often depends not on the nature of the crime but on the person who commits it. Our prison population contains a quite unrepresentative proportion of poor, of disadvantaged and of native offenders. The richer you are, the better your chance of getting away with something. Is it that rich men make the laws and so what rich men do is not a crime but simply shrewd business practice? Or is it that position and wealth protect the rich against intervention?

I see the section on gun laws being enforced along lines which bear the least resistance. The easy targets will be those who are underprivileged and unfamiliar with the law. I see the prospect of harassment levelled against innocent people who are caught in the web of this law on legal technicalities because of the difficulty they find in adjusting and altering their sports and cultural habits in line with the imposition of this law, one which is based upon sheer lunacy. This is a form of "innocent guilt" which is unjust, unnecessary and inexpedient.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: There are areas where steps could legitimately be taken with respect to the use of firearms; for example, the development and administration of an

effective safety program, the development of high standards of proficiency among sportsmen and hunters. In these respects, legitimate sportsmen organizations throughout the country have never been recognized; their recommendations have never been acknowledged; they have not been consulted or requested to provide input into the legislation we are considering. Surely an effective safety program could be worked out jointly between the federal government and the provinces in consultation with gun clubs, hunters' groups and fish and game associations. If this legislation is to command the co-operation and support it will need in order to make work, the minister and the government will have to go to these people and work with them.

For years, fish and game associations across Canada have been asking for some of compulsory, hunter training program or for some form of selective screening process. This limited objective was rejected by provincial government on the basis that it was overly cumbersome and costly. The federal government now comes along and unilaterally imposes a universal licensing and/or registration program that will be cumbersome, costly and complicated.

● (1650)

As far as the use of an offensive weapon while committing an indictable offense is concerned, penalties should be severe and they should be enforced. There can be no doubt, so far as I am concerned, that the courts and enforcement agencies have been overly lenient in this particular area. A general tightening up with respect to the issuance of permits for restricted weapons and the broadening of the prohibited class is a step in the right direction, providing the laws are enforced. However, here again we see the powers that are granted to the governor in council as being overly excessive and broad.

So while we have some very serious misgivings about this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there are areas where the government could act, and act in a co-operative fashion, with the hunters, gun owners and sportsmen, and indeed with the provinces. However, to impose the universal licensing and/or registration program that is advanced in this bill is, to me, nothing more than overkill.

We have to ask ourselves this question, Mr. Speaker: Will this law be effective in reducing deaths caused by guns through accident, murder or suicide? I say the answer is "No". As a matter of fact, I think a fair case could be made for saying that if the Criminal Code as it now stands were properly enforced, it would perhaps do more to minimize death and injury caused by firearms than the draconian measures advanced in this legislation.

For example, we have in this country a registration and licensing program for the owners of hand guns. The statistics that have been provided by the minister relating to gun control indicate that as of February, 1976, some 644,481 hand guns were registered and that some 50,000 hand guns were probably in circulation which were not registered. It is interesting to note that in spite of this provision—something that this bill sets out to do for all guns—the incidence of murder involving the use of hand guns has increased by 115 per cent over the past five years. That is a record which is clearly indicated on page 14 of the report.

Further, Mr. Speaker, one notes that armed robbery involving the use of hand guns has increased by 65 per cent over the last five years in Canada—two robberies out of three involve the use of hand guns—while armed robbery involving the use of long-guns has increased by only 17 per cent. What this means is that in spite of the registration and licensing provisions, the incidence of murder is increasing dramatically and the incidence of armed robbery has increased dramatically over the past five years.

So we have to ask ourselves: Why, then, are we imposing a licensing and/or registration system on the owners of long-guns in Canada? Why are they made the scapegoats? Where are the statistics to prove that the licensing and/or registration of shotguns and rifles will reduce murders and robberies in this country?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might ask the hon. member a question. He asked how registration of long guns would have some effect. I would be delighted if he could point out to me any provision in the bill that proposes the registration of long guns and rifles.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the minister asked that question. Section 106(1) is very broad in nature. By government order in council, the powers can be extended to require registration of all guns. I appreciate the fact that the minister is listening to me, but I did expressly say in my comments the licensing and/or registration provisions, and I used that option.

Let me move on to suicides, where the same thing applies. These figures are bandied around in the packaging and merchandising of this gun control legislation, but is the minister really saying that by imposing a licensing and/or registration system for all firearms we are going to reduce the suicide rate in this country? He cannot seriously defend this legislation on that ground. If so, let him bring forth the statistics. If it can be proven to me that by imposing a licensing and/or registration system for all guns he could have saved one or more of the 1,021 lives lost through suicide committed by using a gun, we might be sympathetic and go along with his argument. I believe that by using the suicide statistics in trying to sell this package, the whole question of gun control becomes distorted, cloudy and confused. I submit that suicide has very little relevance to gun control as it applies to the licensing provisions.

Before this debate is concluded, Mr. Speaker, I should like the minister to prove unequivocally that licensing as proposed in this bill will either prevent or impede crimes of murder, robbery or any other form of violent crime involving the use of a firearm. I challenge him to prove to the Canadian people that guns will be kept out of the hands of criminals under the provisions of this legislation. I have yet to see any statistical proof, any projection at all, that does in fact lend some credence to this proposition.

Many members have cited statistics relating to other states and countries. The city of New York, for example, possesses some of the most restrictive firearms legislation on the North American continent, yet has one of the highest crime rates. It has been proven conclusively that registration is an expensive government exercise in futility. In Massachusetts, harsh gun law have been adopted which have proven useless in reducing crime. The Washington

Post described the statute as the toughest gun control law in the nation which mandates an automatic one-year prison sentence for carrying a hand-gun without a licence, but says, however, that it has had little effect.

I could cite other statistics. But surely the minister and his colleagues are not so naive as to visualize criminals licensing and registering their weapons before committing a felony. The only people who will comply with this law are the law-abiding citizens of this nation, the very people for whom this legislation is totally and absolutely unnecessary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: There are better ways of getting to the core of the criminal problem than using a sledgehammer on the innocent, law-abiding gun owner of this country. Surely the hunters, target-shooters and gun collectors are not criminals, Mr. Speaker. If we dealt with our killers and criminals in a firm, harsh way, it would be the first positive step in stemming the tide of rising murder and violence. The law dealing with those who have threatened violence or use violence in a criminal act requires tightening up and firmer enforcement, and to that extent I welcome the provisions of this bill. The legitimate gun owner, in this particular case, should not be made the scapegoat.

It seems to me that quite a public relations job is being done here. The government has utilized a kid-glove policy in dealing with the criminal element in this country, and it now attempts to take it out on the legitimate gun owner. It has responded to the emotions of hysteria in relation to some dramatic episodes that have taken place in the last year or so. Had these episodes not involved the use of guns, they may have involved the use of some other weapon such as a bomb. My view is that if a person is bound to kill or has an absolute desire to kill, he will kill in one way or another, whether it be with a gun, a bomb, a sledgehammer, a knife or the fist. That is the core of the problem, and that is the problem to which this bill fails to address itself.

● (1700)

Having regard to accidental shootings, surely there is some need for improvement in this area such as by upgrading educational safety programs. I endorse that, as I endorse the idea of a uniform, countrywide mechanism for the training and testing of individuals in safe gun-handling practices. This should be mandatory, but it is not referred to in this bill and there is nothing in the bill that suggests this will be done. I repeat that what we need is stricter enforcement of existing laws, and less coddling of criminals. Stricter gun laws will not cut crime, but proper enforcement of existing laws will.

Let me deal now for a few minutes with the legislation as it relates to civil rights. The legislation itself constitutes a further encroachment upon the basic individual rights and civil liberties of Canadians. This has been the hallmark of this administration. We have had a form of press censorship, which was debated in the House in the last month or so. We have had a wage and price control program which started out to be selective and has now become universal, with the threat of becoming permanent. We have seen a move away from the free market economy. We have more and more government intervention, more regimentation, more inspectors and more statistics. We have growing confrontation between business and government, government and labour, and we have an increasing tendency toward individual Canadians becoming numbers rather than individuals. We have more licences, more permits, more bureaucracy, and more cost. We are told that the gun registration program in New York costs roughly $100 per person.

An hon. Member: Where did you find that?

Mr. Mazankowski: Those are the statistics. The way this government accelerates its spending, it will probably be more than that here. Civil liberties and individual rights can no longer be policies of the federal Liberal party. A lifelong Liberal, namely, Don Klein of Edmonton—and we have one or two in Alberta—wrote in the Edmonton *Journal* as follows:

> Such legislation is not gun control. It is people control, and an invasion of civil liberties directed only at law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Sharp: Just like the licensing of the automobile.

Mr. Mazankowski: We can go into that during another safety debate. Mr. Klein goes on to state:

> This endless barrage of useless legislation such as the proposed gun controls, which we are faced with every day of our lives, is breeding a profound disrespect for the law in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Another man, Mr. E. L. Willson from Tofield, Alberta—I am not sure what his political persuasion is—writes the following—

An hon. Member: And where is that?

Mr. Mazankowski: If you would get out to that great province, I could take you around and show you where Tofield is. Mr. Willson writes:

> It is my unshakeable belief that if this restrictive piece of gun legislation is enacted the government of Canada will have
>
> 1) Created in one stroke the most expensive and unenforceable law ever written into the books
>
> 2) Created a monstrous new society of criminals (former law-abiding citizens who would balk at unfair legislation)
>
> 3) Made a giant step towards the creation of a totalitarian state, after all what easier country to take over than a disarmed one.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been described in various ways. It has been referred to as misleading, ludicrous, useless, irritating, senseless, asinine, pitiful, expensive, stunning, and worthless. Those are not my adjectives; they are an assortment of descriptions I have collected from a number of articles appearing in the press on this subject. I submit to you that all these descriptions are suitable and adequate.

This piece of legislation will create a massive bureaucratic network for the government, the police, the dealer and the public. It will cost millions of dollars to administer, but will do nothing to curb crime and violence. Edmonton city police staff inspector Mitchell has said that Canada's gun laws are already stringent and that our law books are already full of such statutes. He states:

> We are taking guns away from people every day and the next day they are back on the street, they are treated too damn lenient.

He goes on to state, as to people being compelled to safeguard guns, that all these safeguards do is to stop an honest man. The crook will get at the guns even if they are chained down in the house. I think that drives home the point very dramatically—and this is what a staff inspector of one of our major police forces in Canada had to say. As far as the requirement of a licence to continue ownership of the privately owned six million long-runs in Canada is concerned, it will do nothing to prevent their use by criminals. Section 106.1, to which I referred in answer to the minister, places in the hands of petty officials broad arbitrary powers. The imposition of regulations to provide such additional information and documentation at the whim of the local registrar can only result in undue harassment. The fees for licensing can be exorbitant, given the intended principle of self-financing of the bureaucracy. We can see that a prohibitive licence fee could be tantamount to an outright prohibition of firearms to the average person. We will end up with only the rich being able to afford the luxury of owning a gun.

The broad scope of powers granted to the governor in council is not clearly defined to prevent back door regulations which could prescribe total gun registration and alter restricted classes of weapons to the prohibited class. This is possible under the broad, sweeping powers granted under this bill to the governor in council. The interpretation of "ammunition" is so broad as to include anything from a lead fishing-weight to a spent cartridge to an atom bomb. Surely that has to be an asinine description. If it is possible for me to drive down the street in my automobile with a spent cartridge in my car and subjected to being charged under this law, surely this bill is overextending in its powers.

The sections dealing with legal responsibility arising from the handling and storage of firearms is something else not clearly defined. Whose judgment will be used, and what constitutes a "careless manner" or "reasonable precaution"? Will this interpretation be left to the regulations, or will it be left to the discretion of the police officer? The same thing applies to section 101.

● (1710)

I think the appeal procedures are overly complex and do not really constitute an effective procedure. I believe that the major thrust of any firearms legislation should address itself to two things: first, to restricting the use of firearms by criminals; second, to developing proficiency standards which will ensure the safe handling of firearms by good citizens in order to prevent harm and injury to themselves as well as to their fellow citizens. This bill fails to include training, testing and certification. It fails to include any sort of proficiency or competence test. Therefore, one can only assume that this bill represents something less than a genuine desire to get at the real root of the problem but is content to mislead the public into believing that severe regulations and restrictions imposed upon gun owners will.

The gun legislation, as it is drawn up, is the product of a government removed from reality, perhaps assisted and abetted by idealistic philosophies of overeducated bureaucrats who insist on imposing their views and solutions upon what they see as an uninformed and irrational public. This condescending approach does not serve the purpose of curbing crime and violence. As a matter of fact, it does not serve the best interests of society. If it is the sincere wish of this government to curb crime and violence, then I submit it should reconsider the proposals in this gun legislation and withdraw them or send this bill to committee for study before proceeding with second reading. That is the thrust of our motion and I support it as wholeheartedly and vigorously as I possibly can.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier).

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I must say at the beginning that it is very nice to see you back in the chair. Since I first came into the House of Commons I have always had great respect for the way in which you have handled yourself and for the patience and fairness you have shown. For these attributes, I think this House owes you a great deal of thanks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, obviously we are at the second reading stage and we are studying the principle enunciated in Bill C-83, an Act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime.

Until now, the debate has given rise to many comments from concerned organizations particularly about some clauses of the bill and it has also allowed many hon. members to give their point of view.

I receive—and I suppose that goes for many members as well—comments from my constituents and organizations concerned about gun control. The provisions of Bill C-83 are aimed indeed at eliminating those who would misuse guns and at controlling the availability of guns without unfairly prejudicing the legitimate use of guns for hunting or other sports. Those provisions are also aimed at applying severe standards governing the safe and proper use of those guns. They are mainly aimed at diminishing the use of guns in criminal acts by imposing more severe and new penalties.

So it is important that all groups concerned be heard before the House pass this legislation. It is at the committee stage, Mr. Speaker, when this bill will be studied in depth, that associations, organizations and individuals will make an important contribution. They will be able to voice their reservations and offer positive suggestions concerning amendments.

[*English*]

When the bill is studied in committee we can hear some of these organizations, such as the Ontario Arms Collectors' Association, the National Firearms Association, L'Association de tir de Québec, the Firearms and Responsible Ownership Group, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, and many other groups from which I have received representations. We should seek the full co-operation of all these organizations and all levels of government in establishing rules and regulations with regard to gun control. It is, therefore, very important, if we are to reach consensus,

that this bill be given second reading as soon as possible and sent to the committee for study and possible amendment.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to inform the House that it has not been possible to reach an agreement under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or 75B in respect of proceedings at the second reading stage of Bill C-83, an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime which is now under discussion. I therefore give notice of my intention to propose, at the next sitting of the House, a motion pursuant to Standing Order 75C for the purpose of allocating four further days for the consideration and disposal of proceedings on that stage of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

An hon. Member: You are afraid of your own shadow, and afraid of your own legislation.

An hon. Member: It won't stand up to public scrutiny.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. The hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) has the floor. The last minute or so will not be counted against his time.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I am always astounded at the word "Shame" which is pronounced by members of the opposition with big smiles on their faces. They smile and yell "Shame". I wonder how serious they are.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I should like to have the amendments put into this bill, but hon. members opposite do not want the amendments put in because they do not want to go into committee.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Taking for granted, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues have all read Bill C-83 and knowing already that my constituents have received the documentation I sent them concerning the public order and security program, I will not deal with the subject as a whole since its factors or components are well known and largely publicized. I will rather emphasize an important element which is not included in the explanatory notes on the program, in the part dealing with the prevention of crime.

The basic principle of the amendment I would like to see examined by the committee would be to prevent any broadcaster from airing before 9 o'clock p.m. any program likely to promote, glorify or justify the use of firearms to settle conflicts. The previous speaker, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) talked about violence on television. It is that matter, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to discuss.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the Canadian society, through its representatives, wants to take the necessary measures to get better protection against perpetrators of violent and other crimes, in so far as protection against crime requires by its very nature that we identify all the measures to be taken to prevent a rise in crime.

One of these factors has not been mentioned, in spite of the undeniable and increasing impact of its social import in our modern society. I refer to television or, in other words, to the daily presence of violence in every Canadian's life and particularly in the education of our youth. This problem is a very important one with which we must come to grips if we really want to prevent recurrence of violence which is often an underlying aspect of television programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a few comments from a speech delivered by Dr. Northrop Frye of the CRTC about violence in general. This is what he said:

[*English*]

I am somewhat disturbed by the fact that the opposite of violence seems always to be non-violence, as though violence was a positive thing and we had nothing to put against it except a negation. Wherever there is one human being there is a very considerable output of mental and physical energy, and wherever there is more than one human being those energies are going to conflict. It seems to me that violence, as we have been using the word here, is misapplied energy. It is to energy what prostitution is to sexual love. As such, it really is a negative force, and controlling violence would be the way to set human energy free for its proper tasks. I quote the following:

● (1720)

Controlling violence means, first of all, raising the level of society. The people who produce and sell socially irresponsible programs are thinking of their viewers as a mob rather than a community. The mob is the lowest form of community: it is a completely homogeneous society organized for hatred, and will not remain a mob long unless it can find someone to beat up, or, failing that, something to smash. When a television program depicts someone being slowly beaten to death, the primary appeal is: "Look at this: isn't fun?" As soon as anyone begins to object that this may be a wrong kind of fun, the violence is immediately rationalized, and turns self-righteous. All rationalized violence has much the same argument, the argument behind all fights on school playgrounds is: he started it. That is, whenever violence is rationalized it is asserted to be counterviolence. Somebody else did something first, and we have to resist it. That is true of the violence of capital punishment; it is true of the violence of Palestinian terrorists. Fictional violence, however, may be rationalized more simply as a refusal to take a positive attitude in a violent world: for example, this is what we're all involved in, whether we like it or not, etc. But the real reason is simply lack of imagination: depicting violence is easy, quick, and profitable. It is easy partly because violence is a mechanical form of human energy: so mechanical that it can even be quantified or classified as "heavy" or "light". As a mechanical cause producing a mechanical response, violence never accomplishes anything: the pendulum of aggression and counteraggression simply goes on swinging all through history.

[*Translation*]

This quotation from a speech by Dr. Frye with which I agree, is a brief summary of an overall problem. In dictionaries, violence is defined as "intense force". No one would deny that when we use our most developed senses, hearing and sight, we are subject to television and no one would deny the importance and power of this media. Let us not be mistaken about my purpose here.

I do not pass judgement on television as such, but on a significant proportion of its contents. In so doing, I speak for every Canadian who clearly blamed that kind of program for the surge of violence, a radical one to say the least. In the context of a gallup poll, Canadian pollsters ask Canadians to indicate the cause of the increasing rate of crime and violence among six possible factors. Fifty-four per cent of Canadians said television was the third most important cause.

Most human social behaviours are learned through observation and imitation. Because television is vivacious, true to type and ubiquitous, we may conclude that adults as much as children model themselves on behaviours they see on television. Indeed, a recent study by American sociologists showed that the greater the number of violent television programs a child sees, the more aggressive he can be expected to be. It is felt that a teenager just out of highschool will have watched television for 15,000 hours, during which he will have witnessed 31,000 murders. These figures are not far-fetched. They were gathered in the course of a study by Dr. Katz, a psychiatrist, which was published at the 25th Canadian Psychiatrist Conventions held in October of 1975.

Violence on television has sometimes been rationalized in the name of morals and nothing less, on the grounds that the bad boy is punished for his misdeeds. The result is nonetheless that violence is depicted as a solution to problems.

During the summer of 1974, the CRTC Research Branch surveyed 55 entertainment programs broadcast by two Canadian TV stations. A total 108 violent episodes were reported in a 36-hour screening period, a frequency of three murders per hour. Significantly, the great majority of programs and violent acts telecasted were American production.

This is the crucial point: The influence of American culture, which is evident with the multitude of television stations brought in by cable, constitutes a threat for us. The economic factor is greatly responsible for this situation. It seems that programs bought outside Canada subsidize the production of Canadian programs by commercial networks. For instance, series like Mannix, Cannon and Kojak are bought by the American network at a cost of $250,000 per program, while Canadian broadcasters—and all other foreign buyers—can purchase the same series for as little as $5,000, which constitutes a certain monetary advantage.

So-called violent programs are mostly imported from the United States, as I said earlier. If we classify all half-hour segments of television programs shown in Toronto according to their country of origin, and the category violent, non-violent, sports and news, we see that 34 per cent of programs of all origins are violent and that most of them, or 68 per cent, come from the United States. Forty-seven per cent of American programs contain some violence compared with only 3 per cent of Canadian programs. The dramatic series shown on American television are oriented towards crime and violence. This choice of programs is therefore deliberate.

All this suggests, Mr. Speaker, that television can have a negative cumulative effect. It makes the population more concerned about the dangers of society than real life conditions would justify. Such programs constitute the greatest of all threats against human dignity and the respect of life itself.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this House and the committee have to seriously consider the possibility of restricting the viewing of violent programs where firearms are used to solve conflicts during so-called family hours.

My aim is to awaken public opinion to the constant threat of television programs where violence is in some way made prestigious and justifiable, and we must stop promoting this misconception in a civilized society.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I shall have the opportunity to present my amendment properly to the committee and during the report stage of the bill.

[*English*]

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, before I open my remarks on the bill I want to say how shocked I am and how shocked is, I am sure, the whole House at the recent announcement of the government House leader invoking closure on this important matter which we are debating, a matter which is vital to every Canadian citizen and which affects the liberties of all Canadians. I am shocked and surprised at the announcement.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

An hon. Member: They want to muzzle parliament.

An hon. Member: They are muzzling the Canadian people.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Surely it must have been authorized by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I do not know why the government is in such a hurry and is proposing to slough off and ignore these important items which we are putting forward in defence of the liberty and rights of most Canadian citizens.

I should like to open my remarks on Bill C-83 by congratulating my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko) on the excellent speech he made over a week ago tonight. Both he and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who spoke on the following Monday, have effectively stripped this bill of any semblance it might have had to what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) called the government's major legislative initiative. I give my unqualified support to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North to have the gun control legislation separated from the totally unrelated material in the rest of this bill.

● (1730)

As the hon. member for Edmonton East pointed out, many of us could be placed in the position of voting against the bill in order to vote against a particular part of it. This is grossly unfair, Mr. Speaker—not only grossly unfair to members who hold those opinions but also to their constituents.

I wonder if the Minister of Justice really believes that there are people who are so naive as to suppose that guns leap out of their cases, load themselves, then rush out and commit crimes. It is not so, but that is what we are

expected to believe if we accept the minister's rationale that the way to deal with gun-related crimes is to licence all law-abiding Canadian gun owners. In the game of credibility, the minister is batting zero.

It has been pointed out over the years and in the last few days in this House that guns do not go out and commit murders. People commit murders. Short of setting up a communist state in Canada, there is no way we can legislate against free movement and free activity. As long as we preserve the degree of liberty and freedom we enjoy in Canada, people will be free to move about and commit acts both legal and illegal, sad to say. In communist countries, governments legislate what people may own, what they can do and where they can go; yet communist states are not free of crime. Do we have to go so far abroad to find support for the thesis that crime cannot be eliminated simply by restricting the rights of the innocent? I should think anyone of average intelligence would work that out in his or her own mind without the need to do any more than just think.

In this legislation on gun control, the Minister of Justice, in effect, tells us he has six criminals, figuratively speaking, ans six law-abiding citizens, so naturally he has a round dozen of something or other. The fact is that he does not have a dozen of anything, Mr. Speaker. He has six people of a type that we should be seeking in this legislation to control, and six people of a type who should be left strictly alone. Six apples and six oranges do not make a dozen of either apples or aranges, and I hope that we will not delay too long in separating this bill into its pertinent parts.

I wonder just how much more control over personal rights and freedoms the Canadian people will accept before they rebel. It might be that the gun controls proposed in this bill will push the average Canadian over the line. No doubt some people of uneven temper and certain mental make-up will be pushed over the line as a result of the legislation. I happen to believe that even if we were to spend the millions of dollars it would cost to register all gun owners in Canada, we would not be certain of whether we had in fact registered all gun owners, three-quarters of them or even just half of them.

Experience that other countries have had with gun registration—and that goes for both pistols and long-guns—is that there are eventually more unregistered guns in a given city or country after a time than there are registered guns. In North America, particularly, people have traditionally felt that they had a right to own shotguns and rifles. On this half-continent our whole history and economy is founded on the historic traditional and sensible use of firearms. That is why, today, in millions of Canadian homes there are firearms belonging to the family. They are not used very often, but families have a historic right to them. In the United States they have the right to own long-guns enshrined in their constitution. It is difficult, if not impossible, to convince people in Canada that they should accept gun controls because the federal government has this hang-up about limiting and restricting civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought for a minute that we could fight crime in Canada by forcing law-abiding people to line up and register as gun owners, dog owners, budgie owners, or any other hobbyists, then I would have to give it a try. I am just as interested as anyone else in controlling violent crime in Canada, and if I match my record of public statements against those of the Minister of Justice and the Sollicitor General (Mr. Allmand), then I have to say that I am more interested in combating crime than they are.

However, unlike those ministers, I do not propose to combat crime by chipping away at the rights and privileges of the victims of crime and the potential victims of crime while ignoring those at whom this kind of legislation should be directed. It would help a lot in our anti-crime campaign—if it can be called by that name—if we could get just a little help from the ministers across the floor. It would help a great deal if the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General would stop wringing their hands and sobbing over the fate of some poor fellow who happens to be found guilty of a vicious and senseless murder.

I have repeated over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that my sympathies are with the law-abiding citizen and with the victims of crime. When we have a federal minister who opens a speech on a bill designed to control crime with the statement that the bill seeks to protect the rights and dignity of those charged with offences, then I feel inclined to reserve my sympathies for the victims. The rights and dignity of those charged with offences are already protected by legislation existing since the time of confederation. We certainly want to defend those rights, but that is not our paramount concern at this time. The minister's statement at least ran true to form, because we find the minister saying later in his speech that these gun control proposals will assist the government's efforts to control gun-related crimes.

The member for Edmonton East related a few instances of how the rights and privileges of Canadians are steadily being eroded by this government's succession of controls—controls over the economy, controls over the incomes of working people by way of oppressive taxation, the abolition of the right of inheritance, and control of communications. What about the necessity and the right of people in some occupations and exposures to carry a gun, usually a hand-gun? This right, history has shown, has always existed, and it is our duty to see that it is maintained. A licence for use by this section of the law-abiding public should always be available. I will list two or three categories, and I am sure members have others in mind. Some of these categories are: women on late night duty should be able to carry a gun if they wish; nurses and others having to traverse areas not having full-time police surveillance during early morning hours; and messengers and people who carry considerable sums of money in unprotected regions and areas. A licence to carry a gun for these reasons is often the best form of crime prevention.

I will give an example in my own family. It took place long before I was born, but I will always remember the story as told to me years ago by an uncle, R. W. Kimmerly of Napanee who passed to his reward in 1951 at the age of 95. He was engaged as a young man in about 1880 to peddle goods and merchandise. He used a covered wagon and travelled northward out of Deseronto, Ontario, for the Rathbun Company, a large lumber and timber complex of that era. He was badly scared and roughed up one night in a hotel yard in one of the villages along the way, but with help he managed to defend his wagon against the hood-

lums who were bent on stealing his goods. Before he began his next trip northward he bought a licence to carry a hand-gun and bought a gun and shoulder holster. When he arrived back at the same village and stopped for the night at the same hotel, he made sure to tell the proprietor that he was now carrying a weapon, and showed him his licence. Word was circulated by the proprietor, and from that time forward the local wild boys ceased their violent antics and treated my uncle with the deepest respect. He had no more trouble; he never had to fire the gun and he never used it. The moral of that old, true story of 1880 holds true today. Outlaws respect one thing only: the naked power of right, rigidly reinforced by a potent deterrent.

● (1740)

Every time this government is engaged in devious activity, or when it finds itself in an impasse over some boondoggle like this attempt to fight crime by impinging on the few rights left to Canadians, the Prime Minister creates a new diversion. Taking this government on past performance, Mr. Speaker, we must assume, when debating these gun control proposals, that this is only the beginning. When the bureaucracy needed to administer this law is in place, we can expect some further action with respect to gun owners. The Minister of Justice knows full well that you do not fight crime by taking away the rights and privileges of law-abiding citizens. Even if we only asume that the minister is an intelligent man, we must assume that he is party to a plan that is broader and more encompassing than the provisions in this legislative proposal.

It has already been pointed out that, like all other legislation pushed through this House by the present government, this bill in its present form is open-ended enough to allow for extension and expansion without end. It has been estimated that it will take at least 6,000 man-years of labour to conduct an initial registration of gun owners in Canada and the cost could run into millions. We have found through bitter experience that this government exceeds all estimates by four or five times and even more.

What is to happen to the bureaucracy after the registration has been accomplished? Again, our experience has shown that these bureaucracies, these temporary agencies remain in place, intact. In fact, like ill-starred Information Canada, it grows and grows with nothing meaningful to do and doing nothing meaningful. With nothing to do, the gun agency will be seeking things to do with its personnel, its time and its power. If my fears are realized, this agency will become even more restrictive. The big bosses in Ottawa will surely find some ways to further harass the law-abiding gun owners. They will have to justify their existence and protect their jobs.

Much has been said about how much the fee should be for gun owners to register their guns. If it gets to that point, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there should not be any fee. Gun owners are being asked to come forward voluntarily to register and tell the bureaucrats how many guns they own. I own three guns, but do not use them any more. Once I was an ardent hunter. I keep the three guns at home. I think they are serviceable. I do not mind registering them, but that is as far as I want to go.

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

Since the Minister of Justice cannot show how this proposed law could play any part in helping to control gun-related crime, there should not be any fee for registering. In these days of efficient computers, surely one computer could efficiently register all the serial numbers and makes of the millions of guns in this country. The process would not be costly and would not need a large bureaucracy. Why not take advantage of the computer age? As it is, the government wants to put another burden on the backs of Canadians. The fee will be just another imposition on top of a totally unnecessary and uncalled for restriction. I say to the Prime Minister, give us free registration.

Before I conclude my remarks on the gun control section of this bill I would like to say that it is already an offence under the Criminal Code to own an automatic weapon, a sawed-off rifle, shotgun or unregistered pistol. I suggest that what we need instead of restrictions on law-abiding, long-gun owners, is more severe minimum sentences for those convicted of possessing and using these restricted or prohibited weapons. Some judges today are inclined to apply the slap on the wrist in these cases rather than to impose a deterrent sentence. Perhaps we should demand minimum sentences in some cases.

As I said before, I deplore the restriction by closure which will limit our time for debating this bill. When the bill is in committee, I hope the necessary amendments will be moved so that we can improve the bill and make it more satisfactory and fair to all Canadians.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, before beginning my main comments on the second reading of Bill C-83, may I commend my House leader for showing the essential leadership needed if parliament is to survive as a useful institution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Paproski: You will live to regret it.

Mr. Martin: After the motion has been put we shall debate for the bill for four more days, which will give more than enough time for members on all sides to make their contributions. It is important to send the bill to committee soon. In committee it will be examined by members of parliament and we may hear contributions from such members of the public as may wish to appear.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What guarantee is there that you will not impose closure in committee?

Mr. Paproski: You are lucky you can speak today.

Mr. Martin: So far, the discussion on this bill has centred mainly on the two aspects of gun control and wiretapping. Bear in mind, this bill is far more extensive than that and covers much more than those two subjects. Indeed, it is useful to remind hon. members of the title of the bill, an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime. The bill encompasses some 73 pages and contains many important clauses. It is, therefore, a mistake for hon. members to suggest that the bill deals mainly with guns and wiretapping. It is an all-encompassing bill and must be so considered.

As was mentioned in the debate by way of background, it is easier to maintain control than regain it. This bill is designed to amend the criminal law, improve this country's administration of criminal justice, come to grips with the increasing incidence of crime in Canadian society, and provide the public with the greater measure of protection which it wants.

● (1750)

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to discuss the aspects of gun control. This was the first matter that was brought to my attention by a constituent after my arrival in Ottawa as a new member of parliament in the summer of 1974. The first item brought to my attention was, indeed, from a constituent who was most concerned about the freedom with which guns could be acquired in this country. I was asked to inform him what was happening in connection with a bill which was referred to as Senator Cameron's bill.

One of my first priorities on arriving here was not to try and find out specific information on a specific bill: however, on doing some research on it, it became evident that this particular senator had put forward, in two or three parliaments, a bill dealing with the subject of gun control. It had gone into committee at least twice and had died because of sessions ending or parliament being prorogued. My understanding is that this particular bill was a sequel to a bill presented to parliament by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) as a private member's bill when he was a backbench member. There has, indeed, been considerable attention paid to gun control in this country. In fact, I further understand that the omnibus amendments to the Criminal Code in 1969 contained elements relating to gun control.

Correspondence is still coming forward to myself, and I am sure to other members of parliament, asking "What are you doing, as a government? What do you intend to do in relation to gun control? Can you not see the problem that is before the public? When are you going to give us some leadership?" I suggest that this is not new. It is by no means something that is arriving for the first time. It is an area in which the Canadian public is demanding, not requesting, some action by the federal government.

In my own brief reviews of this matter before the legislation came forward I had the opportunity to spend a whole evening with a concerned citizen in the Toronto area who is chairman of the Toronto chapter of the National Firearms Association. This citizen and several others got together some time ago because of their concern over the matter of inadequate gun controls and their inability to work through the bureaucracy to try to get something on their own. They put together a group of recommendations which they were able finally to discuss with the Solicitor General and his officials. I was very impressed with this concerted citizen act. It is my hope, and indeed it is the case, that this bill now incorporates many of the aspects these people brought to light.

In reviewing the many cases involved in gun control we must bear in mind that unnecessary fears have been put into the minds of the Canadian public. This has been done to some extent by the media and to some extent by members of this House, indicating that suddenly weapons are going to be seized and that people will not be able to continue holding on to their collections of guns. We must understand this is not the intention. Rather, the intention of the gun control legislation is to license people just as today we license a person who drives an automobile.

The automobile is presumably considered some sort of lethal weapon, otherwise why did we go to the great trouble many years ago to bring out such things as drivers' licences and automobile licences? Surely, it was felt at that time by governments in all provinces, states and governmental jurisdictions, that this was something new, had certain dangers attached to it and that it was necessary not only to keep control of where the vehicles were and what was happening to them, but to ensure that those who got behind the wheel of those vehicles had some basic qualifications to qualify them to take a vehicle on the road without becoming an undue menace to the rest of the public. Surely, there is an analogy here. It has been suggested across the way that we do not need this kind of licensing, that we have too many licences today. I am sure these people would not want to suggest the elimination of drivers' licences or automobile licences. They are accepted in society today.

I believe that society is now ready to accept some kind of licensing, some kind of assurance that the person who is going to operate a gun of some form of other is going to be qualified to do so. After all, he does possess a lethal weapon, a weapon that can do harm to others. It is the same as when he gets behind the wheel of an automobile. I think it makes eminent sense to look at that analogy in the light of what governments have done in the area of control over automobiles and their drivers.

We are not asking that all guns be licensed; we are suggesting that dealers be licensed. When speaking last spring to an eminent member of parliament in Sweden who was here with his finance committee, I posed the question of gun control. He said that for years it has been accepted that guns can only be sold in Sweden at licensed outlets. He took it as such a norm that he could not understand the point of my question. It is accepted in Sweden that you do not sell guns you know something about the gun business and are a qualified person. This kind of licensing is acceptable.

It is clear in Sweden that a person who has a gun in his home is licensed. This indicates that he is qualified to handle the weapon. I might go a step further and indicate that they are not permitted to leave a weapon in a state where it can immediately be used. In other words, the bolt must be removed. This is the attitude adopted by the military. It is done for one clear purpose, to prevent theft and misuse. That is not recommended in this legislation but it is something that could be considered in the future. It is important to consider how weapons are maintained in the home. There should be an insistence that weapons are maintained carefully and in a manner in which there is a psychological response to a person dashing over, picking up a weapon and running down the street in a moment when he may feel somewhat berserk.

Much more could be said about gun control. It is important that we are imposing a higher maximum sentence in the case of crime involving an offensive weapon. It is important that the police have some power of seizure. It is

equally important that the limitations of this legislation be clearly spelled out so that the fears expressed by some people cannot possibly occur.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2 p.m.

At 6.01 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 1, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

REQUEST FOR DELAY OF BILL C-68—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion.

In view of the financial difficulties the provinces will encounter as a result of the passage of Bill C-68; in view of the danger of seeing the quality of medical services reduced; finally, in view of the forthcoming federal-provincial conference of health ministers, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk):

That this House unanimously invite the responsible minister to delay the passage of Bill C-68 till after the proposed conference.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS ACT

SUGGESTED RETENTION OF INFLATION FACTOR—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the strong possibility that the federal government will propose at its meetings this week with the provincial finance ministers that the inflation factor in the Fiscal Arrangements Act be removed, and in view of the disastrous effect this would have on the budgets of the provinces which are already faced with the necessity of increasing their taxes to meet their increased costs, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That the government be urged not to remove the inflation factor from the Fiscal Arrangements Act at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

REQUEST FOR REFERENDUM ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

Considering that the vast majority of Canadians favour upholding capital punishment in cases of premeditated deliberate murder, that the will of the majority must be respected in a democratic system, and that a referendum is the best way to let the majority express its views, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard):

That this House direct that a referendum on capital punishment be taken immediately across the country so that debates on the abolition of capital punishment take place in the light of the views clearly expressed by the Canadian people.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF AEROSPACE INDUSTRY IN VIEW OF LAY-OFFS AT DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members of this House are saddened by an announcement made yesterday by the management of the Douglas Aircraft plant in Malton, Ontario, of the layoff of 150 workers. In view of this urgent and important matter, I seek unanimous consent under Standing Order 43

to move the following motion, seconded by the hon. member for York South (Mrs. Appolloni):

That this House expresses its regret at the announced layoffs of 150 workers at Douglas Aircraft, Malton, and urges the federal government to continue negotiations to save the jobs of these workers and to increase the priority of the government's study to develop a sound policy for the Canadian aerospace industry.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, such a motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO ALTERNATIVES TO PURCHASE OF LOCKHEED "ORION"—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the problems surrounding the financing of the Orion LRPA contract that are threatening the early commencement of this essential defence program, and in order to give the people of Canada and members of this House a better understanding of the government's decision, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon):

That the Minister of National Defence table immediately all documents of the alternative proposals to the Lockheed P3-LRPA that have been considered by the Department of National Defence including the Cp-107 Argus Refit program proposed by Canadair.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

BILINGUALISM

SUGGESTED NEGOTIATIONS WITH ONTARIO TO ENSURE CONTINUATION OF FRENCH LANGUAGE TRAINING IN OTTAWA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter which I consider to be of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the contents of the Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Official languages, and since the government of Ontario is responsible for education in the Ottawa-Carleton area, I ask permission to move, seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis):

That this House instruct the government to enter into negotiations with the appropriate Ontario authorities in order to ensure the continuation of French immersion language training at the option of each of the four Ottawa-Carleton area school boards.

An hon. Member: Cheap shot!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed!

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed!

Mr. Speaker: For the purpose of the record, the House should know that the motion was put by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin) and seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis).

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSIONER AND BIBEAU REPORT TO COMMITTEE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I hope the unanimity of the House with regard to that question will continue to prevail now. I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council—excuse me, I should have said "the President of the Treasury Board".

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Clark: I am not sure to whom I ought to apologize.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether, following the timely and constructive suggestion made yesterday by the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont, the hon. gentleman is prepared to arrange for reference of the annual report of the Commissioner of Official Languages to a special committee of both Houses for early consideration.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Spicer's report refers to the bilingualism policy, and Mr. Spicer is basing his remarks on a report we will get soon. I have myself commissioned the Bibeau report on the effectiveness of the public servants training program. The Bibeau report should be submitted to the Treasury Board within a few weeks. We will find a lot of information in this report, and I hope that after we have received the Bibeau report, which I have undertaken to table in the House, we will be able to make a review of the whole problem. I would also like to point out to the House

that it is noted in the Spicer report that tremendous progress has been made in recent years with respect to bilingualism in the Public Service.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark: I believe the House would be anxious to see the Bibeau report referred to a committee in addition to the report of the Commissioner of Official Languages, rather than merely being tabled here. Will the President of the Treasury Board give us a commitment that both of these reports will be referred to a committee either of this House or of the two Houses for consideration?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I have already been questioned on this subject this week before our Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. I have answered many questions. I am ready to answer any question on those two reports, if necessary, and we will find whether it is necessary to take more specific action with regard to Messrs. Spicer's and Bibeau's reports.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark: Members on this side of the House share with the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont the view that it is not enough simply to have the opportunity to question the minister on these matters. It is far preferable to have the reports themselves referred and become the subject of joint study. I hope that the minister might follow that bipartisan suggestion.

ALLEGED UNDER-UTILIZATION OF FRENCH BY EMPLOYEES GRADUATING FROM TRAINING SCHOOLS

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the minister this question. Having regard to the reference in the report of the Commissioner of Official Languages to the fact that 83 per cent of Anglophone graduates from public service schools utilize French on the job less than 20 per cent of the time, is the minister prepared to make a full statement to the House regarding the serious allegation of an extraordinary under-utilization of bilingual graduates, as suggested by the Commissioner of Official Languages?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, of course it is very difficult to make the best use of the services in the other language of all those who work in Ottawa. The hon. Leader of the Opposition speaks French very well, but he does not have the opportunity to use it often, so we will have to get the whole system to use both languages as often as possible. I am glad to see that the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants French to be much more widely used in Ottawa.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATION OF COMMISSIONER—CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCES ON LANGUAGE TEACHING

Mr. Claude Wagner (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the leader of the government.

While recognizing that until now the bilingualism program has been reasonably successful, is the government giving serious consideration to the recommendations of the Commissioner of Official Languages which say that we should prepare a generation of bilingual Canadians before they enter the public service?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, of course we are considering that. It is not only a wish we have expressed, but also something we have told the provinces at various meetings, namely the ones on the constitution, when we were talking about bilingualism. As a matter of fact, many members on both sides of this House wish that the educational system of the provinces would give Canadians more fluency in both official languages. It is our wish, Mr. Speaker. I rather think that this recommendation is addressed to the provincial governments, which are primarily responsible for education.

Mr. Wagner: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary and I thank the Prime Minister for his remarks.

While keeping in mind the question of jurisdiction, would the Prime Minister tell the House if, during the first ministers conference in May, he has the intention of discussing these new propositions concerning the teaching of languages to young Canadians with the heads of the provincial governments?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the agenda of that conference has yet to be established, but if the provinces want to discuss the subject I would be very anxious to do so myself. Generally speaking, however, such subjects are dealt with during meetings between the provincial ministers of education and the Secretary of State who has been appointed by the government to spend the funds for promoting the teaching of the other official language in each province.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS TO BANKS ON FINANCING—ALTERNATIVES OPEN TO GOVERNMENT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. An announcement this morning indicated that the option on the Lockheed Orions had been extended for one month. Presumably, therefore, arrangements with respect to financing have not been worked out. The minister indicated to the House yesterday that the arrangements that are being proposed to Canadian banks do not mean a guarantee of any loans that those banks may put up to the Lockheed Corporation. In view of the importance of this matter would the minister advise the House specifically what it is that the government is proposing to Canadian banks and financial institutions to encourage them to take a risk which, in normal circumstances, they would not take?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, it is correct that my colleague the Minister of Supply and Services has done an excellent job in obtaining an option for the government to continue negotiations until April 30. The discussion with the banks

are continuing. As I said on earlier occasions, until these discussions are complete I do not intend to discuss the details.

● (1420)

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, since the time of the premature announcement of the minister on November 27 concerning the agreement in principle to make this purchase, it is my understanding that some $20 million has been expended on the contract. Will the minister advise the House whether he has received a legal opinion from any source on the government's present legal status as a result of the November 27 announcement in order that the government can make a proper assessment of its position on the Lockheed matter, namely, to get out clean, to cut our losses and get out, or do we have to stay in because our commitment is so high we have no choice but to stay in? Will you answer regarding those three options?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the legal aspects of the contract are the responsibility of the Minister of Supply and Services.

Mr. Alkenbrack: He's the one who bought the oil and lost $14 million.

Mr. Richardson: As I have indicated, he and his department have done an excellent job of protecting the interests of the government. The figure of $20 million that was mentioned is too high, but the details of the legal aspects should be left to my colleague.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—EXTENT OF COMMITMENT AS A FACTOR IN DECISION TO CONTINUE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could turn to the minister's colleague, the Minister of Supply and Services, and ask him whether his department now, in terms of the negotiations he is continuing with the Lockheed Corporation, has a legal opinion from any source, whether the Department of Justice or private, about the legal commitment of the government in terms of the expenditure that Lockheed has already made? Is that a factor in the decision of the government to continue in the negotiations; that is, is the $20 million lost now and therefore we have to stay in because we cannot stand to take that loss? Would the minister answer that?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, it is true that Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Ltd. did some work before the contract signature. It is also true that Lockheed gave us a first delay until March 31 without any change in prices and in the economic advantages for Canada. This is in fact a provision of the letter of agreement we signed yesterday at midnight, to the effect that we are going to pay Lockheed for work done between January 5 and April 30, with a view to preserving the price we negotiated last December, preserving the production schedule which is advantageous for Canada, and preserving the economic impact which is evident for this country since we sign a $614 million contract with Lockheed and we are going to have economic repercussions of about $580 million in Canada.

In consideration of all these advantages, we agreed with Lockheed to pay a maximum of $16 million in case we put an end to our negotiations between now and April 30. This being said, we do intend to sign the contract if possible, because these are the best conditions we can get for Canada to fulfill its role in NATO.

* * *

BILINGUALISM

TEACHING OF BOTH OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN ALL SCHOOLS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

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

A while ago he said with regard to bilingualism that it was left to the discretion of the provinces to have the second official language taught in the schools. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe told us that handing over the teaching of both languages to the provinces was a new suggestion.

I should like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that for at least 10 years now I have been suggesting the teaching of both official languages in all Canadian schools, and I request the co-operation of the federal government in helping the provinces to do the job properly.

Now, Mr. Spicer said yesterday that teaching a second language to people of 50 or 60 was a waste of time and money. To force someone to learn a second language at 50 does not make sense, whereas by teaching it to children of five, six, seven and eight we would have a perfectly bilingual Canada, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, within five years.

If the provinces were to decide to do so, would the federal government be willing to spend as much money in helping them as it spent, for nothing, or almost, teaching both languages to the civil servants?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the hon. member has advocated for years the teaching of the second language in the schools. That is an opinion we all share. Naturally, we hope it can be done. However, the question is whether we can wait 25 years for results. That is the figure the hon. member mentioned—

An hon. Member: Five years.

Mr. Trudeau: Indeed 25 years is a little too long after 100 years of waiting—

An hon. Member: No, he did say 5 years!

Mr. Trudeau: No, the hon. member said 25 years. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Chrétien: He did say five years.

Mr. Trudeau: He did? I am sorry, then. He said five years. It seems strange to me that if the two official

languages can be taught in elementary schools, within five years bilingual children will qualify as deputy ministers. That does not seem logical.

As for expenses, Mr. Speaker, the answer is that we already spend around $80 million a year—

Mr. Chrétien: $125 million.

Mr. Trudeau: —$125 million, as the President of the Treasury Board has just mentioned, so that the provinces may teach the other official language within their jurisdictions. It is important for us and for all hon. members to ensure that those moneys are well spent. We now have a Social Credit government in British Columbia. I do hope it will heed the Socred leader and start teaching French in all the schools of that province.

GOVERNMENT INTENTION TO ACHIEVE NATIONAL UNITY BY TEACHING BOTH LANGUAGES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

The Prime Minister can be sure that in many areas it will be easier for him to convince the Socred premier from British Columbia than Mr. Bourassa from Quebec.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the possibility of financially assisting the provinces. I did not speak of a 25-year period, I said that if our youngsters were taught French or English or both from the first school years, in less than five years our young Canadians, both French and English speaking, would use the second language with a surprising flexibility, whereas our civil servants still cannot do so. We cannot blame them, for it is much easier to learn at age five or six than at sixty.

So is the federal government ready to spend, not $60 or $125 million, but the millions necessary to build up national unity through bilingualism?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned $80 or $125 million earlier. Those sums are considerable. I do not know if the hon. member is suggesting that we should make more money available to the provinces and thereby deprive the official language program of the federal government of that money. I am prepared to consider specific proposals during the forthcoming discussions, but when the hon. member says that it will go faster in British Columbia, only the future will tell if he has succeeded in three days.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF DECISIONS MADE AT RECENT MEETING WITH COMPANY

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister make a statement on motions today concerning LRPA and any decisions made by Canada and, if not, would he inform the House about the decisions reached with Mr. Wilson of Lockheed last night. Other than the decision which the minister made to give himself 30 days grace on making a decision on the contract and deciding to pay our just debts, what decisions were made?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of the fact that I have always believed that the hon. member for Victoria was a supporter of the Canadian armed forces, I will confine my statement to reading his words, as recorded on October 24. He said this problem has plagued the department for many years, that is, too low a percentage of the defence budget being used for capital equipment. He has been an advocate of new equipment for the Canadian armed forces, and that is what we have been achieving in these negotiations.

● (1430)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McKinnon: The minister leaves me almost speechless with his attack.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McKinnon: I have been a supporter of equipment while this government has been procrastinating for eight years on this matter, and I still am,—but not at any price.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LETTER FROM MR. HEPPE—REASON FOR FAILURE TO CHECK FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Perhaps since the minister is unwilling to answer the question I put to him he will answer this supplementary. Yesterday the minister showed the press a letter from Mr. R. R. Heppe of Lockheed indicating that there was a financing problem which arose last summer. Would the minister table the letter from Mr. Heppe, and would he explain to the House why, given the implied warning in Mr. Heppe's letter, he did not check the financial arrangements again until late December? Why was he aware of a minor problem in midsummer and unaware of the enormous problem in November?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): The letter in question has not been discussed in the House and therefore does not need to be tabled.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Just give it to the press.

Mr. Richardson: The department was fully aware of the problems of financing early in the year and toward the completion of the contract. I have explained many times that we were given a very clear impression that Lockheed could assist. I think I will read from that letter, and therefore I will be obliged to table it. I think this will answer once and for all whether the Lockheed company was in fact—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the House appreciates the willingness of the minister to table the letter.

However, if I am to exercise some restraint on the length of questions which ought to be put, I equally have to exercise some restraint on the length of answers during the question period. I ask the minister to conclude his answer very briefly.

Mr. Richardson: I will be brief and read only one short paragraph from the letter as follows:

If Lockheed were to finance the shortfall as suggested in item (c), it is estimated that the financial impact would be approximately $800,000. Such an arrangement would, however, be contingent upon Lockheed's ability to secure approval for additional financing with lending banks and would further be subject to approval by the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board.

I ask members of the opposition to listen to the next sentence. This is from a Lockheed vice president.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: We are listening.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the letter is important enough to be quoted at length in this House, it is equally important that it be tabled in total.

Some hon. Members: Right now.

Mr. Speaker: The minister has indicated his willingness to table the letter.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Then let's not ruin the question period.

Mr. Clark: The question period will be over before he finishes reading.

Mr. Richardson: The letter went on to say the following:

We believe this approach . . .

That is, the approach to the banks and to the emergency loan guarantee board.

. . . has merit and after due consideration would receive a positive response.

In fairness to the Lockheed company I think I should say that this letter was related to a financing shortfall in the summer which was not of the proportions which we discussed in December. I want to underline that and make it clear. However, in fairness to my personnel and to my officials I also think that this letter is a very clear indication of the willingness of the Lockheed company to assist us with the financing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE OF CABINET DECISION ON SIGNING

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): The minister has given no indication that he will make a statement on motions. I wonder if he could indicate to the House, in a general sense, when the cabinet will make a final decision on this contentious problem and decide either to sign the contract or not to sign it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Surely, the hon. member has heard that the government now has an option which is good until the end of April, so that presumably before that date or on that date a decision will be reached.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of National Defence, during the course of his answer to the second last question, made reference to a letter which he is prepared to table. Under the circumstances he is at liberty, I think, without the leave of the House, to table it either now or during tabling of documents. Perhaps it might be more orderly for the minister to table the document forthwith.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—AUTHORITY FOR SPENDING THE MONEY WHICH HAS BEEN SPENT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, in light of what we have just heard, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Supply and Services. It has to do with the money which has been spent up to this point by Lockheed in the develoment of engineering work ups and design—to accommodate other user departments' requirements, I might add. On what authority has money been expended up to this point in time? What parliamentary authority, what governor in council authority or under what aspect of the Financial Administration Act has the $10 million or $12 million been spent up to this point in time?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that we have indicated to Lockheed Aircraft Coporation Ltd. our intention to enter into a contract with them which is nothing but normal if we are to preserve the advantages I stated to this House; it is normal, for the time being that we pay Lockheed for the works done so far, and also to protect the government's interest that we place a limit to the amount to be spent from now to April 30. I believe that it is a good business deal.

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE RECOVERY FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF A SHARE OF THE COST OF THE "ORION"

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): The minister has not answered the question at all. We can only assume that there has been no authorization other than a requisition from the Department of Supply and Services for the expenditure of funds or a telephone call or some conversation, in the absence of a contract. Because of the substantial proportions of this $59 million or probably up to $70 million we are going to pay per aircraft, could the minister indicate whether the cabinet committee responsible sought from the other user departments their share or pro rated share of the capital cost of this equipment? I am referring to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Department of Fisheries and other govern-

ment departments which will use the Orion. The basic cost of the Orion will be from $30 million to $60 million. Are the other user departments going to contribute their share of the capital cost in order to give the Minister of National Defence and his department access to the funds which parliament has granted for defence spending?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will understand that I am not responsible for the general administration of the government. I think the question should be addressed to the President of the Treasury Board.

* * *

● (1440)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE RECOVERY FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF A SHARE OF THE COST OF THE "ORION"

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board has left the chamber, but because the Minister of National Defence is completely and totally uninterested in this question—

An hon. Member: Here he is.

Mr. Forrestall: I shall direct my question to the President of the Treasury Board in the interests of national defence because the Minister of National Defence does not seem to be too concerned about the availability of funds for spending on capital acquisition.

Has any initiative been taken by the President of the Treasury Board to secure from other government departments who will use the Orion aircraft their share of the capital cost of this program? Judging from other world prices the cost of this aircraft is some $60 million, and 50 per cent of that is attributable to the requirements of departments other than the Department of National Defence. Is there any sharing sought?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, when we prepared the budgetary program dealing with the capital investments for the Department of National Defence, we spread our requirements over a period of several years in the estimates of the Department of National Defence, because I do not think it would be very practical, in the case of a project like this, to divide the capital between three or four departments. If we had done so, the hon. member would probably be inclined to blame us and would say that we are trying to create a state of confusion.

BILINGUALISM

SUGGESTED MEETING WITH PROVINCES ON TEACHING OF SECOND LANGUAGE

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State a question. In the light of the motion that the hon. member for Ottawa Centre managed to have adopted by the House today, could the Secretary of State widen the rather narrow scope of the talks with the province of Ontario in order to include any provincial government of good will which shows that it is sincerely willing to make language courses available to the greatest number of Canadians, thus avoiding the creation of new linguistic disparities in this country.

[*English*]

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Yes, of course, Mr. Speaker, I discuss this question continuously with ministers of education of the provinces. There is a formula in place under which the federal government agrees to pay 9 per cent of the additional cost of any extended French language training program. That provision is available to any province which wishes to take advantage of it. Manitoba recently announced a major extension to that province's French language program. I discussed this matter with the minister of education of that province yesterday. The provinces can do this and we are prepared to respond through our program of financial assistance.

* * *

ENERGY

SYNCRUDE PROJECT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF AGREEMENT—DISPOSITION OF ATLANTIC RICHFIELD LEASES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Can the minister confirm if an agreement has been signed relating to the Syncrude project? If so, will he table that agreement? May I also ask, as one item in particular held up the signing of the agreement, what disposition is being made of the six Athabasca oil sand leases which were held by Atlantic Richfield? Are those leases to be turned over to Syncrude? If so, what price will be paid to Atlantic Richfield for those leases?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, may I answer the second part of the question first? The leases are to be turned over. The Alberta government assured the participants that the leases will be turned over to them, that is, to the new participants. As to price, it will be done at no cost to those participants. As to the agreement itself, I must point out that it involved probably 90 documents, agreements and subagreements, etc. It is not one piece of paper that we discussed yesterday. We were trying to hammer out several of the remaining, major outstanding issues. I am pleased to announce that we did just that.

SYNCRUDE PROJECT—REASON FOR FAILURE TO STIPULATE IN AGREEMENT EMISSION STANDARDS FOR SULPHUR DIOXIDE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Department of the Environment found 287 long tons per day of sulphur dioxide emission unacceptable and said the emission should be reduced to 40 long tons per day, why is there no stipulation in the agreement for reducing progressively,

over time, sulphur dioxide emissions? Or, are we to assume that the Department of the Environment is merely a public relations enterprise and that the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources intends to pay no attention to the Department of the Environment and ignore the commitment the Minister of the Environment made to this House on January 29 last?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the entire question should be directed to me. It must be clear to the hon. member that the federal government respects the jurisdiction of Alberta in environmental matters. It will be up to the province to set environmental standards.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ALLEGED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN MANDATE AND OPERATION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It relates to the recent report of the Economic Council of Canada which criticizes the inadequacy of the government's current programs and past performance. In its report released yesterday, the Economic Council says that much of the problems of abuse of unemployment insurance could be solved by two methods—by tightening administrative efforts to get persons back to work and creating jobs to absorb them. As these recommendations coincide with the very mandate of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, when will the minister rectify the serious discrepancy between the operation and the mandate of the Unemployment Insurance Commission? Will he make a statement in the near future, giving full details?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the premise of the question. The administration of unemployment insurance is efficient and tight.

REASON FOR FAILURE OF CLAIMANTS TO PURSUE JOB OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With respect, the minister may not have read the report. It is a scathing indictment of ministers' programs and the government's attitude to people and jobs. As the report also indicates that 40 per cent of unemployment insurance claimants do not report to manpower centres to pursue job opportunities which present themselves, would the minister care to explain why UIC claimants are reluctant to take advantage of this service and why manpower centres are unable to encourage claimants to attend at the centres? I ask this as there is a problem in this regard.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, many measures, with which the hon. member ought to be familiar by virtue of discussions in the standing committee, have been taken to increase the number of unemployment insurance claimants registering with manpower offices. Indeed, these measures are increasingly successful. I do not agree with the 40 per cent figure the hon. gentleman quoted from the Economic Council's report.

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

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

PROPOSAL TO BRING PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANIES UNDER BOARD—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question was to be directed to the Minister of Finance. In his understandable absence, since it deals with what the philosophy underlying the anti-inflation program can do to companies which operate at a loss, may I direct it to the Prime Minister? Will the right hon. gentleman say what is the government's response to the Anti-Inflation Board's proposal calling for all property and casualty insurance companies to be brought under the mandatory enforcement provisions of the Anti-Inflation Act? I ask this as these highly competitive companies collectively lost $400 million in the last two years.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will remember that in the policy paper published on October 13 it was indicated that, in cases where entities make a loss, they, of course, would not be bound by the strict application of the guidelines. To the extent that the hon. member asks a precise statistical question, I will take notice of it on behalf of the minister who is attending a federal-provincial conference of finance ministers.

Mr. McCleave: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since, despite what the right hon. gentleman just said, the Anti-Inflation Board recommended that those companies should be brought under those provisions, is there not a serious conflict with the Prime Minister's philosophy?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. The philosophy I stated is as stated in the white paper. I suggested in the last part of my answer that this may be a particular circumstance of which I know nothing. I will look into the decision and refer it to the Minister of Finance for study.

* * *

[*Later*]

MANPOWER

RECOMMENDED MERGING OF MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT OFFICES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Hamilton West. As the Economic Council recommended in its most recent review the putting together or amalgamation of manpower and employment offices, contrary to previous recommendations in which it advocated separation of these offices, will the minister now reverse his decision and integrate these two services under one jurisdiction, so that they may provide worth while service?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question recently in the House.

ALLEGED INCREASES IN JOB VACANCIES AND NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the minister? As the report of the Economic Council of Canada tabled yesterday notes a new and unusual phenomenon, rising unemployment and increasing numbers of job vacancies—something which has come about despite the many assurances the minister gave to the manpower committee when he spoke of the various programs now in place for acquainting the unemployed with job opportunities—will the minister step up liaison with the private sector in order to direct Canadians to long-term jobs?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the situation is far more complex than that. The number of vacancies unfilled is, unfortunately, by no means the same as the number of people looking for jobs. As for liaison with the private sector, that has been considerably stepped up during the last two or three years through the job information centres and many other measures we introduced in the last two or three years.

* * *

● (1450)

AIR TRANSPORT

THREATENED STRIKE OF SAFETY OPERATIONS GROUP—GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO ASSURE CONTINUED OPERATIONS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It is reported that mediation talks have broken down between the aircraft safety operations group and MOT and that a nationwide walk-out has been ordered by the union, leaving no safety supervision or procedure for reviewing pilots' licences. What measures will the minister be taking, since this will eventually ground all commercial air travel in Canada? I would point out to the minister that there are 11 Air Canada pilots whose licences have expired.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a certain number of steps were taken to extend licences when it was clear that that could be done without any hazard. That kind of action was a limited measure to delay the impact of any extended walkout. However, there is a limit to what can be done with regard to postponing the difficulties.

PUBLIC SERVICE

THREATENED STRIKE OF AIR SAFETY OPERATIONS GROUP—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board if he will resume his seat. He has certainly been bouncing around today. The talks are over wages and the direct responsibility of Treasury Board. If the walkout is allowed to continue, within a few weeks there will be few licenced commercial pilots left in Canada, as their licences are expiring daily. Will the minister intervene, resume and speed up negotiations before commercial air travel is completely grounded in Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, in that field the workers have the right to strike and it is a right given to them by Parliament.

However, this Parliament passed a legislation last October establishing guidelines within which bargaining must be conducted. We intend to negotiate within those guidelines and if the association concerned would understand our position, we could reach an agreement within those guidelines. The legislation does not allow us to exceed the guidelines.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PREVENT LAY-OFFS AND DEVELOP AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether he is aware that the management of Douglas Aircraft in Malton, Ontario, announced yesterday its plan to lay off 150 workers, whether he will endeavour to take immediate steps to help save the jobs of these workers and also approach his cabinet colleagues to accelerate the federal government's study to develop a sound policy for the Canadian aerospace industry?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was advised of the plans by McDonnell-Douglas of Canada Limited. They followed a month of very intensive negotiations between myself and representatives of McDonnell-Douglas to see if there was a solution. We responded positively and with two specific proposals which McDonnell-Douglas did not feel they were in a position to accept. I understand that their statement yesterday with regard to the layoffs indicated that the Canadian government had done everything it possibly could in the circumstances, but that the business situation of the company was such that they could not in fact retain the employees any longer.

[*Translation*]

COMMUNICATIONS

SUGGESTED MEETING WITH QUEBEC TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Communications.

Last week her Quebec counterpart suggested in a public conference the setting up of a bipartite task force made up of officials of both governments whose terms of reference would be to determine the special demands of Quebec for which some constitutional clarifications might be useful. Is the minister willing to say whether she will comply with the wish expressed by her Quebec counterpart?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): I have not yet received Mr. Hardy's suggestion. I read it in the papers like the hon. member, but I can say that I am in favour of the setting up of that committee and of frequent meetings between federal and provincial officials. However, I would wish, as I have already said, that the terms of reference of that committee were much broader so that we might consider all the problems dividing us presently.

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOREST MANAGEMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent statements by the Director General of the Canadian Forestry Service, who is also a policy adviser to the Minister of the Environment, calling for the development of a national forest policy, saying that our forests are not well managed by even the most "permissive and charitable of yardsticks", can the Minister of the Environment inform the House whether he has within his jurisdiction the capacity to respond to these recommendations, and what particular agency will be made responsible to address itself to this challenge?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): I have no communication to that effect, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

REASON FOR USE OF PRIVATE AGENCIES TO SUPPLY CASUAL HELP—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CASUALS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the President of the Treasury Board. Last year the amount of money spent by this government on casual workers hired through personnel firms increased by 77 per cent. Treasury Board alone more than doubled the amount it spent through these private agencies from $209,000 to $492,000. Considering that these private firms rip-off anywhere from 20 to 50 per cent of the wages of these workers, my question then is why is the government using these private firms rather than using the existing facilities of the Canada Manpower Centres to save the government money and prevent the exploitation of these casual workers?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, this is a mechanism used by many organizations to fill positions on a temporary basis. Every department can do it, but this does not create new jobs. The departments must use the money already appropriated for the number of man-years that they are allowed, and until now, we have found this mechanism rather effective. But we are now looking into this problem with the Public Service Commission to determine whether it would be possible to develop a somewhat similar mechanism within the public service that would not be more costly for the administration.

[*English*]

Mr. Rodriguez: Was the use of temporary employees included in the announced austerity measures in December which stated that hiring would be held to a 1.5 per cent increase this year and, if they were not, can we then expect to see another doubling of the use of temporarys in the upcoming year?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the casual employees within the civil service are considered within the guidelines. That means if they are casual employees, they are included in the moneys allocated to every department. Therefore, that will not change the maximum of 1.5 set in the budget.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ENERGY

RESEARCH ON WIND RESOURCES—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Since the research on traditional oil resources has declined more quickly than the National Energy Board had expected, and because of the threat of an energy shortage in the near future, can the minister tell the House whether his department has developed research programs in the field of wind energy, and if so, can he report on the true potential of wind energy in Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in an announcement that I made about two weeks ago, I indicated that the government was increasing its expenditures for research and development, including research and development in renewable resources, solar and wind energy. The National Research Council is the agency responsible for administering the wind energy program. I invite the hon. member to contact them for further information. If I can be of any assistance, I will be glad to provide it.

AGRICULTURE

MINISTER'S POSITION ON RESIGNATION OF MEMBER OF NATIONAL FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING COUNCIL

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, it is late in the day, but I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister received a letter of resignation from one of the members of the National Farm Products Marketing Council over a disagreement with the CEMA policy and alleged discrimination in the allocation of birds and quotas to take effect this weekend? If so, what is he going to do about it?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): I am going to accept his resignation, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (1500)

Mr. Nowlan: Is the minister going to accept it today and rescind it tomorrow or is he going to accept it completely? What will the situation be, since the member who resigned is an ex-president of the Lambton-Kent Liberal Association and a political appointee of this political minister?

Mr. Whelan: As to the accusation the hon. member has made, I am sure he is not aware it is not factual or he would not have made it. The member he talks about was not appointed by this minister. He was recommended by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture to the minister at that time, who accepted the recommendation. He has a large farm, he has a young family; he has an obligation to them and he wants to return to his farm. Last year he wanted to resign but I suggested to him he should stay one year longer to serve his country and he did stay on to serve his country with distinction.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF NATIONAL CADET RIFLE CHAMPIONS

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to draw the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of the national cadet rifle champions.

Some hon Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Richardson: The Pickering high school cadet corps won the Ontario championship six weeks ago and last weekend went on to take the Canadian championship.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Business of the House

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill S-33, an act respecting United Grain Growers Limited, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Speaker: The President of the Treasury Board on a point of order.

Mr. Chrétien: In replying to a question put by the Leader of the Opposition earlier, I forgot to say that Mr. Keith Spicer will appear before the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates on April 29.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the government House leader is in a position to announce the business for the balance of today, for tomorrow and for the first of next week.

Mr. Sharp: Perhaps I ought to begin by saying it is the intention of the government that the Easter adjournment shall begin at the end of the day on Wednesday, April 14, and that we shall return on April 26. I say this by way of a preliminary statement before filling in the business for most of the time between now and then. Today, I hope that after disposing of the motion I intend to move, and of which I have given notice, for an allocation of time in respect of Bill C-83—

Mr. Paproski: Shame!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Closure!

Mr. Sharp: —a motion which I hope we shall see agreed to more frequently by the opposition in the future in order to provide for the more orderly disposal of business, we shall then go on to consider the prisoners of war bill, C-92. Following that, in this order, for the remainder of today and tomorrow we shall take Bills C-92, S-32, C-88 and C-20. If the House agrees to the notice which is on notices of motions, we shall on Monday and Tuesday turn to the consideration of objections to the reports of the Redistribution Commissioners. After those have been disposed of, we shall return to the consideration, during the four days which will be provided in the allocation order, if it is accepted, of Bill C-83.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, may I ask the government House leader this question: In view of the resignation of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and in view of the fact that new laws to combat loan sharks and control business monopolies are now sitting in limbo, does the minister consider the situation is important enough to call for the announcement of

the appointment of a new minister of consumer affairs in the near future?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the acting minister is one of the more vigorous members of this administration, and nothing which is in his hands can be described as being in limbo. He is a very active proponent of the principles embodied in that legislation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government House leader whether he will include Bill C-81 in the bills to be dealt with before Easter, so that we can amend the legislation and make the freeze on our incomes complete?

Mr. Sharp: There would remain on the schedule which I have announced two days on which business has not been allocated. This is one of the possibilities. I trust we will have the wholehearted support of the hon. gentleman for the proposed law.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. YEWCHUK—POSITION OF MEDICAL DOCTORS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SITTING ON HEALTH COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Athabasca on a question of privilege.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): I was always under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that a question of privilege superseded a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will realize that every Thursday it is the practice of the House to clarify the business to be undertaken. The hon. member will understand that this is a general question which is of interest to everyone in the House and that it ought to take precedence in certain circumstances.

Mr. Yewchuk: My question of privilege deals with the position of members of parliament who are medical doctors, and their right to sit on the health committee and examine any and all witnesses who come before the committee in a manner in keeping with their own judgment, free of any fear that their motives will be questioned by other members of parliament, by the press or by anyone else.

On March 25, representatives of the Canadian Medical Association appeared before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs concerning the subject matter of Bill C-68. During that meeting, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) clearly attempted to impute motives to certain Conservative members of parliament by implying that they had a particular pecuniary self-interest to protect, thereby attempting to undermine their credibility as members of parliament and prejudice their right to speak freely in accordance with their conscience before the standing committee. The offending comments are reported on page 20 of issue No. 44 of the committee proceedings as follows:

[Mr. Hnatyshyn.]

It is remarkable from the other side how doctors do stick together. They praise this brief and I would like to say even over a dead body, but I say they are certainly getting together on a dead issue.

Even more offensive is the following comment, also by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway:

It is better that some people who get the service and who are paying for the service started asking a few questions and I am asking them on behalf of my constituents who seek the medical service and who are paying for it.

Clearly, in the second quotation, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is implying that she is suited to ask questions on behalf of her constituents, but that members of the official opposition who are MPs and physicians are not—that these members put a professional interest before their public duty. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I ceased active practice four years ago. I asked the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway to withdraw her comments which I felt were undermining my credibility as a member of parliament trying to do his job. She replied as follows:

● (1510)

My indication is that you were giving evidence as though you were witnesses over there.

In short, she refused to withdraw her comment. In regard to the CTV network and their employee, Eric Malling, he stated the following day, March 26, on the "Canada AM" program at 8.20 a.m.:

The Conservative representation on the committee consisted of four doctors and a more shameless defence of the witnesses I have never seen. The way these doctors stick together you would think they had a sponge in a stiff—the entire lot of them.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way, in my view, that that comment could be interpreted, and this is that doctor MPs on the Conservative side were not acting in the best interests of the public of Canada, but by sticking together were acting in their own self-interest or the interest of their former profession.

In committee, the chairman, on the question of privilege raised by myself that the member for Vancouver-Kingsway should withdraw her allegations, ruled, in effect, that there was no prejudice. The comment by Mr. Malling occurred, of course, outside parliament and has not been dealt with in any way to date. What is required here, Mr. Speaker, is reaffirmation that doctor MPs are entitled to the same rights and privileges as all other MPs—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: —regardless of their employment before they came to parliament as representatives of the people of Canada, as well as corrective action by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and Mr. Malling of the CTV network.

There are many examples of members of parliament sitting on committees related to their original employment—for example, farmer MPs speaking out vigorously on behalf of the rights and needs of Canada's farmers—without being placed under suspicion by other MPs for so doing. Members of Parliament who may have an interest in the fishing industry speak out on behalf of the fishing industry; indeed, any MP can speak of income tax laws, vote against income tax increases, and so on, and not be placed under the suspicion that he or she is acting in their

own self-interest. And finally, Mr. Speaker, this applies even to members of parliament voting upon and debating bills before the House dealing with salaries and services of members of parliament.

I move, therefore, that the subject matter of this question of privilege be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think there is at this point a very fundamental procedural difficulty in regard to the question raised by the hon. member. There seem to be other hon. members who wish to contribute by way of argument or debate to the intent of the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) which were referred to by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk). However, the fact is that on the description of the hon. member for Athabasca, the events complained of took place in a standing committee of the House. Indeed, a remedy was sought, or at least according to the description of the hon. member for Athabasca a remedy was sought, in that standing committee and was in some way dealt with at the time by the standing committee.

It has been a very long-standing and clear practice of this House that at no time before any proceedings of a standing committee are reported does this House in any way appeal, examine or scrutinize events which have taken place or decisions or rulings made in a standing committee. Before other hon. members make any intervention in this regard, I would want to make it very clear that this has been a long-standing practice in the House, one from which this incumbent has no desire to depart. However, there may be other hon. members who wish to speak to this question of privilege.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my complaint is particularly in regard to the reporting of the CTV network representative, one Eric Malling, who on March 26, on the "Canada AM" program made this statement which is completely false and unfounded. As a matter of fact, I will call as my witness the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) who stated, as reported at page 44:29 of the health, welfare and social affairs committee, line 28, that she found the hon. member for Simcoe North's evidence very interesting and constructive to the committee.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. It was stated by Eric Malling on CTV, March 26, 1976, that a conflict of interest arose when four Conservative MP physicians were in attendance at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs at which time the Canadian Medical Association presented their brief on Bill C-68. It is my contention that his statements were false and misrepresented my rights, responsibilities and obligations as a member of this parliament. I find his conclusions of the meeting not only unacceptable but illogical. If one is to accept his thesis regarding conflict of interest, then it would preclude farmers from serving on the agricultural committee, lawyers on the judiciary committee, businessmen on the industry, trade and commerce committee, and I could go on to give other examples.

I have been impressed with the board range of interest and knowledge displayed by members from all corners of the House. I am also impressed that each member offers a degree of expertise in various areas which contributes in a very positive way to the operation of the House and its standing committees. I respectfully submit that members of parliament who have been trained in and have practised medicine provide special expertise in questioning medical witnesses which can be invaluable when combined with the questioning of other interested members of the committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Holmes: With respect to the standing committee meeting held on March 25 at which the Canadian Medical Association presented their brief, I must indicate that I did not have the opportunity to question the witnesses, as implied by Mr. Malling. This is not to protest the manner in which the meeting was conducted by the chairman, since he was committed to a fixed time schedule. However, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this incident was provoked either intentionally or unintentionally by the final questioner, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. In retrospect, I believe that had time permitted additional questioning of the witnesses, the incident might have been defused and this question of privilege made unnecessary.

If the reporter in question had researched his subject matter, he would have found during the second reading debate of Bill C-68 that I made no reference to the Canadian Medical Association, no reference to physicians' salaries or incomes, but was concerned about the future of medicine in Canada and specifically about the quality of medical care. If that reporter had also taken the time to review the debate during private members' hour on May 29, 1975, he would have found that on that occasion I took a position opposed to the official policy of the Canadian Medical Association. Finally, if that reporter had taken the opportunity to read the health paper I had written before the national convention held in Ottawa in 1974, it would have been obvious that my questioning could have been constructive to the proceedings of that day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Holmes: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one or two brief comments—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not want unduly to restrict the hon. member, but I think he surely must realize that he has gone fairly far afield from the original question of privilege which was raised. I wonder whether he would return to it.

Mr. Holmes: May I make one or two brief comments, Mr. Speaker, regarding politics, development of public policy and the role of parliamentarians, which matters I think are extremely important in this instance. My mandate is to represent all the constituents in my riding of Lambton-Kent irrespective of their political persuasion, vocation, problems or interests. That has been, and will continue to be, my primary responsibility. For an individual to suggest or imply that my purpose is to represent a special interest group either reflects naiveté or lack of understanding on their part of the duties and responsibilities of a member of

parliament, or in the extreme must be construed as irresponsible reporting.

● (1520)

Sir, I have been impressed since my arrival in Ottawa in 1972 that the two principal academic disciplines used to prepare the would-be politicians are law and political science. Many students of political science go into the public service, becoming administrators of policy and advisers to those making decisions. Their training may best be described as the art of the possible, not concentrating on idealism but on the practicalities of the political system. The decisions, sir, are made by the legislators, many of whom have studied law on the general principle that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Again, I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member. Much of what he is saying, of course, has value. It is not that these are not important observations on the role of a member of parliament, whether or not he is also a member of the medical profession, as in this particular case. However, the question the Chair has to decide at the moment is in respect of a rather narrow and confined question of privilege. On the one hand, hon. members are concerned about the proceedings of a standing committee and the remarks of another hon. member. There were certain procedural difficulties involved which I have already exposed. The second point has to do with the comments on the reporting of a journalist vis-à-vis the functions of the standing committee, or the motives of an hon. member of this House.

In both instances there is, and has been, a clear and unbroken line of precedents to the effect that neither constitutes a question of privilege. I am trying to extend to the hon. member as much leeway as possible in the matter, but there are several other members who seek the floor and I wonder if the hon. member might continue on that basis.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. If there has been a reflection on any member of this House by another member, there is a privilege. There was an incident not too long ago when this House took upon itself an examination of the very point, only it was regarding a different form of the media. It is important, sir, that this House not sit idly by, letting anyone play with its morals or standard. The duty is upon you, sir, to protect us by allowing members of parliament to speek their piece when they feel their reputations as members of this House have been challenged.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a very brief comment. I am sure the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) who has raised this issue has given the House a full, fair and responsible report of what happened in proceedings about which I know nothing. I have no intention of saying anything about the conduct of members or persons in this House or elsewhere, whether on CTV or otherwise, but I would ask that if Your Honour's ruling on this matter in any way relates to statements made by or the conduct of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Miss Holt), your decision be reserved so that she may, depending on your intention in this matter, be heard by members of the House.

An hon. Member: She knew it was coming up and that is why she is not here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) was in the process of speaking.

Mr. Holmes: I have three or four short paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, but I will bow to the wishes of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I want to make it perfectly clear that I was not trying to stop the hon. member for Lambton-Kent.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I simply want him to keep his remarks within the narrow confines of the question of privilege.

An hon. Member: Sit down, then, and let him do so.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Holmes: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You are most gracious, under the circumstances. Perhaps I may just conclude. I was talking about the composition of parliaments and the predominance of lawyers and graduates of political science among those who make the decisions, as we see it. I think all we need do is look at the predominance of lawyers in the cabinet. The same is true of the international political scene, where a great many are trained in the arts of existing political life, which in effect is an adversary system. I want to suggest, in all seriousness, that the adversary system is not always productive and in today's society of turbulence such a system, I believe, in many instances is outmoded.

I am the first to recognize the effectiveness and importance of the academic disciplines to which I have referred in this House, and I know it is not necessary for me to defend their presence. However, many of the problems in today's society, touching not only the lives of Canadians but on all individuals within our global community, should be approached with reasoning and not confrontation and partisan politics. It is my opinion—I believe, shared by others—that there are times when adversary politics could be replaced by an intelligent, unemotional assessment of objective facts combined with a genuine concern for human beings.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Holmes: I would suggest to you, sir, that there are many members in this chamber who approach their duties in this manner, recognizing this may have minimal media appeal, but firm in the belief that such a role can be constructive in our political process.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few brief words on this question of privilege relating to the conduct of a committee. I would address my remarks specifically to the question regarding

the matter not being referred to the House. Standing Order 65(11) is the authority of the chairman in the committee, and it states that he—

—shall maintain order in the committees; deciding all questions of order subject to an appeal to the committee; but disorder in a committee can only be censured by the House—

The matter before us is not a matter of order, it is a question of privilege, and that is distinctly different from a question of order. Keeping in mind the constitution of our committees, I would suggest that committee chairmen do not have access to the expertise to which the Chair has access, nor do they possess the experience of the Chair. The clerk and the assistant clerks of the House have a great source of expertise instantly available to Mr. Speaker. The Speaker can consult with the clerks, who can research a decision and they can advise him at his elbow. That is not the quality of the clerks of committee, and I say that with the greatest respect. Regretfully, most of the clerks are not well versed in the rules and privileges of this chamber. Therefore, I do not think it is quite right, and I say, with the greatest respect to the Chair, that for Your Honour to suggest that a question of privilege can be disposed of summarily by a chairman of a committee, that being the end of the matter, is not proper.

Members' privileges can be infringed upon just as grievously, and sometimes even more so, in committee as in this House. Committees, being extensions of this House, I fail to see how the rights and privileges of hon. members can in any way be diminished or be less in a committee than in the House. It is my submission that on a fair reading of the Standing Order, part of which I quoted, a question of privilege arising in a committee should always be referable to the Speaker of this House.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) covered some of the points to which I should like to refer. I am not referring to what went on outside this House after something took place, but to what went on in this House in relation to something that transpired at the committee, a committee which I believe is a creature of this institution. You, sir, have been appointed as the guardian of our rules and privileges. We must refer matters that transpire to you, more or less as the chief justice of a court, just as we do when a lower court makes a decision which in our opinion is not fair and equitable. In this particular case, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) has attempted to appeal to you because he is not happy with the fairness or the end result of a decision rendered by the chairman of the committee of which he was a member. I think also, that all of us in the House must expect from our colleagues, regardless of our vocation before we came here, that they would respect what we say and what we do as being done without any particular vested interest, and that what we do is done on behalf of our constituents and, more especially, on behalf of the Canadian people at large.

We should learn not to gang-up in any way, in any type of clique, to try to put a point across. I believe that when any member endeavours to leave that impression, which might result in some newspaper commentator saying something which in effect mirrors what was said in the committee, was objected to and thrown out, then all of us here are in difficulties in trying to determine whether or not we should censor what we say because someone might believe that what we say is associated with something we have done in the past.

● (1530)

We must be very careful to be fully protected against that kind of charge by anyone at any time, and I believe that the only person to whom we can look to give us that kind of protection is you, Mr. Speaker. It may be one of the more difficult responsibilities that you have to assume—but I believe you do have to assume that responsibility. If the precedents are not in our favour, then I say, sir, make new precedents to give us the protection because the law we have today is only the law we have today because judges at some time, somewhere, made a decision which was different from what previous judges said in certain areas.

I do not believe you can ignore the fact that the committee system is a creature of this parliament—and you, sir, whether you like it or not, are responsible for the committee system and for the protection of members within that system as much as you are our protector here in this chamber. I ask you, sir, to give us the same kind of justice in the committee system which you have been willing to provide us with in this chamber, and I think all members in the House would then be happy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. I have a great deal of sympathy for the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). However, I recognize that the point you made with reference to the question of privilege being raised in committee is one that has been followed in the past. There has been no precedent whereby a question of privilege raised in committee has been referred to the House.

I would point out to the hon. gentleman opposite that presently there exists a committee of which Your Honour is the chairman, dealing with the rights and obligations of members of parliament. Surely that is a topic which should be dealt with by that committee, formed of responsible members from all the parties in the House, and the time of the House should not be spent further with that point, which seems to be the only point of interest before the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, once again the House of Commons has to deal with a problem of improper comments which are misinterpreted. This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Commons must deal with such a matter and I think that the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) has rightly raised a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, a committee of the House of Commons is an integral part of the House. Its power proceeds from the House. The committees have the same powers as the House itself from which its powers proceed. Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of statements is too serious a matter to be taken lightly. Recently, a minister tendered his resignation and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) accepted it. All this as the result of a statement made outside the House. It is

therefore an important matter. There has been in this House during the year 1975-76 a number of instances where a member on either side clashed with a newspaperman, was misquoted by him or gave him an indication that went beyond his thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I submit our rules in this respect are definitely evasive, inadequate and outmoded. In this respect neither hon. members nor the Chair, if I may respectfully submit, can determine exactly what our privileges are. On the basis of what authority, either in Beauchesne or in May, can we define exactly the rights of the hon. member for Athabasca, or for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), or Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) or Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin)? The rules are very evasive, which leads to very unfortunate situations where for instance newspapermen gleefully report some remarks that seem to have been said in the heat of the discussion during our work.

Mr. Speaker, personally I am convinced of the integrity of the four Progressive Conservative members sitting on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. I believe these members work to the best of their ability. The fact they are MD's finally enhances the quality of that committee's work. We have no right to imply that kind of intentions or allegations. But referring to the Chair's earlier remarks, you will no doubt agree, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of an evasive, inadequate and outmoded rule, as I said, you cannot intervene and efficiently protect the hon. members' rights.

This issue therefore is absolutely basic, because it imperils every member in this House under the heat of action, without practically giving him any protection. Mr. Speaker, in the name of my colleagues I wish that on the acceptability and value on merits of the extremely valid question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Athabasca, your ruling also include very positive propositions for the preparation in 1976 of a modern wording in which the rights of members would be clearly defined, so that we know where we stand once and for all. This would benefit newspapermen or other colleagues that may utter certain indications under the heat of discussion, which is only normal. We were elected to give our views. Let us have the means of expressing opinions.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I say this: we have had recently an experience with the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) who, in the heat of the debate, made a certain statement concerning some sugar companies and a certain judge. This has cost the minister his department and his case is still pending before the courts.

Again all this happened not because the minister was right or wrong, that does not matter to me. But what intrigues me and especially concerns me is the fact that today members of parliament, while doing their duty, if they go a little too far and if they do not accomplish their task, are once more censured by the people. Between the Standing Orders of this House which everyone refers to with great admiration, in the final analysis they do not protect the member, do not convey any kind of privilege since neither the Chair nor any member can spell out truly what these privileges are, how far we can go, what are our rights and our responsibilities.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Mr. Speaker, that is why I will conclude by saying that the Chair should take very seriously the question of privilege of the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Yewchuk) since it is only another problem that adds to all these incidents relating to privileges that have taken place for a year or so and because of which this House cannot properly carry out its business, is more or less effective in its proceedings and even less in its measures and, in particular is impeded at given times by the legal aspect.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has gone too far to be dealt with lightly. In view of the fact that the incident referred to by the hon. member for Athabaska happened in one of the creatures of the House of Commons, that is to say in a standing committee, I suggest that this House must not ignore it. It must assume its responsibilities and review the decisions made within one of its creatures, in this case a standing committee. Finally, it must take this opportunity to really determine the rights and privileges of hon. members so that they really be able to do the work for which they are paid.

● (1540)

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton has already made a contribution to this question of privilege. Is he rising on the same question of privilege?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I was going to make a suggestion as to how we might proceed if no other hon. member wishes to contribute. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) made an excellent suggestion. I think the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) ought to be given the opportunity to reflect on what she has said and perhaps done to affect this institution, and be given the opportunity to explain and, hopefully, withdraw remarks which by any stretch of the imagination are at least offensive.

Mr. Speaker: The question of privilege is raised by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) further to the notice he gave the House yesterday. The hon. member raises three procedural questions: first, whether in fact the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) constitute a question of privilege, aside from the fact that they were made in committee; whether the remarks of the reporter referred to outside this House, or in fact any reporter's comments on the performance of any member of the House can, or, to be more specific—if it is possible—constitute a question of privilege, and whether the matter, having been dealt with in committee, the Chair ought to attempt—frankly, against all precedents—to sit in appeal on judgments of procedure made in standing committees. However, these questions are valid enough to be considered.

Furthermore, in respect to the first of the three questions, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is not in the House at the moment, and it is clearly in the interests of a full understanding of the events which took place, or the events which have been described by the hon. member for Athabasca, and in keeping with one of the clear practices of the House, that in questions of privilege of this

sort, whether or not they technically amount to a question of privilege, pending such a decision it has always been the practice of the House, certainly whenever possible, to give an opportunity to the hon. members involved to expose their thinking and to make whatever explanations may be warranted in the circumstances.

Certainly, the Chair would be very reluctant to try to make a final decision on any of the three questions unless and until the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway has either had an opportunity to make an intervention or declines to do so. Accordingly, in the circumstances it would seem the best course for the moment would be for the Chair to reserve any decision, at least until that event takes place, and then after such intervention, if it does take place, further reservation of the matter may be warranted.

I conclude by saying that I think hon. members understand that it is not the desire of the Chair to in any way encourage either a relaxation of the protection of the privileges of any member or to downgrade the quality of respect which is owed by one member of the House to all other members. The practice of this House, in taking most seriously any imputation of motives to any of the members of the House in the conduct of their duties, is one which has been clearly followed in the past. In the eyes of the House an imputation of motives is clearly reprehensible. Whether or not it has constituted privilege, it certainly has been a reprehensible practice, and it is certainly not the desire of the Chair at this time to relax the vigil that the House has always maintained in that regard. However, it might be appropriate to hear from the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway before going any further.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which arises from an answer which the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) gave this afternoon to my question regarding casual and part-time workers in the federal civil service. I am quite sure the minister did not mean intentionally to mislead the House, but he indicated that his announced austerity with respect to growth in the federal service of 1.5 per cent in man-hours involves all workers, including part-time and casual workers.

I spoke with officials in the minister's department prior to asking the question and I was assured by them that the 1.5 per cent growth in the federal civil service included only permanent and term employees, not those who are under contract or who are casual workers. I thought I ought to bring that to the attention of the House in the hope that the minister may be reading this before tomorrow and he may be able to clarify it within his department and to this House.

* * *

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Thirteenth report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications—Mr. Campbell.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I should like to table, in both official languages, a statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance at the federal-provincial conference of ministers of finance on federal-provincial fiscal arrangements.

* * *

[*English*]

PROXY VOTING ACT (AIRMEN)

MEASURE TO CLARIFY DEFINITIONS IN CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-431, to amend the Canada Elections Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend to those employees of commercial aircraft, mainline carriers, regional carriers and any other registered aircraft carriers the privileges which are extended to certain other categories during election time with respect to proxy voting. I commend the bill to hon. members of the House.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MOTION RESPECTING COMPLETION OF DEBATE

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the notice of motion I gave yesterday, I should now like to move the motion under Standing Order 75C.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House knows the terms of the motion, and the House is aware that pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 75C in respect of which the notice was given yesterday, a debate of to hours' duration may begin. There remain only any other motions which might be called pursuant to motions today and questions on the order paper. I wonder if hon. members might agree that it would be in order, before entering into such debate, simply to dispose of questions on the order paper and any other motions, if there are any, in order to complete routine proceedings before putting this motion. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: We agree, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, hopefully, I will have the agreement of the House to approve a motion which appears under notices of motions at page 13 of today's order paper as follows:

That, on Monday, April 5, 1976, the House shall continue to sit between 6.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m.;

That, on Tuesday, April 6, 1976, the House shall not adjourn until the completion of the business provided for in this order;

Electoral Boundaries

That, on the aforementioned days, no private members business shall be taken up;

That, on the aforementioned days, the business taken up shall be the consideration of objections to reports of Electoral Boundaries Commissions;

That all objections to any given report be considered at the same time;

That the objections or groups of objections, as the case may be, be considered in the order in which the objection or first objection in the group, as the case may be, was laid upon the table; and

That during the consideration of any objection or group of objections, as the case may be, no member shall speak more than once, nor for more than twenty minutes.

Ordinarily, this would not come before the House until tomorrow. I have had discussions with representatives of the other parties, however, and I wonder whether there would be unanimous consent to deal with it today. I make this suggestion because I announced in the business of the House that on Monday and Tuesday we would deal with these distribution objections; but until we have approved this order the business of the House is a bit uncertain.

● (1550)

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the government House leader has discussed the matter with me and we are prepared to consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Beaudoin: D'accord.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise at this time on a point of order relating to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario which was laid before this House by Your Honour on February 27, 1976. I will explain why I am raising this point of order now. In view of the order referred to by the President of the Privy Council and the other House leaders relating to the debate which is to take place next week, and wishing to assure the President of the Privy Council and the other House leaders—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned here. If we attempt to depart from the traditional order of events, we may experience difficulty. Perhaps other hon. members will want to contribute to the point of order the hon. member for Thunder Bay wishes to raise. I do not know, as I would not gainsay such a possibility. As things now stand, the President of the Privy Council has proposed an order respecting Standing Order 75C. Questions remain on the order paper. If we depart from the proper order of business we could run into difficulty in attempting to dispose of the point of order now and in the hope that consent for the other matter may be given. I think the safest procedure would be to take matters as they come. I wonder if the House would care to provide some guidance on the point.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would hurt if the government House leader were permitted to put his motion and we dealt with the point of order after that. If the point of order is found to be valid, could it not be dealt with in connection with the report concerning Ontario? I understand the hon. member's position. I do not think it would be amiss, procedurally, if we dealt with it in that way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would it not be more appropriate for the point of order to be raised when the first Ontario objections are dealt with on Monday? Surely the point of order does not apply to the passing of this procedural motion. Surely it ought to be raised when we consider the Ontario report.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. All this shows the difficulties one can encounter when one tries to depart from the regular order of doing business.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, could we not deal with the matter this way: could we not go ahead with the motion proposing an allocation of time under Standing Order 75C? After that is disposed of, we could call this motion for the business on Monday and Tuesday. The point of order could be raised after the question is put, that is, after we have disposed of the motion under Standing Order 75C.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Questions on the order paper remain. I think we shall run into difficulty if we attempt to reorganize our program. We have called motions. The President of the Privy Council wishes to propose a motion pursuant to Standing Order 75C. Obviously, the simplest course is the direct one. We should proceed with the motion in its proper place in the proceedings of the day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME ALLOCATION MOTION FOR SECOND READING STAGE ON BILL C-83

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-83, an Act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, four sitting days shall be allotted to the further consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill; and

That, on the fourth of the said days, at 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business in such sitting, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceeding then before the House, if required for the purpose of this order, and, shall forthwith put, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage of the said bill.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 has now been before the House at the second reading stage on six days. There have been 29 members who have spoken in this debate and, quite clearly, many more also wish to put their views on the record.

The issues raised by this bill are great in number and in complexity. With such a bill there comes a time when general debate ceases to contribute to the resolution of such issues and a more detailed consideration is required. We on this side feel that that time is fast approaching with regard to Bill C-83. We feel that this bill should be referred to the standing committee in the very near future. In my discussions with my counterparts in the opposition I did not find, I think it is fair to say, disagreement with the proposition that the time to send the bill to committee was fast approaching. What we could not agree on, however,

was how fast that time was approaching. My counterparts were not in a position to agree to any arrangements for concluding the debate and sending the bill to committee. Therefore, the government had to take the responsibility.

It is important to note that this motion does not end discussion of the issues raised in Bill C-83. Far from it. This motion provides four additional days of debate at second reading. Then the bill will go to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, where witnesses may be heard and the bill will be given very thorough consideration. After committee, of course, there is the report stage, and after that there will be a very thorough debate at third reading. Thus, this motion is not so much intended to restrict discussion as to move it in an orderly fashion into a more satisfactory forum.

I think in the long run it is beneficial to members on all sides to know in advance how much time is to be given to various debates, and I hope that in the future it will be possible more often to fix the time for debates by agreement among the parties. As things now stand, open-ended debates at the early stages of measures such as this help neither their advocates nor their opponents. Members supporting a measure all too often hesitate to intervene in debate lest the time taken be unduly extended. Members opposing a measure tend, after a while, to repeat arguments and to lose thereby the attention of the media and the public. I might say that a strong advocate of this course was the former leader of the Progressive Conservative party who, like myself, felt that we should concentrate our efforts more in committee and on third reading than on second reading stage.

Mr. Paproski: But he was not in favour of the muzzle at second reading.

Mr. Sharp: The legislative process is deliberately designed to provide opportunities for members not only to examine bills but also to stimulate public response. This particular bill raises issues that have been of public interest for many months. It was introduced late in February and will have received second reading by mid-April after being debated in the House on ten days. This does not seem to me to be an unreasonable amount of time either in terms of House time or of the over-all passage of time that is necessary to stimulate public response. Now it will go to committee where, as I have said, it will receive careful consideration. In due course it will be passed, but that will be many weeks from now. This time allocation motion does not end debate. We are attempting to make the legislative process an orderly one. We would prefer to do it by agreement. We hope that members will soon realize that parties do not have to agree on a bill in order to agree on how much time to spend on a given stage of the bill.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am always amused when the government House leader begins any discussion for making parliament more responsive with the introduction of a motion the effect of which is to muzzle parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: Some muzzle! It's a ten-day muzzle.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The government does this when public response shows the government and the opposition that the public opposes this ill-conceived bill. The government can think of no better way of stopping public discussion than by limiting debate.

Mr. Paproski: By muzzling parliament.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The government House leader decided to do just that. I can think of no better method of muzzling discussion on the bill than embarking on this bad procedure. What is really interesting about this government House leader is the kind of issue he chooses with respect to closure. First it was the anti-inflation program, Bill C-73, which by any measure in this country, prejudiced or unprejudiced, socialist, Conservative or Liberal, political or apolitical, is an absolute failure in terms of inflation. That was his first choice for closure.

● (1600)

The second choice was the abomination of Bill C-58, the *Time* and *Reader's Digest* bill. It started off as a marvellous piece of legislation to improve the publishing industry in this country. All of a sudden, with a little twist of the foot of the Minister of National Revenue, it became a piece of censorship legislation that no one could ever count on. It brought a degree of mystery and intrigue into the law, an ability to change legislation without referral to parliament the like of which we have never seen.

The third instance chosen to muzzle parliament and cut off debate for the government's own reasons and for the reasons advanced in the puffery of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) is this bill.

An hon. Member: Bill C-68.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Yes, there was one other, Bill C-68. That is another indication of the marvellous choices of the government House leader—a grand slam. That bill directly affects the delivery of health care in the province of Ontario and in other provinces. Surely there is not a self-respecting member on the other side who can support such stupidity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We have heard, in terms of the length of debate, the best example of the scissors' syndrome of this government. This bill is full of bureaucratic discretions in many things, not the least in gun control. There is a danger of imposing a burden on the law-abiding citizen and doing very little for the peace and security in this country and the protection of society which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) indicated was the intention of this bill. That is the position which this government asks the House to lie down and accept for the purpose of closure. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to do that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We are not going to accept the unintentional misleading of this House by the President of the Privy Council. He said we had debated

this bill for six days. I have the record of the debates in this House—Monday, March 8, four hours and 50 minutes; Tuesday, March 9, two hours and 35 minutes; Thursday, March 11, one hour and 25 minutes, and then nothing with respect to this bill—and it is he who chooses the legislation, not us—until Monday, March 29, when the matter was debated for 15 minutes. On Tuesday, March 30, it was debated for three hours and ten minutes, and on Wednesday, March 31, for two hours and 35 minutes. That, Mr. Speaker, is a total of 15 hours' debate on a matter that is of great public importance.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If a normal, average day—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. With the noise on both sides it is very hard to follow the hon. member. This is a very emotional subject and I think hon. members should at least listen to the member who has the floor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If a normal, average day at this time of the year is put at three hours and 40 minutes—and that is the experience in terms of debate in this House—we have spent the equivalent of just over four days on Bill C-83. That is hardly any period of time to debate something of urgent and public importance, at least so important that it was put on the order paper and brought forward. The government House leader is attempting to indict the opposition for delaying this piece of legislation. Up to March 31, yesterday, there were 11 Liberal, 11 Progressive Conservative, 4 NDP and 4 Social Credit speakers. If there was ever an indication that a piece of legislation has engaged the attention of members on all sides of the House, it is the record I have just quoted. If there was ever an indication that debate on a piece of legislation ought not to be cut off before running its normal course, it is this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): This was introduced as a peace and security program. It is part of a whole package of legislation that includes a government proposal for the abolition of capital punishment. This government is putting forward an alternative when it asks this country to go with it and abolish capital punishment. If that abolition is important to this government, then I say this government ought not cut off debate on one important aspect of the whole package it is asking parliament and this country to accept. This parliament and this country is not prepared to accept this kind of untoward muzzling on matters which are so important that they are likely to engage the time of the House until the end of this session.

Mr. Blais: Do you want to sit in July?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The choice as to whether we sit in July rests with the government House leader and his colleagues, and not with anyone else. In fact, I think it would be a much more pleasant July if the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) went home.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this government ought to know better, four times they have gone to the plate with respect to closure, and they are about to strike out for the fourth time. The people of Canada are not going to forget what this government is trying to do to this parliament in terms of legislation which is so important that it has generated the greatest amount of mail on any subject since many members have been here, including many who have been here much longer than I have. I cannot understand what motivates this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are thoroughly opposed to this motion. Before he sat down, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) said that he could not understand what motivates the government to bring in a motion of this kind. I can only conclude that the government is stupid.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In the course of his remarks, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) said that he hoped it would be possible more often to fix the time of debate by agreement among the parties. The implication of that statement is that what we are doing today is fixing the time of debate by agreement among the parties, and that is not true. Neither was it true with regard to Bill C-73, Bill C-58 or Bill C-68. This is another case of the government using its authority, its majority and its brute force to tell this parliament what it shall do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As has often been said from the chair, this is a place of debate. It is a place of confrontation, where issues are involved. However, I suggest that when it comes to arranging the business of the House and arranging how we will use our time, that ought not to be done by debate and confrontation. It ought to be done by understanding, consultation and agreement.

● (1610)

I hope to be in this place long enough to see the day when we shall arrange the time of the House by consultation, understanding and agreement. But every time the President of the Privy Council moves a motion under 75scc he puts off the day of understanding or agreement. In effect, he says he cannot wait for the business of the House to be arranged in that way; he has the power, he has a majority, and so he uses a form of closure. Every time this is done, it not only raises questions about the immediate issue under debate but it delays the day when we can come to some sensible arrangement about the conduct of business.

An hon. Member: Not with you here.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is for this reason I am annoyed because this stupid motion is being put forward today, and my colleagues and I will vote against it. What is before us is Bill C-83. Gallup polls and other indications make it fairly clear, I think, that the majority of Canadians want legislation along the lines of Bill C-83. But there are requests from all over the country, even from those who support the bill, for improvements and modifications which might be made in committee.

There is, however, a sizeable minority of Canadians who do not like some of the things that are contained in the bill. They have a feeling it is being railroaded through the House. The minister's action today will reinforce that feeling. As for the minority which does not like the gun control measures, I suggest they have a right for their voices to be heard through members in the House who wish to express their objections.

I used the word "stupid" with respect to this motion. I did so deliberately because I think that what is being done today hurts the cause of Bill C-83. It is hurting the cause of the whole peace and security legislation package. I wish the President of the Privy Council had paid attention to the advice some of us tried to give him not to bring in this motion.

May I also point out, in addition to the statistics put on the record by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton in connection with the debate up to this point, that the motion the minister has made is not as generous as he would like to suggest. He said there would be four more days; and there were interjections during the remarks of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton repeating that phrase—"Four more days". We learned today that those days are to be Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of next week, and Monday of the following week. So two of those days are short days, the Wednesday and the Friday. Further, on Thursday, Friday and Monday there are private members' hours and I see nothing in the motion which would turn those hours into time spent on Bill C-83. So the total number of hours is limited.

I suggest, too, that there is another form of closure which comes into play when a motion such as this is made. When there is no time limit placed on debate, members of the opposition speak one after another and government members sit back; they do not like to speak because they know that to do so would lengthen discussion. But when there is a time limit on the preceedings they rise freely to take part in debate, and since the majority of the members of the House are Liberals they can claim, and expect, a majority of the time to be allotted to them in the days available.

Mr. Blais: And why not?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. I would remind hon. members that during this debate no member may speak for more than ten minutes. Experienced members know that once a speaker has the floor he should be heard without interruption.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That interruption from the other side reveals the basic attitude of the Liberal majority. The Liberals think they run the place, they think they own it. I was not suggesting that Liberal members do not have the right to speak in this debate. I was pointing out that by taking up 50 or 60 per cent of the time available, they cut down considerably the amount of time available to the opposition.

Mr. Blais: Why not?

An hon. Member: Because we shall be under closure.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I shall spend no more time dealing with these idiotic interruptions. The fact of the matter is that the motion contains the elements of double closure. It provides for four days, two of which are short and on three of which there are private members' hours. It also sets up a situation in which members of one party can take up more than half the time available. This means that opportunity for the opposition to express its point of view will be seriously curtailed. Again, I say the President of the Privy Council has been most unwise. In my opinion he has done a disservice to the good which is contained in the bill; he has done a disservice to the whole peace and security package, and he has done a disservice to the effort to arrive at arrangements for conducting our business in an orderly fashion. We shall be voting against the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, as both House leaders spoke before me, namely the leader of the official opposition and the leader of the NDP, I ought to express the views of the members of the Social Credit Party of Canada. We strongly object to the adoption of this motion under Standing Order 75C to restrict the debate on Bill C-83 to four days only on second reading.

This important piece of legislation deals on the one hand with gun control and on the other hand with all the measures the government intends to take in order to reduce the crime rate in this country. I think that anyone who supports this motion accepts at the same time that a member's role be downgraded. It is even an undemocratic measure because it cuts short forcibly the debates in this House. Why then are members elected to come and discuss in this House if the government keeps on resorting to this so-called special legislation to end the debate to suit itself?

In my view, it is a misuse of authority, it is dictatorship, and history has proved that those administrators who have indulged in dictatorial methods were most unpopular at least with those under their jurisdiction.

I hope that all the members of this House will take a stand against that proposal, even Liberal members. Otherwise, I shall have to conclude that there is some truth in the tale about the frog which is gradually heated in a pot of water until it bursts. I shall also have to infer that this tale applies to the letter to those speechless members whose powers, responsibilities and even right to speak are being gradually eroded and who allow themselves to be quietly boiled by the government House leader and the cabinet without so much as raising an objection.

No matter how the government leader explains away that his motion is not a motion of closure, it is nevertheless a gag. I will not accept this attitude on the part of the government. Nor do I accept the rule which was passed in

1969 because it is becoming a political instrument in the hands of the government whenever it wishes to gloss over a problem or ignore an important or controversial issue, as is the case with Bill C-83.

If the debate were to last for too long, the public would have enough time to realize the nonsense the government is ramming down their throats through this legislation. Therefore the government is simply reducing the discussion period to a maximum of four days. That is why I say that Standing Order 75C is an anti-democratic political tool. What other logical reason could there be to limit the time spent on debating this bill?

Are there very few bills before the House? Is there any problem in the country which calls for an emergency debate today and which would require the time of the House? The government has not given us any proof of that. Bill C-83 now before us is very important and its implications are many. Many members had expressed the desire to take part, in conformity with democratic principles, in this debate on second reading.

Then why is the government trying everything to limit these discussions, if not prevent the opposition from doing its work, thus making sure the public has no time to react; for public opinion is beginning to get involved.

If the government does not want to manage in a democratic way, it should say so openly and stop this charade to make believe that discussions in Parliament are not useless. At the same time it could tell us how the real powers governing the country—those who administer it and introduce legislation—are out of the House and Parliament and can be found in the hands of big financiers and enterprises that take care of the Liberal party fund.

When the government takes out this blackjack that article 75C of the Standing Orders represents, less than 10 per cent of the members of this House have spoken on second reading of this legislation. There were 28 speakers out of 265 members and ministers, as follows: 11 Liberals, 11 Progressive-Conservatives, three New Democrats and three Social Crediters.

It is now suggested that the debate be limited to four days only. If we look at the schedule of the House business, it may happen that such days be allocated as follows: three short days and only one long day, which will further reduce the time allocated to hon. members. Tomorrow, Friday, is a short day, because the House does not sit in the evening. Next Monday and Tuesday will be devoted to the consideration of the electoral boundaries reform. Wednesday and Friday will be short days and Thursday, April 8, will be the only long day devoted to the consideration of Bill C-83.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else I would like to point out before concluding. By ending the debate on this bill, the government gives the impression that it is irregular that on second reading the House should devote more time to some bills than to others. As if all legislation should be equally important and require the same time, which is totally wrong and illogical.

Mr. Speaker, when it is impossible to have democracy serve one's own purposes, one is sometimes willing to resort to force. This is how I see this motion which was introduced today pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 75C. The entire government army, with its back bench mercenaries, is now fighting against democracy and we have the proof.

In the Middle East they have the PLO, the Palestine Liberation Organization. Here in the House of Commons we have the Liberal party which, through this silencer motion, becomes Parliament's PLO, the Parliamentary Liberties Ostracizer, so to speak.

● (1620)

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the government has moved that Bill C-83 be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs after four more days of debate. The motion is moved under this section simply because we could not receive agreement under the other sections of the rule having to do with time allocation. As has already been pointed out, this will mean that there will be ten days of debate on what, under the rules of the House, is supposed to be the principle of the bill, not the detail of the bill.

For those unaccustomed to parliamentary procedures, I want to put on the record, as did the House leader, that this bill will go to committee for clause by clause, word by word examination by the members of that committee. The committee will call witnesses. The committee is comprised of good members from all sides of the House; there are lawyers and experts of one sort or another on the justice and legal affairs committee. The bill is then reported from the committee back to the House for consideration of changes made in committee and for third reading. The same process is then repeated in the other place, the Senate. By no imagination, Mr. Speaker, is this rushing legislation.

The debate so far, of which we have four more days to go, has confirmed my own belief that amendments to the criminal law of this country are complex, intricate measures that require detailed and careful examination in a committee. It has confirmed that there are misunderstandings of the proposals made in Bill C-83 which can only be cleared up in committee. It has confirmed that there are many groups in this country that need and want to be heard on the bill. If the opposition does not want to provide them with an opportunity to be heard, then I want that clearly on the record.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Sheer sophistry.

Mr. Basford: The debate has shown that there are parts of the bill of particular contention, such as the gun control measures and the protection of privacy amendments. With regard to gun control, a number of concerns have been expressed by responsible and knowledgeable members of the House, some resulting, however, from misunderstanding which I hope is not deliberate. Questions have been raised concerning the nature of the licensing system; as to the adequacy of the firearms-use training programs; as to the nature of the rural needs and interests and the urban needs and interests of the people of this country; as to the bill's effect on gun collectors and on crime and criminality; and as to how to encourage responsible gun use.

We have spent six days debating those subjects and we will debate them another four days. I may be a lawyer and a politician, but I believe in action, Mr. Speaker, rather than rhetoric. I believe that the most effective action at this time is to refer this bill to the expert committee on justice and legal affairs so that the many suggestions made by members of the House, as well as those made in correspondence and in briefs, can be considered by that committee of experts. It is in the hands of the committee, not mine, Mr. Speaker; but I hope that at an early date the committee will hear, and hear exhaustively, the representations of the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Wildlife Federation—of which I am a member—the firearms and responsible ownership group, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Canadian Sporting Arms and Ammunitions Association, the Shooting Federation of Canada. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association is a responsible group that has raised questions about Bill C-83 which it is my duty, as minister, either to answer and convince them or consider changes in the bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear from the various native groups that have expressed concern about the bill. All of these are people who have a right to come to parliament and be heard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: An effective parliament has the obligation to provide the machinery to hear these people at the earliest time. Much has been said recently about the importance of making parliament more effective. I was delighted when the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) was elected the new leader of the Conservative party, because he said one of his priorities was to see parliament become a more workable and relevant institution. I regret that his House leader and his followers are out of step with him already—only three weeks after his election as leader.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: We have not had any resignations yet.

Mr. Basford: We on this side want an effective and relevant parliament. The Leader of the Opposition wants an effective and relevant parliament, and the people of Canada want an effective and relevant parliament. For Pete's sake, Mr. Speaker, let us make this that kind of parliament!

● (1630)

It is the theory of parliament that the government proposes legislation and parliament disposes of it. In this case, Mr. Speaker, parliament cannot properly deal with this kind of legislation until it has received full, rational and complete consideration by an expert committee which, under the Standing Orders, is there to deal with bills of this House. The committee on justice and legal affairs is the place to deal with the details, the words, the clauses and the ramifications of Bill C-83 and to explore with witnesses of interested groups their views as to the effect of this legislation and where it goes.

When we have had ten days' debate on the principle of this bill, we should then refer it to the committee, as this motion would require. I do not think my history in trying to get legislation through this House would indicate that I am unreasonable when looking at amendments, and I think the hon. member for Calgary South will confirm that.

Mr. Woolliams: He might, but I won't.

Mr. Basford: We cannot look at amendments or changes, and we cannot look at the details and the ramifications of this measure until it is before the committee.

Someone asked how members on this side of the House can support the motion today by the government House leader, seconded by myself. The reasons are very simple, Mr. Speaker, and they are two: we on this side of the House believe this country needs an effective and relevant parliament and, second, we want to put parliament to work dealing in detail with the problems of crime in this country. Let us get on with that job.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) congratulate our leader, in spite of his fallacious remarks. It is true that our leader said we wanted a workable parliament, but he never suggested that we wanted parliament gagged or muzzled, and that is what the government is doing today. The Minister of Justice says he wants action and not rhetoric. I suggest that what he wants is a dictatorship rather than a democracy.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: What has taken place, Mr. Speaker? There has never been a bill brought before this House about which there has been so much public response and uproar. It is not about what the bill is called, but rather about what it contains. All across this land—and everyone of the backbenches over there knows this—there has been a great deal of response in the form of letters and telegrams, in fact, there has never been an issue over which so much abuse has been poured on the government—and that is what it deserves. This bill contains not only gun controls—about 83 pages in that regard—but also provisions relating to dangerous offenders, amendments giving police full powers under wiretap, amendments giving provinces additional jurisdiction and provisions respecting parole and the Parole Board.

The Minister of Justice talks about wanting to get on with the job. We have so far had about 15 or 16 hours of debate. There have only been 11 Progressive Conservative, 11 Liberals, 4 members of the NDP, and 4 of the Social Credit party who have made speeches on this bill. Considering the important content of this bill and the amendments to the Criminal Code, 16 hours of debate is nothing. This whole thing is a farce. It is nonsense that the government should implement the provisions of Standing Order 75C at this time to guillotine or cut off the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Woolliams: Is this the new kind of arrogance, the new kind of duress, the new kind of coercion? Is this the new society? Is this the new compulsive democracy? Is this just the beginning? Our House Leader pointed out that

this measure has been used four times. Is this the procedure we can now expect to be used? Are we to have a few hours' debate on important matters and then be gagged in the opposition? The Minister of Justice said the committee is the place to study this bill, rather than here in the House. If we carry that argument to its logical conclusion, it means that we will just have second reading with a bill referred to the committee, and that is all. That is nonsense.

Mr. Sharp: We said ten days' debate, first.

Mr. Woolliams: I suggest that if this is the way we are going to carry on in this place, parliament will not last. God help Canada, God help the democratic process, and God help Canadians. How long can this country withstand this government that was elected on a program totally different to that which it is trying to implement now? This is the same government which is preaching and implementing an easing of the laws which, either intentionally or unintentionally, is making it easier for the criminal element to operate against law-abiding citizens. The government now comes forward with a peace and security package to cover its mistakes. This is a legal poultice to cover up the next bill, C-84, about which the government is frightened of public opinion.

I hope the Minister of Justice's promises about amendments to be made to the bill and briefs that will be received from a wide section of the country are not idle promises. The Minister of Justice may feel that we should be allowed to call more witnesses and hear more briefs, but I am always afraid of another guillotine that can be used outside this chamber. That guillotine is the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who will tell the Minister of Justice how many briefs and how many witnesses can be heard. He is the man behind the scene. This is the Prime Minister's baby, and the mover of this motion is merely his puppet.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: The government House leader dances to the tune of the Prime Minister. Because of this action on the part of the government, when this bill does get to the committee, which has always worked well together, instead of there being that kind of fellowship and co-operation we will have nothing but tension.

Mr. Lang: Oh, surely!

Mr. Woolliams: The minister says "Oh, shoot". He might want to change that word, because I could use it in reply.

Mr. Lang: I said, "Oh, surely"—you are not being serious.

Mr. Woolliams: I am being very serious. I think this is a very serious matter. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt (Mr. Lang) may think this is a great joke because the guillotine is part of his way of life.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the parliamentary secretary rising on a point of order?

Mr. Blais: No, Mr. Speaker; I wish to participate in the debate.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The parliamentary secretary did not rise in time, and I recognize the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman).

● (1640)

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, on one occasion, when discussing the relative merits of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) as against the merits of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), someone asked me who I would hire as my lawyer if I had to go to court. My reply, of course, was obvious: I said that it depended upon whether I was innocent, or guilty. If I was guilty, I would obviously take the Minister of Justice, because that had been his role for a long time. I remember the minister when he was a bright, curly-headed backbencher. His job in those days was to take the bad case of the government and to defend it. That is how he got to be Minister of Justice. He did such a fine job of defending bad cases that they made him minister—and he is still doing the same thing. So everything changes, and nothing changes.

This is one of the things that I do not think the Liberals will ever learn, namely, that it is important to have an opposition in the House of Commons. If the Liberal party had its way, there would be just the Liberal party in the House.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saltsman: I hear "Hear, hear!" They admit to it openly. When they say that, after all, they are entitled to speak and they rise and say they are entitled to equal time with the opposition, do you feel like asking them, "What are you guys supposed to be doing in caucus? This is not the Liberal caucus, this is the House of Commons." I presume that they have voices in their own caucus, and I presume someone pays attention to them in their caucus. But perhaps they do not; perhaps they sit there like a bunch of sheep in caucus and no one pays any attention, so they impose closure so that someone notices they are alive. They do not understand the most elementary fact about parliamentary debate and the opposition.

What is the point of this debate? This is an important decision that parliament is being asked to make. It is a decision that must be aired, a decision that needs time to gel. They say, "Take it to committee and examine it point by point." It is valuable, and no one disagrees that it will go to committee at some point; but public opinion is formed in this House of Commons and it needs time to form. That is the point of the debate, and that is the one thing the Liberals do not seem to want any part of. They can take the best case in the world and, by some incredible piece of genius, turn it to mud. Many of us on this side of the House recognize the importance of this legislation and, in fact, have spent a good part of our time going around the country and defending it. We have tried to reassure people that the government does not mean to be arbitrary, that it does not mean to behave badly to the collectors of guns or the legitimate hunters in this country.

What is the government trying to do? It is trying destroy a good case. It is going out of its way to take a good case and wreck it so that nobody can defend it. This is really what the implication is. If we look at the legislation, we find sections in it that have an arbitrary ring. One of the

legitimate complaints of people who are hunters or collectors of guns is their fear that the government intends to be arbitrary in relation to them. If anything is required to reinforce these fears, the government has managed to do it by bringing in closure. It has managed to say, "Yes, you cannot believe a thing we say in this legislation."

I have spent a good part of my time in the past two months speaking to rod and gun clubs. I have been very fortunate, because there are a number of rod and gun clubs in my riding and their members initially did not see any need for legislation of this kind. But unlike the American rod and gun clubs or rifle associations, the members of our clubs are pretty intelligent people who say, "All right. If parliament wants to have this legislation, if the country or parts of the country feel that this kind of legislation is important, we are prepared to co-operate."

I am very proud of the rod and gun clubs in Canada. They have gone out of their way to look at the legislation, to make suggestions, and in most cases their suggestions have been excellent. After all, what do most of us in this place know about guns? Not a great deal. I certainly do not know a great deal about guns, about collecting guns and about the problems associated with either the legitimate or illegitimate use of guns. I welcome the kind of advice that I have been receiving from hunters and associations who know more about it than I do. I have asked for their co-operation and it has been given to me.

I am sure I am not the only member in the House who has done that. I know other members have gone to these associations and asked them to help them, to look at the legislation and to make some suggestions so that we can come out with a bill which achieves the purpose we want it to achieve; in other words, to keep guns out of the hands of the people who should not have them, without inhibiting the legitimate use of guns for sports activities and the use of guns in the hands of people who know how to take care of a gun and do not constitute any problem to society. That is really what many of us have been working to do, and we have received that co-operation.

How do I go back—I am glad I am not a member of the Liberal party; I am glad I am not one of their backbenchers—after having sought the co-operation and given assurances to the rod and gun clubs that the government means to do the right thing, and that if there is something wrong with the legislation there will be ample time in parliament to look at it and correct it and explain the government's imposition of closure? I do not have to do it, of course, because I can say I did not like it and I voted against it. But I would hate to be a Liberal trying to explain that after having gone around telling rod and gun clubs not to worry about it, this legislation will not hurt them, their feelings will be taken into account, the government wants their ideas, it wants to listen to them, and then the government brings in closure and cuts off the debate.

What is the great urgency about getting the bill through in what amounts to two working days? I suspect that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt), while she does not have much of an effect on anybody else, has had a very profound effect on her caucus. She has sold them the notion of piecework, that you come to the House under a kind of piecework system and that the more words spoken in the House of Commons, the more it costs the country. We are not on piecework. We get our salary whether we talk or whether we do not talk, whether we sit all year round or whether we do not sit all year round. As a matter of fact, some people over there rarely come here.

An hon. Member: That is socialism.

Mr. Saltsman: It is equality of income. It is equality of condition, rather than equality of opportunity. I do not think you should take the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway very seriously. I see there are a few people opposite who have suddenly become very articulate. They are going to speak today because they do not have to worry about the opposition. It is very handy; they brought in closure and they can kill it themselves by talking. They do not need caucus because, after all, caucus is irrelevant. I wonder whether they have said anything in caucus.

It is really disturbing—and I think every member of the House is upset, or if they are not upset they certainly should be—to see the kind of thing the government is doing with this particular legislation. I think it is the kind of legislation which the country really needs, and that is what makes it doubly sad for all of us to see the ineptitude of the Liberal party trying to bring in legislation that is required, and destroying it simultaneously.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in participating in the debate because I hope that my few comments might tend to temper the attitude which seems to have been created by the opposition. Effectively I am a parliamentarian, and I have indicated that before. I feel that this House is a place where debate ought to take place. I am very disturbed by the suggestions made by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) and by the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) that Liberal backbenchers ought not to participate in any of the debates in this House, or at least that our participation ought to be inferior, numerically, to the participation of hon. members on the other side. Surely that is a complete misconception of the role of a member of parliament. Surely hon. members opposite will agree that each and every member of parliament is equal in status in this House and should have an equal opportunity to participate—

● (1650)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: —in the deliberations within this precinct. I am shocked when the hon. member for Annapolis Valley says that for us to maintain that we have a right to participate equally in any debate in this House is stupid because we are dealing with government legislation. That is the depth of misconception of the role of a backbencher, whether he is from the opposition or from this party. The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge says we have a caucus, and why do we not speak up in caucus? That, again, is an absolute misconception of the process within this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge knows full well that the backbencher's role in caucus, prior to the introduction of legislation, is to make sure that the legislation is acceptable when it is presented. Once the legislation has been presented following the input of the backbenchers in caucus, surely it is the obligation of those backbenchers to sell the legislation, as much as it is the responsibility of the minister to sell it, and to persuade gentlemen on the other side of its validity. Surely that is the role of hon. members on this side. Surely we have a role in debate. If we are to have an adversary process, we are not going to sit here and be bludgeoned by hon. members opposite—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: —with the use of misrepresentations, be they unconscious misrepresentations; and on top of that, using all the rules available to them in order to defeat the legislation of the government without any response from this party. I can understand the objection of the New Democratic Party. When we were dealing with this same motion with regard to Bill C-68, every member of the NDP had spoken—and when we consider the legislation which has been delayed in this House we note that that small party, representing less than 10 per cent of the total number of members in this House, has taken a disproportionate amount of time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Sit down.

Mr. Blais: The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) tells me that I should sit down. The hon. member has had an opportunity to speak whenever he has been in the House, but that has not been too often lately. He has had more opportunities than any other hon. member in this House, or any backbencher in the Liberal party whose attendance record is superior.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) has taken my name in vain, I want to point out that he has talked about equality among hon. members in this House. I have been seeking an opportunity to speak on second reading of this bill and I am being denied that opportunity by this motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker accused us of taking too much of the time of the House in relation to the number of Social Crediters who are elected. I think this is not true. If we take time it is because we want to comment on the issue and find it important, and we are entitled to speak in this House as much as he is no matter how many members are elected since we are elected democratically. If we are in this House it is because we secured a majority in our ridings.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): I think the points advanced by the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) are really points of debate and the parliamentary secretary should be allowed to continue his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), I suggest that I did not refer to the fact that his party was taking too much of the time of this House. I spoke about the members from the socialist party. I did not refer to the Social Crediters for whom I have much respect. I respect not only the hon. member for Richmond but also all his colleagues.

[*English*]

When the hon. member for Nickel Belt—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: I have a problem with my voice. It is not as powerful as the voices of some hon. members opposite who are kibitzing. May I have some peace so that my arguments can be made?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: We don't kibitz. Only the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) kibitzes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Perhaps the parliamentary secretary will regain his voice over the next couple of hours. I will leave a note for the next occupant of the chair to the effect that when this debate resumes at eight o'clock, certain time should not be subtracted from the hon. member because of the difficulty he has encountered.

An hon. Member: The poor little fellow!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Criminal Code—Suggested committee study on other methods of applying capital punishment; the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz)—Industry—Douglas Aircraft, Malton—Measures to save jobs—Date of announcement of aerospace policy; the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche)—External Affairs—Cambodia—Inquiry as to Canadian protest against violations of human rights.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills, public bills and notices of motions (papers).

PRIVATE BILLS

[*English*]

CONTINENTAL BANK OF CANADA

The House resumed, from Thursday, March 18, consideration of Bill S-30, to incorporate Continental Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there have been some suggestions, which I do not believe were conclusive, that the sponsor of the bill before this House would be prepared to forgo the hour by postponing it in order to carry on the debate on the motion of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). I am not sure there is disposition in all corners of the House in that regard, but if there is, I would be very grateful.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is not a disposition in all corners.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): There does not appear to be unanimous consent, and when the bill was being debated previously the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) had the floor.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking previously I referred to a number of names on the list of directors which indicated the interlocking directorship of those who comprise the board of IAC and the directors of the proposed Continental Bank of Canada. It was pointed out that these poor, small, little innocent people were asking for the right to spend whatever largesse they have under their jurisdiction for other people. I referred to some of those people and mentioned some of their interlocking directorships. Many already are bank directors. In that category I put F. M. Covert, a director of Royal Bank; J. S. Dewar, director of Toronto-Dominion Bank; C. F. Harrington, a director of BM-RT Realty Investments, which is jointly owned by Bank of Montreal and Royal Trust; L. A. Lapointe, a director of Toronto-Dominion Bank; Paul Paré, a director of Royal Bank; and Renault St. Laurent, a director of Banque Canadienne Nationale.

● (1700)

It strikes me as strange that all those directors, who also hold the directorships in other companies, want to set up another bank. My party, which represents many disadvantaged people in this country, does not favour the proliferation of banks. We see no reason for establishing another bank. I agree wholeheartedly with at least one plank of the Creditiste party: The banking industry should be nationalized. At present there is absolutely no competition in the banking industry except to the extent that one teller, in one bank, may be cuter than another in another bank. We

would be well advised to nationalize the banking industry, not proliferate the number of banks. Let us nationalize banks so that they can work in the national interest and develop this country uniformly. The need for more uniform development is evident in our disadvantaged areas, the maritimes, northern Ontario and many parts of Quebec. We do not need the proliferation of banks. Adding one more bank to the list will merely mean the addition of an expensive building downtown in some city and more expense for someone—for me and the ordinary Canadian.

Banks do not always work in our best interests. For example, the other day an Ottawa bank refused to cash government-backed pay cheques. I do not know if the Bank of Montreal across the road had listened to some disgruntled civil servant, but it refused to pay government-backed pay cheques. Mr. Speaker, our banking system is not like the United States system. Our banks do not go bankrupt; they do not behave stupidly because they are governed by the Bank Act. They are protected. They cannot go broke unless the country goes broke. Imagine a bank saying, "We cannot cash government-backed pay cheques because the government has no money." If the government has no money, the banks don't have money either, because they get their money from the government. Mr. Speaker, there is no competition in the bank industry.

All the directors I mentioned who hold interlocking directorships want to establish a bank merely for their own advantage. IAC has not been a good company. In many ways it has been a bad company. In northern Ontario, IAC cancelled some automobile financing contracts. In New Liskeard it was responsible for making two automobile enterprises go out of business. IAC decided that there were better returns in the small loans business than in the automobile business. Were automobile time payments not lucrative enough? Apparently not, because they now want to go into the banking business.

Those little, disadvantaged citizens on the board of directors of IAC want special privileges going far beyond letters patent which would establish the new bank. They are asking, in effect, the Bank Act to be changed. They are asking all kinds of favours which could even give them advantages over other banks. Mr. Speaker, we will not act in the best interests of the small people of Canada if we let those shysters, those people on the list of interlocking directors, band together and set up another bank. They want to do it only for their financial advantage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is extremely important for us to express certain opinions during this debate on Bill S-30, which aims at allowing the IAC finance company to become a chartered bank in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, since my early childhood, I have heard Canadians from all parts of the country, especially in my social group, say that finance companies are bad, that they gouge the people, charge high interest rates and use the financial problems of people to jump on them and strangle them. Finance companies in general are commonly called the sharks of finance. Mr. Speaker, this is why I am surprised to see that one of these companies wants to become a bank. This must means that there is something even more profitable than being a finance company. IAC

does not want to become a bank because of its generosity, it does not want to become a bank simply because that would serve Canadians. I refuse to swallow that.

● (1710)

Mr. Speaker, it is important to realize that finance companies in Canada have always been scorned by almost all Canadians, especially those who had some knowledge of either social or economic issues. They were considered as big villains, as loan sharks.

Every time we talked about the bank system, the chartered banks, the process of creating money, every time we said that chartered banks systematically control the Canadian economy, the government as well as the provinces we were told by the Liberals that it was not true. They tell us it is an extraordinary and excellent banking system and that there is much to be said for the Canadian banking system because, thanks to it, our economy is sound. The Liberals find the proposals of the Social Credit Party concerning the bank system ridiculous. When we tell them it is only normal that a country should control its own economy, namely the money, the Liberals find this funny.

And now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have become the sponsors, the supporters of a finance company which is aiming at changing into a chartered bank. First of all, Mr. Speaker, this is proof that our banking system is a real racket and that it actually exploits Canada. The IAC people who hold capital stock amounting to hundreds of million dollars are no fools, Mr. Speaker. They like to get in where there is money to be made and where there is security. That is why they want to leave the world of finance and become a chartered bank.

They said in committee, and I was there, that the finance market is no longer secure, that it is overcompetitive and crowded, whereas banking is an open field with room for one more bank in Canada. That is why they are applying for incorporation. Mr. Speaker, not only do they wish to incorporate as a chartered bank, but they do not comply at all with the Bank Act nor with the Bank of Canada Act, as one immediately realize upon reading Bill S-30.

Mr. Speaker, Bill S-30 contains more than five exceptions to the Bank Act and the Bank of Canada Act.

My third point is this: Mr. Speaker, IAC which wants to become a chartered bank not only does not comply with the Bank Act, but asks for exemptions on 16 points and, in addition, asks to be given letters patent one year before the ten-year review of the Bank Act due in 1977, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) confirmed again this week.

Mr. Speaker, here is what is most serious about the decision Parliament is about to make. If this Parliament agreed to incorporate this corporation so that the new Continental Bank may transact business, we would thereby create a precedent in our chartered bank system. We would grant letters patent with 16 exceptions to the Bank Act, and the following year the same government would introduce a new Bank Act. And what would the government do with the act it had just passed, which is not yet passed and already contains 16 exceptions?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government is supporting this bill in Parliament because they have financial interests to preserve or promote. If the government is actually serious and concerned about the Canadian economic situation, it is first going to allow the House and Parliament to conduct an in-depth, responsible review of our banking system in order to correct abuse and then allow IAC to become a bank if they still want to. Mr. Speaker, even if this financial institution waits a year before it is transformed, there will be no great harm done. I would like to repeat that Liberals, with regard to the banking system, are pure hypocrites. They protect the banking system and compromise with it. They allow Canadian chartered banks to generate—I cannot state an exact amount but from memory—I would say 16 times their deposit. They let the population being exploited by uncontrolled interest rates which deprive people and require more of them than they can financially assume. The Liberals protect a banking system which contributes to run our country, our provinces and our municipalities into debt.

The Liberals prevent the provinces, their own partners, from having their own bank. What they refuse to their partners in confederation they are prepared to grant to a finance company. The Liberals are hand in glove with the banking system to protect it, and the list read by the some hon. members of New Democratic Party to the effect that the owners of some banks are also owners of Dominion Stores, Steinberg. This nice big family of nice people, Mr. Speaker, indicates to what extent there is an obvious monopoly in the banking system, yet the Liberals say: We should leave banking system as it is.

When we discuss with the liberals, they tell us: You Social Crediters are very good MPs indeed, but the moment you start talking about the banking system, it's the end of it. They recognize that we are right on many points, but never on the banking system because they are protecting it. So what is their interest in refusing that this point be discussed? They prefer to introduce Bill S-30, recommending that Parliament turn a blind eye on 16 exceptions to the law on the chartered banks which Parliament itself voted. They ask us to vote the bill and then, next year, they will ask us to vote their own law on the charteved banks because they, the Liberals, always hold the truth.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the fact that this bill could be voted quickly, I object, on principle, to this bill. I am not opposed to the fact that the IAC become a chartered bank, but I refuse that this company be given letters patent so that it can transform itself into a bank, on the very eve of the day when we are going to decide that the law dealing with the chartered banks be revised. Mr. Speaker, I think we are going a bit to fast, we are putting the cart before the horse.

In committee, it appeared that if passed, Bill S-30 would create a number of precedents. The committee heard a Mr. Read, inspector general of banks, who very definitely stressed the fact that a big financial corporation was attempting to covert into a bank. That resulted from government policy which stimulated competition within the banking system. Some may say there is too much competition within the banking system, others will say there is not enough competition, but this is not the main point. What counts is the reason why IAC wants to become a bank.

That reason is that the banking business is quite better than the finance business.

Mr. Speaker, if people knew what goes on the banking system, they would be astounded. Mr. Speaker, many people and several members of parliament, especially opposite members believe that the government controls money in our country but they are wrong; the chartered banks, not the government, control money, the issue of money and credit in Canada. It is not the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) either who controls the issue of money and credit.

The finance minister and Cabinet members control the lives of citizens in many areas. They control subsidies, they encourage unemployment, they control inflation, they control the workers' salaries, they control some prices—they say. They fine companies which want to raise their employees, salaries, they control people through forms, through taxation, and they control Parliament today through Sanding Order 75C. The government controls the political life of the people of Canada at all levels, from birth to death. But this very government does not control one cent of our bank system, but is the valet of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I raise here a fundamental issue and none of the opposite members can give any evidence that I am wrong. This question is very clear and one has only to listen to the President of the Royal Bank to know it.

● (1720)

This afternoon I read his latest speech, in which he attacks the government anti-inflation policy. This is to save the face because there is no section in the act dealing with this subject. It will also be noticed that in the anti-inflation this government is controlling workers. It also controls prices in some way, it is confronting everybody and downgrading collective bargaining. But this same government flatly refuses to control interest rates. Abuses are tolerated. They let the banks create money, they let them create in a systematic way 16 times their volume, if I am not mistaken. That is a minimum figure, 16 times their volume.

Banks are allowed to set interest rates. People are forced to pay back principal, interest, plus interest on the principal money that does not exist. Mr. Speaker, a certain type of business or "racket" is allowed between those banks. They are allowed to buy bonds and control our municipalities and even the federal government, but interest rates are allowed to go up. Who foots the bill, as always? The Canadian citizen, the low-wage earner. What then is a new bank doing in that picture? Absolutely nothing more, except maybe some supposedly increased competition. But everyone knows that there is no competition in the banking system. There may be different corporate names, but basically it is the same group of people, it is a family compact, it is a monopoly.

When one bank increases its prime rate, the others do the same. When one increases interest rates on deposits, the others follow suit. When one bank tightens the money, the others follow suit. This is simply a monopoly, protected by the Liberals, encouraged by the Liberals. When I think, Mr. Speaker, that these same Liberals would now allow a finance company considered by every Canadian as a loan shark, when I think they want to allow that company to become a bank, I see the light. This is disappointing. At any rate, a great number of people are shown that banking is much more profitable, and gives a much better yield than any investment that could be made by a finance company. Mr. Speaker, many things have been written about the banking system. I have studied and read the latest works published on the occasion of the last review of the banking system.

I hope to follow very closely the review for 1977. Mr. Speaker, we shall see that once again the Liberals will be there, not to promote the review of the banking system, but to protect the banks and ensure that this review will be in their favour. Mr. Speaker, as concerns the proposals of Bill S-30, I have nothing against IAC, I have nothing against its wish to become the Continental Bank; it can do what it wants. We live in a democracy, at least the opposition thinks so, Mr. Speaker; we live in a free competition system. I am not opposed to the idea that this company have the same public recognition as the Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Montreal, the Canadian National Bank and any other bank; I am not opposed to that, but I want the government to understand that we are not going to swallow this as easily as it hopes.

A company cannot become a Canadian bank simply through a small bill like Bill S-30, because we are supposed to know nothing about the banking system, because this is only normal and good for competition. Too many things and too many factors are involved in such proposal, Mr. Speaker, for us to close our eyes and do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that on behalf of Canadians, before going along with the government under the pretext of helping competition, we must see the situation like it is. This government is very good at making us swallow or believe certain things. For instance, when a parliamentary delegation makes a trip, the Liberals glorify themselves throughout Canada by saying: For our part, we live in a democracy. They use the Progressive Conservatives, the New Democrats and the Social Crediters to show that the Canadian Parliament is a great democracy. But when we are back in Parliament, they invoke Standing Order 75C and blame us for wanting to work. Mr. Speaker, this shows how much this system is hypocritical.

Let us truly go to the bottom of things and before issuing a permit, a piece of paper, in return for some favours for the Liberal party I suppose, Mr. Speaker, let us serve the interests of Canadians, let us go to the bottom of things and let us protect Canadians through the banking system. In other words, let the government regain control over the issue of money and credit in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that these are all honest people and very nice guys, but the most powerful cartel in Canada is the banking system, the banking monopoly, and as Canadians we cannot agree to increasing this cartel. We do not believe that competition will be increased through Bill S-30. The monopoly of money on human lives, human beings is allowed to grow. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the decennial bank review it is, to my mind, premature to pass Bill S-30, all the more so because it does not comply with the chartered banks act and the Bank of Canada Act, and because Parliament is being asked to pass, in addition, the sixteen exceptions to the Bank Act it includes. Mr. Speaker, let us leave well alone, for the time being. Let us hope

for an in-depth revision of our banking system after which we can see how necessary and urgent additional competition is within our banking system.

● (1730)

For the time being, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and this I repeat, it would be premature to allow this finance company to become a bank. However, that possibility is certainly interesting, and I shall make sure this bill is sent out to the tens of thousands of Canadian citizens who did not hesitate to laugh at the Crediters when they decried the banking system: they might then see where the racket is: With the finance companies or the banks.

Mr. Speaker, Bill S-30 is the best proof that the Social Crediters are right in attacking the banking system. And the government recognizes our claims in this regard through this bill, since it proves that the real monopoly is not that of finance companies but that of the banking system. No one is forced to go to a finance company but everyone, sooner or later, has to deal with a bank. There is the real monopoly.

Some time ago, I made a speech in this House to prove the monopoly that exists with food products. At that time, I demonstrated how the owners of the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Bank in fact own Dominion, Steinberg and Canada Packers. I think that if we relate this to what the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) said, it becomes an extremely dangerous monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, let us go back to the sources. Let us allow the Canadian people to control their own country. However, the members of the cabinet want to make us believe that inflation is being controlled. The Liberal members say to us: You members of the Social Credit Party claim you know the banking system, but you would print money. It is the usual joke. Then they tell us: There would be too much money in circulation and money would have no value any more. Suffice to look at the present situation, Mr. Speaker, and to ask oneself: what is money worth today? Absolutely nothing. Our unemployment rate is increasing. And the members of the Social Credit Party are not those who are in power.

Mr. Speaker, we must stop fooling around with the banking system, it is too important and too serious. We will have to approach these matters seriously. Here is a very simple example. When there is too much blood in the human body, what happens? Hemorrhage. When there is not enough blood, there is anemia. If there is too much money in Canada, certainly it is not good, and the same if there is a lack of money.

Now the government is saying in its fight against inflation: Tighten your belts, restrain yourself! Let unemployment increase! Control yourself and accept a 10 per cent ceiling on your wage increases. At the same time, the profits of chartered banks rise to 30 per cent, interest rates are up and the government does nothing. That is why I finally ask the question. On which side does the government stand? On the side of the Canadian people or of the banking system? Who elected this government and whom does it serve? For me, it is obvious that it serves—

[Mr. Fortin.]

[*English*]

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I am really very hurt and touched by that fact that this bill, S-30, is being sponsored by a member of parliament who comes from Northern Ontario, an area I represent. I think of all the hours he is going to put in in defence of a group of corporate bigwigs when we face such serious problems in northern Ontario, including those just enunciated by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion which showed in its tabled report that we are on the wrong side of the track. His riding in northwestern Ontario, and my riding in northeastern Ontario, are probably the two most underprivileged areas in this country, with a declining population, a housing shortage, pollution, and unemployment. Meanwhile, this member of parliament is getting himself tied in with the political bosses to be a running dog, as it were, to the corporate sector, to be lackey, to be a footman to the corporate sector in moving Bill S-30 through the House.

Mr. Symes: A flunkey.

Mr. Rodriguez: My hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie says "A flunkey". I suppose that could be most apropos. It hurts me to see the fine talents of a member like this being wasted a fruitless, frivolous search after building the corporate banking system, one which, does not in any way serve the interests of the people of northern Ontario. We heard the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) point out how quick they are to withdraw from even such activities as financing automobile purchases. It really grieves me to see a man who was involved earlier in the budget debate defending motorboat owners and motorboat dealers, and all the rest, being used again. Why could they not have got someone from their backbenches, a flunkey from an urban centre, or one of their corporate sector guys over there to sponsor this private member's bill through the House? I say to the hon. member: It is a shame you have to come to this level to be a sort of capitalist-roader for Bay Street and try to move this bill through the House.

An hon. Member: A Bay Street buddy!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Is the hon. member for St. Catharines rising on a point of order?

Mr. Parent: Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear something about the bill which is before us. Surely the hon. member for Nickel Belt does not intend merely to waste our time by dilly-dallying on calling hon. members on the back benches here "flunkeys". We would not think of lowering ourselves to call him anything so base. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would direct the hon. member to say something, at least, about the bill which is before us so that we can get on with the business of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1740)

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the hon. member for St. Catharines (Mr. Parent) is that I would have preferred him to sponsor the bill through this House rather than the other flunkey. It is good to get a bill like this once in a while coming through this House because it once more reinforces what we on this side have long

recognized—the incestuous relationship that exists between Liberals, Tories, and the corporate sector of this country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order. The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Corbin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has the floor used a word in the English language that has not been interpreted and I should like to know its meaning. I wonder whether the interpretation service could give it to us. I think the word used was "flunkey".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The hon. member asks for an opinion or a direction from the Chair. I have had the opportunity to consult and it seems to me that the word "flunkey", though it has some definite connotations, is not a term ordinarily considered to be unparliamentary.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I will use a term that hon. members may better understand. The parliamentary term would probably be "bumboy" instead of "flunkey". This bill is excellent when it comes to showing—

Mr. Raines: A point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Raines) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Raines: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would wish to withdraw his expression "bumboy". However, if he wishes to stay with it I suggest he is stuck with it. I do not think it is a matter of great importance, but on another point of order I would suggest that hon. members should not become too preoccupied with the sex life of parliamentarians since we have had reference to the word "incestuous", and a few other connotations, which may be of interest to some people outside the Chamber though I think we have other business to do. Since we have had reference specifically to the expression "bumboy", perhaps we could get a definition. Otherwise we might waste a great deal of time, and so I will await Your Honour's ruling on that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Whatever happens I will not count the time taken against the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). The attention of the Chair has been directed to the "Concise Oxford Dictionary" which is upon the Table of this Chamber. I cannot see the word "bumboy" but I do see the word "bumbo", which is a cold rum punch. That seems to be a very commendable suggestion.

I think the hon. member has a certain knack with words. Frankly, the Chair had more difficulty with his use of the word "incestuous" than the word "flunkey" or the word "bumboy". When the debate becomes a little warm in here we do try to respond in kind. I do not think it holds up operations in a way that the Chair should intervene. Therefore I recognize the hon. member for Nickel Belt, and the time taken will not be held against him.

Continental Bank of Canada

Mr. Rodriguez: Thank you for your kindness, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that when it comes to showing that Canada's financial and political systems are one and the same thing, no course in any school or business administration could be more effective in showing that relationship than simply coming to this place and observing the progress of Bill S-30 through the House and the other place. Every time one looks at this bill or at the companies behind it one cannot help but stumble over the names of Canada's big business, the guys who clearly run both our country and our finances, and that includes this House and the other place. As the profitability of IAC goes up, there are a lot of people who stand to benefit greatly. I am not talking about the little shareholders benefiting. They will still have to go to the banks feeling very apologetic about asking for a loan. But the big boys and their friends will see plenty of profit, and this is the kind of thing that we in this party question.

Why should we make an exception under the Bank Act to facilitate this particular arrangement for IAC to become a bank? We have argued that IAC ought to go through the normal processes stipulated in the Bank Act if they want to become a bank. Parliament ought to be making exceptions for small groups in this country, yet never does. For example, widows should be able to get their widow's pension and the guaranteed income supplement. Why not put a special bill through parliament to enable such people to get those benefits? Why not sponsor a private member's bill to do this? We on this side would let it go through almost without debate so that the poor people of this country would get some benefit.

This is why we in this party cannot vote for privilege. That is what this is all about, Mr. Speaker—privilege. We as a party have stood against privilege and will stand against privilege, and we do so as it comes before this House in the form of Bill S-30.

The hon. member for Timiskaming made reference to the name Bronfman. That name has come up time and time again during this debate. The Bronfmans are the friends of the health minister. He travels in their jets to Israel and all over the place. It seems to me there are a lot of other people like that, MP's and Senators, members of both houses, who are involved either directly or indirectly in IAC.

Since this is a Senate bill let me see how that body is involved in interlocking directorships in IAC and other companies. I have a list of Senators before me and the companies on which they sit as directors, on the boards of other companies as well as IAC. I should like to show how corporate interlocking meshes with memberships of this parliament. Since we are dealing with interlocking directorships it is only fair to put on the record the names of those in the other place who have an interest in this particular bill.

Why should the people of this country put up with this kind of nonsense? These are individuals who are supposed to be passing laws. They are passing laws for themselves. They are the ones who will get the biggest benefits out of IAC becoming a bank quickly through circumventing the regulation that provides that you cannot be a member of the boards of directors of two banks at the same time. Who are going to get any benefit from that, Mr. Speaker? It is certainly not the people of my riding or the people in the

riding of Kenora-Rainey River. We cannot even get the government to close off a polluted river in that area.

Who is the first poor little Senator who is trying to make a living on his senatorial salary of $29,000 a year? His name is Louis-Philippe Gélinas, a Liberal. He is vice-president and director of the Mercantile Bank of Canada. I think they had profits of 65 per cent in the last quarter. In any event they did very well. He is also a director of the Canadian International Paper Company, Candiac Development Corporation, Delta Benco Limited, and Gerling Global Life Insurance Company.

Incidentally, there is a Mr. C. F. Harrington, the honourable, and a Senator, who is also on the board of directors of IAC and on the board of directors od Gerling Global Reinsurance Company.

An hon. Member: They don't talk to each other.

Mr. Rodriguez: They don't talk to each other? I see! As I say, he is a director of the Gerling Global Reinsurance Company. That is a new one; reinsurance.

An hon. Member: They get you the second time around.

Mr. Rodriguez: He is also a director of Alexander and Alexander Services Limited, Gerling Global General Insurance Company, Greyhound Leasing and Financing Limited, Montreal—

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the hon. member who has the floor, and has referred to Senator Gelinas, that he passed away sometime ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

An hon. Member: That's NDP research for you.

Mr. Rodriguez: The way things go around here, the spirit lives on.

He is also involved in Montreal Refrigerating and Storage Limited.

An hon. Member: You mean was.

Mr. Rodriguez: Also the Manicouagan Power Company, and North American Car (Canada) Limited.

Then we have one Peter Kilburn and Renault St. Laurent, directors of IAC. Then we have reference to Hilton of Canada Limited and one Louis A. Lapointe who is also on the board of directors of IAC as well as Canada Cement Lafarge Limited and United North American Holdings Limited.

We then have E. Jacques Courtois who is a director of IAC and of Foster Wheeler Limited, Crush International Limited, The Robert Mitchell Company Limited, Distillers Corporation, Seagrams Limited, and is an honorary director of John Labatt Limited.

An hon. Member: If I had all that I would never die.

Mr. Rodriguez: I have always been under the impression that they have been dead over there for years.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I think there are provisions in the Standing Order referring to members of the other place, and while I think the Chair has to permit the hon. member to continue the type of debate that is presently taking place in the sense that he is raising a very fundamental issue which involves one of the Houses of Parliament, it should be done with a certain amount of restraint, particularly regarding personal references that are outside the actual subject matter.

Mr. Rodriguez: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then, of course, we have John M. Godfrey, a Liberal Senator as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): May I interrupt the hon. member again. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, in view of the manifestly limited vocabulary of the hon. member perhaps you might define the word "restraint" for his benefit.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I do not think it helps the Chair or the debate very much when members use points of order to smuggle in one-liners in a debate such as this.

Mr. Rodriguez: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Beaudoin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

It is not that I doubt your judgment when you say that we must take care not to name members of the Senate, Mr. Speaker. However, it is obvious that when a person has a federal or provincial charter, it is a public document which anyone can see; it does not harm any reputation. I know that this does nothing but describe the facts to the House.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Perhaps the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) misunderstood. I hope that I was clear, but perhaps I should repeat what I said so that hon. members will know. The Chair did not suggest that members of the other place could not be identified by name in connection with their outside activities. I just thought this ought to be done within the spirit of Standing Order 35, which I shall read in part as follows:

> No Member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of His Excellency or the person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any Member thereof.

I certainly grant the hon. member for Nickel Belt the right to identify people in the other place and the directorships they hold. I think that is quite proper in a debate such as this. But I thought one of his remarks went perhaps a little too far, and that was when I interrupted him.

Mr. Rodriguez: The next senator we are dealing with, and I should like to make this clear to the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) since this gentleman is still with us, is John M. Godfrey, a Liberal. He is a director of IAC and a director of Campbell, Godfrey and Lewtas.

He is vice-president and director of Renzy Mines Limited, and secretary and director of Cleveland Twist Drill Carpet (Canada) Limited, Canadian Admiral Corporation Limited, and Canadian Klockner Limited.

Then there is one Denis K. Yorath who is on the board of directors of IAC as well as of the Montreal Trust Company, Dover Industries Limited, Howell Litho and Cartons Limited, Richardson Mernell (Canada) Limited, Wayne Sweeper Manufacturing (Canada) Limited. He is, in addition, governor of the Canadian Council on Social Development.

An hon. Member: That's interesting.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, that is very interesting. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have one Harry W. Hays, another Liberal senator. He is a director of the Burritt Travel Service Limited and of The Canada Permanent Trust Company. Then there is Mr. K. H. MacDonald, also on the board of directors of Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation and on the board of directors of IAC.

An hon. Member: They don't talk to each other either.

Mr. Rodriguez: They don't? I guess that means they are on opposite sides of the Chamber. Then, lo and behold, we come to K. H. MacDonald who is also a director of that company and also on the board of directors of IAC. This K. H. MacDonald is the same fellow. He is also a director of the Home Oil Company Limited. Then we have Renault St. Laurent. He is on the board of directors of IAC and Lakeside Cattle Company Limited.

I understand that this chap Harry W. Hays, the Senator, is also a director of Lakeside Cattle Company Limited. Then, somehow or other, and I do not know how this gets in here but I suppose it is quite understandable, we have Senator E. C. Manning—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. The hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) rises on a point of order.

Miss Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member accept a question?

Mr. Rodriguez: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Miss Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member if he is saying that all private sector activities are intrinsically wrong, or is he going to offer us some kind of definition of the degree of nationalization he wishes?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. member for giving me this opportunity to clarify once again what we are about here. When I started out I said that if we look at Bill S-30 and what it attempts to do, and we look at the people who are behind it, we find an interesting situation in view of the fact that we are dealing with interlocking directorships. That is the purpose of our amendment. No director should be allowed to sit on two boards of directors of banks. I was trying to point out the incestuous relationship—I cannot help but use that word because this conjures up in my mind—

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize if I used the wrong word, but I am just a new Canadian and I have difficulty with the language. I am trying to build a word picture for the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I regret having to interrupting the hon. member but his allotted time has expired. I did him extra time in light of certain events that occurred during his speech.

● (1750)

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, do I have the permission of the House to continue?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): The hon. member has asked for leave to continue, but there is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, who said no?

Mr. Roy (Timmins): I did. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely the hon. member—and I should not use the term "honourable"—the member who just spoke should know that with the low level of the debate in this House he lowers every constituent whom he represents. He should be ashamed of his performance. If he cannot flush that big head of his through the toilet, he should not leave this extra mess behind.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I think the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) has been very intemperate. I can understand that the hon. gentleman has become so perturbed because his friends have been unmasked. But surely we should extend the usual courtesies in this House to each other irrespective of the views we put forward.

I have heard members in the House being accused of having been in cahoots to protect the medical profession. We saw that today.

I have had the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Hurlburt) insult me in the House for being a foreigner and a new Canadian.

I would never suggest the hon. member for Timmins is not honourable. I may think all sorts of things about him, but surely this House is a forum for the democratic process and we observe those niceties here. I suppose that is most difficult when your friends are being bored, but surely his words are uncalled for in the House. He should be asked to apologize and withdraw his words because, if that is the system, I could use every kind of word in the House with respect to that gentleman.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): I suspect that the language used—

Some hon. Members: Make him withdraw!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): A great deal of the language used in the last half hour has been intemperate, and some of it has been provoked. The Chair therefore,

with much cheerfulness, turns to a healing force, I hope. I recognize the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I hope my speech will not produce the same effect as did the one of the hon. member who has just spoken. I would not like every of you to draw prematurely his own conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate having this opportunity to express my admiration for all the great financiers who have contributed and still contribute to the administration of this country and of its banking, financial, industrial, commercial and agricultural institutions.

Various institutions such as IAC Ltd. have felt that their great success was being too closely emulated by the big banks, particularly since the revision of the banking system in 1967. That is the reason why these corporations want to sustain the competition against those privileged banks by obtaining the same charter, with the same privileges. All things considered, it matters little to us, of the Social Credit, whether the number of banks in the country varies by one or two. The important thing to us is that our bank legislation should be more in line with the good of the people in general, that is should control more closely their exclusive privileges, and that their services should reach the whole population rather than a small proportion of all Canadian citizens.

Personnally, I have no objection to IAC Ltd., its president, directors and shareholders being allowed to run their bank on the basis of the privileges granted to other banks, since the law exists and these gentlemen certainly have the millions of capital necessary to operate a bank. We can also recognize that greater competition between banks is even more beneficial to the people who have more options with regard to the source of credit they are seeking. When a bank refuses to give you a loan, you can apply to another one. I know something about it for it happened to me not so long ago.

We are pleased to see that the chartered banks are doing a terrific business and making tremendous profits, each year, and that they are repeatedly increasing by several billions their yearly assets out of their profits, and after tax, Mr. Speaker. During the last fiscal year, we have seen in public reports that, 10 chartered banks have increased their assets by more than 14 billions; the Bank of Commerce has increased its assets by 3,300 millions and the Royal Bank of Canada by 3,500 millions.

And is only one year Mr. Speaker, in Parliament we have seen our government increase its annual deficit of $3.50 billions by $500 millions. You can see here the government representing the people and the banks representing the private sector which, within a single year, has increased its assets by $3.5 billions, while the people have to account for a deficit of $3.5 billions, that is, altogether, a difference of $7 billions for this single item.

How is it, Mr. Speaker, that before the revision of the Bank Act in 1967, banks were only accounting for an annual increase in assets of about $3 billions while now, not even ten years later, the annual surplus of their assets is over $15 billions?

There is a great deal of talk about inflation, higher rate of unemployment and poverty. But who benefits from inflation, who suffers from unemployment and poverty? It is a question far more serious than it appears on the surface. It is all very nice for the banks to make big profits and to increase their assets and capital. There is nothing wrong, *per se*, in having strong banks and companies in Canada, but we still have to make sure that it is not going to be detrimental to the interests of the majority of the Canadian people.

When me talk about Social Credit, we mean finance, on a social level as much as on a capital level, we mean work, and so forth, and social justice, for all Canadians.

Why then is the gap widening each year between the poor and the rich between those who make profits and those who operate at loss, including our present government. Why is it that the more the deficits increase on one side, the more the assets increase on the other?

Does that not depend a little on legal privileges granted to some at the expense of others? That is what we must take into account if we sincerely want to fight inflation, unemployment and poverty in Canada in 1976. I do not want to imply that all is wrong in Canada, but I want to say to everyone that there is a way to correct a situation which is not related to the laws and legal privileges that we granted to some and not to the others.

Mr. Speaker, we have no time here—

An hon. Member: Call it six o'clock.

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): As the hour for the consideration of private members' business has now expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

That, in relation to Bill C-83, an Act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, four sitting days shall be allotted to the further consideration of the second reading stage of the said bill; and

That, on the fourth of the said days, at 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business in such sitting, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceeding then before the House, if required for the purpose of this order, and, shall forthwith put, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage of the said bill.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I have only two minutes, Mr. Speaker, I am told. So, I have one point to make.

First we are accused, when proposing this motion, of not providing enough time for public opinion, in fact, to respond to the bill before the House.

[*English*]

This bill was given first reading on February 24. At that time the government House leader indicated that he would allow approximately ten days before bringing the bill on

for second reading because, although it has been expected by hon. members of the opposition, there was a belief that perhaps some time would be required in order to ascertain the full impact of the bill. Subsequently, at the request of the opposition House leader, an additional week was permitted so that public opinion would be allowed to jell, so we did not begin second reading until March 8.

The purpose in not beginning before March 8 was to permit hon. members of the opposition and government backbenchers to communicate with their constituents so that their constituents migh be informed about the provisions of the bill. I am not responsible for any delinquency on the part of some hon. members of the opposition in failing to communicate with their constituents and advise them on the provisions of this bill and to obtain replies from them.

Initially when I became aware of this bill I insisted upon communicating its provisions to everyone in my riding who was interested. As a matter of fact I have been in constant communication with most of my constituents interested in gun control and other aspects of this legislation for the better part of 18 months. As it stands, I am now replying to replies received from people in my constituency, so in effect the matter has jelled in the minds of constituents in the riding of Nipissing. I might indicate that they are willing and ready to make representations so that those representations can be dealt with when the matter goes before the Committee.

I suggest that now is the time to pass this bill at second reading and send it to committee. To the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), who is concerned about not speaking on this bill because of this motion, I say that when he speaks to his party whip the superiority of his remarks will permit him to be recognized within his caucus, and in the event that his whip feels that his remarks are superior to those of other hon. members of his party, he will be heard. Of course I doubt very much that that will be the case.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, this debate demonstrates beyond any doubt that Standing Order 75C is not working. I am not talking about Standing Order 75, because we have Standing Order 75A and 75B. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) knows full well that when we brought in these rule changes back in 1968 it was the understanding of the House during that debate, notwithstanding the fact that this particular provision of the rules was itself brought in by closure, that Standing Order 75C would only be used on the rarest of occasions, and rightly so, because we are talking about closure.

We know the history of closure in this House. We know what it did to the Liberal Party in 1956, and it went on to pay for it in 1957. However, there is a whole new element entering into the use of the principle of closure, and that is the application of closure when there is no apparent urgency. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) pointed out that we have spent barely six days on this bill. If we equate that to full parliamentary days, it works out to about three days or a total of 15 hours, and now we will have closure. As a consequence of this measure before the House and the vote which will follow we will be told that we have only four more days of debate.

I listened with great interest to the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais). It is not often he gets a chance to take off in full flight as he did today, and perhaps that is a good thing because I know the pent up frustration of the hon. member who has an opportunity in this House only to say no.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: He is the original Dr. No. I can imagine the parliamentary secretary having a nightmare one of these days and waking up in the middle of his sleep saying, "Yes, yes, yes".

An hon. Member: To his wife, I hope.

Mr. McGrath: Just think how many worth-while measures have been cut off by the indiscriminate use of the prerogative of the parliamentary secretary to withhold unanimous consent under Standing Order 43.

I listened very carefully to what the parliamentary secretary said. He said that each and every member in this House is equal in status, and I could not agree with him more. Each and every member of this House is equal in status, yet by the very motion of closure which has been introduced in this House the government is denying us the right to participate at second reading of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I have the right to speak at second reading of this bill. Every hon. member of this House has that right, if he feels so inclined. I submit that there has not been a bill which has come before this House in a long time which has aroused public interest to the extent this measure has, in my recent knowledge, and there has been no measure which has generated more mail than this bill.

It is only right that each member who has to deal with his constituents, who has to answer to his constituents and has to account for his actions in this House—if he feels so inclined and if he feels that he has a responsibility to his constituents—should have a right at second reading of a bill to stand in his place and speak on behalf of his constituents. We are being denied that right.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), when he participated in this debate, said that second reading was only a debate on principle. I am not going to argue that. We are operating under new rules; we have new procedures for the passage of bills in this House; we have committee stage and report stage. Debate on the principle of a bill has always been an important part of our parliamentary procedure, has always been an important prelude before a bill is sent to committee. It sets the state for the examination which is to follow in committee.

● (2010)

This afternoon I listened with amazement to the Minister of Justice saying that it is time we sent the bill to committee so that witnesses can be heard. I say to the Minister of Justice and to the government House leader that members of parliament have the right to be heard

before witnesses are heard. That, Sir, is what this debate is all about.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put his finger right on it when he said that it is the right of every member of this House to be heard. Sir, we have that right. I will be the first to concede to the parliamentary secretary and to the government House leader that at times, infrequent to be sure, closure can be justified. But I submit that closure under Standing Order 75C was never meant to be applied as a general principle.

Mr. Blais: It is not closure. It is time allocation.

Mr. McGrath: Consider what has happened since the beginning of this session. We are now debating the fourth closure motion introduced since this parliament began. What does this mean? The government talks about managing the business of the House; but when you talk about four closure motions you are talking about debate taking two full parliamentary days.

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

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McGrath: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you are talking about debate taking two parliamentary days.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point or order. The hon. member suggested that the government has introduced four closure motions. I submit that that is not correct. There have been only three closure motions. Allocation of time was not used with respect to the anti-inflation bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The hon. member can deal with that point if he makes a speech.

Mr. McGrath: The fact remains that important time of this House has been used to debate closure motions brought in under Standing Order 75C. That is a shameful misuse of the time of this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: The government's shameful action in bringing in closure on this bill will ultimately be reflected in the votes which voters will cast when the government goes to the country to give an account of itself. Make no mistake about it, closure will be an issue.

I was surprised to hear the Minister of Justice, a parliamentarian for whom I have the greatest respect, stand up and try to justify closure after only six days of debate on the principle of the bill. I listened to him very carefully. He brought forward that well-worn cliché: parliament disposes, the government proposes. He meant that this government proposes and arbitrarily disposes, and to hell with parliament. That is the government's attitude.

I hope the Minister of Justice can assure us before this debate ends that this bill in committee will not be treated as Bill C-58 was treated. As you remember, Sir, the government introduced closure in the House with respect to Bill C-58. When the bill was sent to committee we found ourselves once more faced with closure in committee. We were told to send Bill C-58 back to the House before Christmas. And what happened? We did not reach Bill C-58 again in the House until last month. How can the government justify its shameful use of closure on that occasion? It introduced closure on second reading, and closure again when the bill was in committee. I see the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) nodding, apparently in approval. He was on that committee and knows that what I say is right.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. His time has expired.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, today when the government House leader moved the closure motion under Standing Order 75C we learned what the new society is all about. At one time I thought the government wanted to do away with free enterprise. Without equivocating, I say that the government seeks to emasculate the opposition. That, exactly, is what it wants to do. The government wants to reduce us to nobodies. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), and the government House leader have said so in so many words. They want to reduce us to nobodies, and we will not accept it. The government seeks to erode the authority of parliament. I only wish the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert were here this evening. He would tell the House what this is all about.

The government has conveniently forgotten the role of the opposition. It is our role to be the watchdog of the public purse and to make the government behave. It is hard to make this government behave properly. It is also our duty to offer constructive criticism. This we have done all along, but the government pays no attention. This insensitive, arrogant government does not want a watchdog, does not want to be told how to behave, does not want to listen to constructive criticism. Yes, I recall the words of some ministers, "We are the masters of this House." Nobody falls for that nonsense. There is a responsible role for the opposition to play. We accept our responsibility, no matter what the government wants to do.

The Prime Minister's attitude to the opposition is, if they don't like it they can lump it.

Mr. Cullen: Really, really!

Mr. Alexander: I see the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) opposite me. He is one of the class of '68 and no doubt remembers the statement attributed to the Prime Minister, "If they don't like it, they can lump it." Well, when the Prime Minister says that to me he is talking indirectly to between 80,000 and 100,000 people. As my hon. friend from St. John's East said, the people will not forget in the next election.

Here the government is, closing off debate on an important measure. It says we may debate the closure motion for two hours and the bill for four more days. What will happen when the bill is in committee? The work of our committees is a myth. Our committee structure is a farce. It is insensitive to the wishes of opposition members. So far as I am concerned the committees are nothing but à means for pushing through government bills. The opposition has been muzzled even in committee. I have seen much hanky-panky in committees. We have asked that witnesses be called, and the government refused.

It is quite possible that the government will close off debate on this bill in committee. The government is fond of closure, fond of stifling debate on controversial measures. I am thinking of the anti-inflation bill, the *Reader's Digest* bill, the medicare bill, and other similar bills. In those cases the government ended debate with closure. The guillotine prevented my speaking, took away a right given to me when I was elected. I listened to the parliamentary secretary talk about bludgeoning. They are masters at that. We in the opposition must guard our rights most jealously. We resent this strong arm, arrogant use of closure. There is no excuse for it.

● (2020)

We have had 16 hours of debate. Surely a bill so complicated and complex that not even government members understand what is going on and the implications of it should be given more time. If government members do not know, they will soon know because letters are coming in by the hundreds, stating that this bill is ill-drafted. It was brought in without any thought whatsoever. All we are trying to do is point out these faults and make constructive criticism so that what is a bad bill can, perhaps in the long run, become a contemporary bill, one that is acceptable.

In conclusion, it must be tiresome for members opposite again to hear the government being labelled arrogant—tiresome, but true. Again members of the government are proving they have little understanding of and less respect for the House of Commons. This closure motion on Bill C-83 is a disgrace. It is a disgrace to the government House leader, to the government, and to all members of this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: I urge prompt defeat of this guillotine motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, when I sit and listen to debates like this I often question my position with regard to capital punishment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: This afternoon I did a quick check of the order paper. I found that there are 19 or 20 government bills at different stages presently before parliament, bills which should be passed before the end of this session or, as hon. members know, they will expire and must be re-introduced in a new session. These are important bills for the Canadian people. We as a government are committed to them and we want to see them passed as soon as possible. It is obvious that the opposition is not as enthusiastic about the bills as we. It is in their interest to drag out debate as long as they can. It is in their interest to delay the government's legislative program and make it look as poor as possible.

The government, faced with this situation, has two choices. It can either let the opposition run this House and control this parliament, or we can do it ourselves. If we do not take action to see that our legislation is put through this House in a diligent way, then I say the opposition will do it in their way. How will they do it? They have what I call the closure of the opposition. They have the closure of delay, the closure of repetition, the closure of obstruction, and the closure of just plain tactical interference. With that type of closure, instead of passing those 20 important bills before the House of Commons, we will only pass five or ten. I say that is just as serious. It is what I describe as closure by the opposition.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) criticized the government for putting this motion to provide ten days of debate at second reading, and he poses as an opponent of closure and allocation of time. However, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did not hesitate for one minute in the last two weeks to introduce a motion to adjourn this House when it suited his own political purposes. That kind of tactic to introduce motions of adjournment, to refuse extensions of hours and to introduce frivolous motions to delay time in the House, is just as much a delay in time and obstruction, and a type of closure as this type.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: As long as the opposition insists on using that type of closure in trying to control this House, we will respond with reasonable rules and reasonable measures to put through our program of legislation.

There are other ways to get through the large volume of legislation that we must put through this House. We could extend the hours of this House. We could extend the sittings. However, I understand that each time we went to the opposition with that kind of proposal, they turned it down. I have been in this House time and again when the government House leader has asked for an extension of hours so that we could sit late to get in more debate and pass a bill, and was refused by the opposition. That is one way we could do it. I am sure our House leader would be pleased to discuss that type of extension of hours.

I also understand that the government House leader approached the opposition House leaders during this debate to see if they would accept some allocation of time such as seven days, ten days, or 15 days. They were not interested in any allocation of time. We asked for a suggestion, but they were not interested in an allocation of time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. This afternoon I called the House to order. Each member is only allowed ten minutes to speak. It is difficult for the Chair to follow the debate when one cannot hear what is being said. I ask hon. members to allow the minister to speak and be heard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) suggested that we were acting contrary to the spirit of parliament in introducing this motion. However, I do not know of any parliament under the British parliamentary system that drags out debates as long as this parliament in Ottawa. If we look at the parliament of Westminster we find that it is very rare for any debate on second reading to go beyond a couple of days. Further, if we look at many of the parliaments in our Commonwealth, very few of them go beyond a few days on second reading

debates. Therefore if hon. members wish to follow the spirit of parliament I suggest that we follow the Mother of Parliaments and restrict second reading debates to one or two days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: The government introduces motions like this the better to order the progress of business in this House and to see that its program of legislation will be passed in a reasonable period of time. The government also introduces motions like this as a response to the opposition attempt to run parliament according to their schedule. As I said earlier, as long as they attempt to foreclose the program of legislation put forward by the government with attempts at closure by delay, repetition, and obstruction, we will respond with motions such as this.

If this motion passes there will be four more days in this second reading debate. There will then be a long period in committee where the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), myself, and our officials will go to explain the legislation. Other people in the country can come before the committee and put forward their views. There will also be a long debate at the report stage, and a long debate at third reading.

I will start taking the opposition seriously, when they talk about closure and time allocation, when they show me by their actions that they are willing to take a responsible approach to the business of this House.

● (2030)

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I might say, as a member who, since 1972, has been sympathetic to gun control and who has introduced two private members' bills in the House on the subject, that I am disappointed, disillusioned, and literally amazed at the stupidity of the government.

There can be no question about the importance of the legislation. It affects four million people in Canada and a stimulating debate has developed up to this point between those interested in the shooting sports and those interested in increasing public safety. The government's refusal to allow this debate to proceed uninterrupted is a knee-jerk reaction of an administration which does not understand the sensitivity inherent in legislation of this type. To impose closure thus soon is running the risk of losing sympathy for the legislation in terms of the public debate which is going on in the country at large. As one who has long supported the principle of gun control this action brings no credit on those who have advocated such a position.

The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) talks about the "closure of delay" and the "closure of obstruction". He has demonstrated clearly the closure of his own mind on the subject. It is absurd to try to pass peace and security legislation in the absence of a consensus, without support in the country, and the government is throwing this support away.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has told us he would like to see the gun control provisions severed from this package. I had reservations about that proposition because this is not just a gun control bill, it is a wiretapping bill, a dangerous offenders bill, a crime inquiry bill, and a parole bill. We had serious reservations with regard to the Conservative position on that aspect. At this point, however, we feel we ought to rethink that attitude in the light of the decision the government has taken.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has told us he would like to get the bill into committee so that witnesses might be called. I have been waiting for a commitment from him and his supporters that closure will not be imposed in the committee as well. I should like a commitment that a long and full debate will be possible with regard to this subject in committee and that we shall not find the Liberal members on that committee dictating to us how many witnesses will be called and how much time we can spend listening to their views.

The motion we are considering today is an indication of the fact the government has lost touch with the constituencies. I can understand the frustration of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) when he said that members of the opposition were always on their feet talking while Liberal backbenchers do not have that chance. One justification for closure is the opportunity it provides for Liberal backbenchers to contribute. I can understand their frustration, having to sit there in silence or, worse, pound their benches after some of the nonsense we hear from over there. They want to get up once in a while and show they are alive.

The mail every member has received on both sides of the peace and security issue is overwhelming. There has been so much response that I cannot conceive any sensitive government cutting off debate.

Mr. Allmand: When are you going to move to adjourn the House?

Mr. Leggatt: It is another indication that these people are no longer merely arrogant; they are drunk with power. They are replacing arrogance with a stupidity they used not to show. The government will need all the friends it can get if it wishes to pass the kind of controversial legislation we are considering. It has made a silly, stupid, and arrogant decision to abandon those friends. It will rue the day when it decided there is no longer a place for meaningful debate in the House. To impose closure after such a limited time is a shame. In this party we have had four speakers out of 16. The Minister of Justice said the other day that this was just a debate on the principle. Mr. Speaker, the principle here is whether three million people in Canada will have to register themselves. Could there be a more important principle than that? That is the principle of the gun control provisions, and that is why it is so vital.

An hon. Member: Why don't you get up and move the adjournment of the House again?

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bélanger): Order, please. I think hon. members have enough experience to know that when an hon. member has the floor he must be allowed to speak and be listened to carefully.

[*English*]

Mr. Leggatt: We oppose this motion because all members should have an unfettered opportunity to make an input on

the subject. We should be able to hear the views of members who are concerned on either side. The government is preventing hon. members from getting the advice they need in order to vote intelligently on this matter, and I suggest it will live to regret its arrogant stand.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to take part in this debate although it is a very sick motion. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is well known for his views on capital punishment and, while many would disagree with them they are respected because they are sincere. Yet a minister who has such strong views on an element that some people consider has to do with the protection of society comes into the House of Commons with this type of closure motion and, in effect, speaks for a type of capital punishment.

● (2040)

The Solicitor General is against capital punishment for those who commit murder, but now he wants to go beyond the pale and, after literally only 16 hours of debate in the House, has the nerve to stand up and practically refute his sincere belief in the abolition of capital punishment. By coming out for "capital punishment" on this bill, Mr. Speaker, that is what he is doing.

I thought that all of the April fool jokes came early in the day, Mr. Speaker. If I did not know better I would say that the motion before us today is one of the sickest April fool jokes that has been perpetrated in the House of Commons in many a year. One hon. member on that side a while ago asked what Bill C-83 was for. It is entitled "an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime". Is it not a sick April fool joke, when talking about a bill to protect Canadian society, to have the government gag the representatives of Canadian society?

The subject matter of the bill is protection against the perpetration of violent and other crime, but what is the most violent parliamentary crime, Mr. Speaker? It is parliamentary rape. It is parliamentary closure. This is a form of parliamentary rape, and I am not going to be raped by those government eunuchs over there!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: While the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) may say that backbenchers on all sides are nobodies—and we can debate that—I never thought I would hear the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) promulgate his theory of parliamentary democracy by, in effect, ending parliamentary debate. This confirms that he shares the opinions of his boss, the prince from Pierreland, that he believes not only in parliamentary nobodies but in verbal eunuchs. That is what he wants to do, Mr. Speaker; he wants to cut off debate.

I had thought that some of the backbenchers on the other side of the House would have spoken to this motion. As my hon. House leader said this afternoon, having presented some well reasoned statistics, after only 16 hours of debate there have been 11 government members—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Where is your House leader now?

Mr. Nowlan: Would the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) just restrain his empty vessel. My grade six teacher told me many years ago that it is the empty vessel that makes the most sound. I know he is not fully empty but only half empty. Be that as it may, there have been 11 government members, 11 Conservative members, four NDP members, and four Social Credit members who have spoken in this debate. I agree with what the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) said, that—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): A point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, the reason I am getting up is that I have two points of order really. One is to ask the hon. member which member he pointed to when he was talking about the House leader; my other point of order is tell him that if he keeps his mouth closed he will never get into any trouble.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) has the floor.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I hope you do not take that time away from me but instead add another minute or two for such an irrelevant comment. The Solicitor General talked earlier this evening about government time and the orderly conduct of government business. How many Canadians know that we are now on the 276th day of the first session of this parliament after the election of July 8, 1974? This is the longest session of Parliament in our history. We have been in session over a span of three years, yet after only 16 hours of debate the government has the temerity to muzzle, gag, and throttle the representatives of the Canadian people on a matter affecting all Canadians.

In closing—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: —I should like to say, as others have said before me, that while the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) and the government House leader may be in favour of "muzzlitis"—and bringing in closure four times this session must be quite an uneasy record that the government will have to defend—may I say in all seriousness that with no commitment from the other side about what will happen to the number of people who will sit on the committee, and with no commitment that there will not be closure in committee, this type of closure is not only closure against members on all sides, including government backbenchers who have spoken equally with us up to today, but closure against all Canadians, and that is what is going to be resented by all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal club or muzzle has been wielded for the fourth time, but the second time within a month. The first time it was to impose a new tax distribution of medical costs between Ottawa and the provinces since no agreement had been

concluded between the various governments and today because Bill C-83 amending the Criminal Code is extremely complex and difficult. This bill is thus giving rise to strong popular pressures against the government and this is why the closure has again been moved.

According to our rules, Mr. Speaker, there are three procedures to regulate the proceedings of this House: Firstly, under rule 75A, requiring the unanimous consent of the House or the parties; secondly under rule 75B, requiring the majority and thirdly under rule 75C which provides for unilateral action by the government which lays down the law for lack of a consensus or a majority.

After some very cheap consultations, the government has jumped immediately to take unilateral action and they are forcing their will upon Parliament by using Standing Order 75C and imposing the closure of debate. What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? In fact, 28 members have spoken on second reading of Bill C-83 in the House, which represents a percentage of 10.6 per cent of the members to have spoken on Bill C-83, the bill dealing with gun control. Surely 10 per cent does not amount to abuse, and no Canadian will accept the government's argument that members on both sides of the House have abused when only 10 per cent of them have risen to speak on this legislation. No Canadian will accept this argument.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Roy (Laval): You will speak in committee.

Mr. Fortin: —I would ask the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) to shut up. He should have risen before. Secondly, 11 Liberal members have spoken on the legislation, 11 Progressive Conservative members have also spoken, as well as four NDP members and three Social Crediters. That means that as many Liberals as Progressive Conservatives have spoken on the legislation. Therefore the argument of the Liberals who want to muzzle the Progressive Conservatives is absolutely senseless. The two parties have had an equal number of speakers. The NDP have had 11 and we, the Social Crediters, have had only three or four, half the number of Liberals or Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I say the federal Liberals behave exactly like their provincial counterparts in Quebec, and I draw the attention of colleagues from other provinces. In Quebec, we have a premier who gets a kick out of dividing people through fear of the PQ. He thus obtains the unanimity in the National Assembly. In Quebec, there is no majority any more, there is no longer any democracy. There is a dictatorship that works, a system of full patronage and here there are attempts to divide the opposition the better to reign. Mr. Speaker, that is the prevailing situation. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) could have risen on Standing Order 75C if the opposition had been filibustering this debate, but such is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals cannot therefore accuse the Conservatives nor the NDP nor the Crediters of listing too many speakers. They cannot accuse the opposition because they have had as many speakers as the opposition. As a matter of fact, 40.6 per cent of the speakers during the second reading debate, which is a discussion on principales, were Liberals and we agree that the Liberals should have the floor, Mr. Speaker, we are not opposed to that, we want backbenchers on the government side to stand up, but we request the same right for the opposition. We request the right to express ourselves.

● (2050)

Mr. Speaker, when opposition or public opinion begins to be felt, when the opposition begins to speak up and when the public gets interested, that is when they are gagged.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): What are you doing!

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, that shows one thing: the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) never stops interrupting me, he is not brave enough to stand up but he is enough of a coward to interrupt me.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp)—

Mr. Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) on a question of privilege.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I quite understand that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) is in the running for the leadership, but when one starts calling others "cowards", Mr. Speaker, that is going a bit too far. I demand that the hon. member for Lotbinière treat the others as they do him. I will not allow being treated so shabbily. I demand that he withdraw his words.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. If the word "coward" was spoken, then I did not hear it. If it was uttered, I admit that it is harsh, strong, but I did not hear the word the hon. member has just used.

An hon. Member: That is what he said.

An hon. Member: Withdraw.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. I want the hon. member to understand me well. As I did not hear the word, I shall take his question as notice, and we can look at *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): It is a matter of personal privilege. If you did not hear the word, then I feel that tomorrow will be too late because the words will have been consigned to *Hansard.* I request that the hon. member withdraw his words immediately. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) knows himself what he said.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order. The hon. member knows full well that when the Speaker does not hear or understand the words that are spoken, he can reserve the right to pass judgment the next day after having read *Hansard.*

The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, if the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) invokes Standing Order 75C today, that proves two things: the first, that he does not have the leadership required to conduct negotiations in the House

leading to democratic debates. He has no leadership. Mr. Speaker, I was parliamentary leader for three years myself. I knew two other parliamentary leaders before the present one and Standing Order 75C was never used for one reason: the negotiations took place. Mr. Speaker, we have the worst President of the Privy Council we have ever had. When he sees we are unable to discuss, he simply imposes his law.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hon. member for Lévis on a point of order.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, if you did not hear what the hon. member for Lotbinière said about me, I think you have just heard what he says about the President of the Privy Council, the leader in this House. Mr. Speaker, allow me to go on with my question of privilege, because I have a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The hon. member probably did not like the words of the hon. member who has the floor but there is nothing unparliamentary in what he said.

The hon. member for Lévis on a question of privilege.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the House that, on a personal question of privilege, if we blame people for talking too much, if we say we must muzzle the House, as the hon. member now seems to be trying to prove, I think he is the one who should be muzzled for all the nonsense he is saying.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hon. member for Lotbinière on a question of privilege.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. the Hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) on a point of order.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I am listening very carefully to these comments. However, despite the good will showed by the hon. member for Lévis, I have the strong feeling that the hon. member for Lotbinière only spoke the truth.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, if the President of the Privy Council resorts to Standing Order 75C, it shows that there is no leadership whatsoever left in the House, and that each time a legislation must be passed, the House is muzzled.

Moreover, the President of the Privy Council clearly indicates that he has no more confidence—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The time allowed to the hon. member is over.

The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik).

[*English*]

Mr. Cafik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Order, order!

[*Translation*]

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

Mr. Fortin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had precisely ten minutes under the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. The hon. member for Lévis found ways to interrupt me, biased ways to prevent me from speaking. I claim my right to speak ten minutes like anyone else.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. The Chair did allow for the interventions and all things considered, the hon. member for Lotbinière was allowed his ten minutes.

I recognize the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik).

[*English*]

Mr. Cafik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I gather from the—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: I am rising on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the Chair and I believe that in the past the Chair has given evidence of its great familiarity with the Standing Orders of the House of Commons and I think that today's ruling by the Chair was fair.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke a while ago and said candidly what I thought. I was interrupted on exactly four occasions, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. I have already given my ruling by pointing out to the hon. member that, all facts considered, his ten minutes were up, and I stand by that.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the third time that you have recognized me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: I think the opposition has made a very valid point in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: I do not think it relates to the use of 75C but I do think it is important that we get some kind of understanding that, at the committee stage, we have a very serious opportunity to deal with this highly emotional subject matter that is of importance to all the people of this country.

● (2100)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Business of the House

Mr. Cafik: My understanding is that by moving it to the committee more quickly there will be that kind of opportunity.

Mr. Paproski: Don't you believe it!

Mr. Cafik: Just a moment. I am saying that I have not heard—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. It being 9.02 p.m., the time provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House under Standing Order 75C has expired.

The motion is now before the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Read the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Read the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Sharp) which was agreed to on the following division:

● (2110)

(*Division No. 124*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andras (Port Arthur)
Andres (Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blais
Blaker
Boulanger
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Ethier
Faulkner
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Hopkins
Jamieson
Joyal
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Landers
Lang
Langlois
Lapointe
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
MacEachen
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McIsaac
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin
Prud'homme
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—115

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Cadieu
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Dinsdale
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Ellis
Epp
Forrestall
Fortin
Fraser
Friesen
Gilbert
Gillies
Hargrave
Hees
Hogan
Holmes
Huntington
Hurlburt
Jelinek
Johnston
Kempling
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Leggatt
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacLean
Malone
Marshall
Masniuk
Matte
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rodriguez
Rondeau
Saltsman
Scott
Smith (Churchill)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Symes
Towers
Wenman
Whiteway
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—81

● (2130)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare the motion carried.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, since the House is in such an amiable mood I have another suggestion to make. It will be recalled that when I announced the business for today and tomorrow, I included as the first order of business second reading of Bill C-92 dealing with prisoners of war. Because of the hour at which we have arrived, I was a little afraid that we might not reach that item before ten o'clock. Therefore there have been discussions among House leaders. There is an agreement, I understand unanimously, to take the second reading of Bill C-92 now without further debate.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the government House leader. We are in agreement with what I think is a very commendable move on all sides of the House. I just want him and others to

know that we put the plight of veterans much higher than the necessity for closure on Bill C-83.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the announcement made by the government House leader is correct. We gladly agree.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, we are in full agreement with the suggestion put forward to the House by the President of the Privy Council. This proves that when the government introduces good legislation to help the poor, especially those who require it most, we always go along.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members should understand that, despite the lateness of the hour, the House is still dealing with Routine Proceedings. If the House were to deal with this measure now and put the motion and have passage of the motion without debate, the necessary steps would have to be taken with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR AND THEIR DEPENDANTS

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan) that Bill C-92, to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war and their dependants and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MOTION RESPECTING COMPLETION OF DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The House is now still engaged in the conclusion of Routine Proceedings, specifically, motions. Earlier this day the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) gave indication of his intention, with the consent of the House, to move a motion respecting the business of the House for Monday and Tuesday, namely, debate on the Electoral Boundaries Commission reports, at which time the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) raised a point of order.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

● (2140)

Mr. Penner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seek your indulgence and that of all hon. members to raise a serious and pressing point of order with reference to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Ontario which was tabled on February 27 by Your Honour in this House. I raise the point of order at this time because, in my view, it must be considered by Your Honour prior to the debate which is to take place on Monday and Tuesday of next week, if in fact that comes about.

My point of order is that this document cannot properly be tabled and considered because the commission has failed to comply with the reporting provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. The Commission has not complied to the extent that it has not included reasons justifying the recommendations as required by the act I have mentioned.

I would draw your attention to section 2(1) of the act and the definition therein contained of the word "Recommendation" which states:

> "Recommendation" with respect to a recommendation set forth in the report means a recommendation that is justified by a reason therefor.

It is the last phrase, Mr. Speaker, which I wish to stress, "a recommendation that is justified by a reason therefor." The section of the act I have quoted was a fairly recent amendment introduced in this House by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). It was a wise and useful amendment simply because when objections are filed, as they have been in large numbers, members quite naturally want to be relevant in debate, and in order to do so they must find specific reasons stated justifying the recommendations. Otherwise members have nothing before them upon which to base what should be cogent and pertinent comments.

Now, Sir, if I may, let me draw your attention to the Ontario report and let us see exactly in what way the commission has failed to abide by the terms of the act. On page three, we find Schedule B, purporting to be that part of the report complying with the requirement of the act as contained in the definition I have just read. The title of Schedule B is "Reasons for the Original Proposed Boundaries". Immediately we are confronted with error No. 1. The report which ought to be tabled by Your Honour is not that

which contains the original proposed boundaries. It must be the report which has followed the public hearings the commission is required to hold.

Let us suppose for a moment that in the title to Schedule B the word "original" were simply deleted. Would the commission then have met its legal obligations? The answer, I submit, is categorically, no. What has the Commission said in Schedule B? They have done no more than paraphrase for us the language of the very law passed by parliament. In what way does that constitute the justification which parliament has demanded from the commission?

On page four, the commissioners, in this document which purports to be their report, go on simply to tell us what they have done. They say, for example, that all of the non-urban electoral districts in Northern Ontario are below quota. I submit that this statement is factually incorrect, but more seriously, and more pertinent to this point of order, the commissioners have made no effort whatsoever to offer any reason in support of their recommendations.

Consider, for a moment, what they have proposed for Northern Ontario—a reduction of the present level of representation from 12 seats to 11. This is a recommendation which has caused deep-seated dismay across the entire region of Northern Ontario. Where is the justification for this particular recommendation?

Mr. Speaker: I am reluctant to interrupt the hon. member but I do want to restrict him from talking about the merits of the report itself. We must be clear about what is taking place. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) has put down a notice which would legalize the calling of this question tomorrow. The minister has now sought the consent of the House to deal with it today, not tomorrow. Before the consent of the House could be sought, the hon. member raised a point of order which has something to do with whether or not the motion could be dealt with at all by the House. I respect that. But I want to confine him strictly to the technicality of whether or not the House can deal with the report.

Mr. Penner: I appreciate very much what you have just said, Mr. Speaker. My reference to Northern Ontario was designed to illustrate the point I was about to make. A serious recommendation is made but it is supported by no reason or reasons whatsoever.

I hasten to add that in this proposed redistribution Ontario is gaining seven more seats than it has at present. All of these, of course, will go to the more populous southern part of the province, and understandably so. But why has the commission found it necessary to subtract one from Northern Ontario? My point is that it has offered no reason for such an important decision. However, in keeping with Your Honour's ruling, I do not wish to dwell on that point. I will conclude by simply reiterating my point of order.

The commission is required by statute to present reasons justifying its recommendations. This document fails to offer reasons and should, therefore, not have been tabled. Hence I contend, with respect, that it would be out of order to proceed with any debate regarding the distribution of seats in Ontario. The debate to take place next week, should it take place, and should Your Honour accept the point I am making, would have to exclude any discussion of the Ontario report.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on this point of order because I strongly believe that the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) has presented a very valid argument. His submission is strengthened by the fact that the Electoral Boundaries Commission has, in every province with the exception of Ontario, provided reasons to support the recommendations. Thus the commission as a whole recognizes the obligation to provide those reasons. However, in the case of Ontario the commission did not do so.

● (2150)

The second point I would make is that this argument is not exclusively a technical argument. I think the requirement to provide reasons for recommendations not only applies to this particular aspect of the report that has been tabled in the House or given to Your Honour, but is a requirement to provide that reasons existed for the original report that was given public debate and participation. The reasons did not exist at that particular point either. Therefore it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the report is not only invalid and in fact fails to be a report under the law at this particular time, but it was so even prior to its arriving in this House.

I contend that the very essence of the function performed by the commissioners was to make recommendations as to the disposition of proposed new ridings. When one looks at the act giving rise to this commission, "recommendation" itself is defined in the interpretation section, section 2(1). A recommendation is defined as one that contains a reason to justify it. If there is no justification, then there is no recommendation, because a recommendation itself is defined to be that which contains within it a justification for a recommendation.

I therefore contend that there is in fact no recommendation whatsoever in the report of the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Commission. If that is true then you have withdrawn the very essence of the report, the very thing that gives it meaning, the recommendation itself. If those recommendations fail to exist, I find it extremely difficult to contend that the report in fact exists. I maintain that when you withdraw the essence of it, you have withdrawn the very thing itself. The report therefore does not exist, and it cannot be dealt with by the House of Commons if it is not here.

I make one other point, Mr. Speaker. The requirement for reasons is one that appears to be fully understood and recognized by Mr. Castonguay, the representation commissioner. On April 26, 1974, at the privileges and elections committee, there was in fact extensive discussion with the representation commissioner respecting a proposed amendment that would require these reasons. At that time the commissioner indulged in quite a lengthy discussion, and indicated to the committee that if such recommendations required reasons it would make eminent sense that those reasons would not only have to be present in the report to be tabled in the House of Commons but, by the same token, should be present prior to the public hearings.

That particular amendment was carried, Mr. Speaker. It was carried in this House. It was an amendment specifically requiring reasons in order to qualify it as being a recommendation in the first place. So I maintain that at that time the representation Commissioner was fully aware of this legal requirement, and in the case of Ontario for some peculiar reason that requirement was not met.

I would further argue that lack of reasons justifying recommendations in the case of Ontario puts Ontario members at a considerable disadvantage when discussing this alleged report. In the case of all other members of parliament from other regions of Canada, they are entitled to see those justifying reasons for the recommendations and thus address their remarks to that which gives rise to the recommendations. In the case of members from Ontario who wish to address themselves to the report of the redistribution commissioners, they are denied that which gives rise to the recommendations themselves. Therefore our position as members of parliament has been somewhat eroded in relation to other members in light of any discussion that would take place in respect to this alleged report. I therefore conclude that this report is non-existent and therefore cannot be dealt with by the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we must keep clear in our minds that we are still on routine proceedings. What has been sought at this point is the necessary unanimous consent of the House to deal with a motion during today's proceedings, as opposed to tomorrow when it could be called. It is important that the Chair be advised in advance of this point of order, and I have been grateful for the participation of the two hon. members. The Chair has been greatly assisted in any event by the opportunity to consider this matter overnight.

Since we have never really got to the point where I could ask for unanimous consent, and it is now approaching ten o'clock with Questions on the Order Paper still to come, perhaps the House would permit the Chair to reflect on this matter overnight, and when the matter comes before the House on motions tomorrow, as it normally would without the necessity for consent, it may be possible for the Chair to give some indication of its views at that time. I might say that it does not seem to me that there is a great deal of difficulty about the facts leading up to the argument. What is in doubt is the effect of those facts from a procedural point of view. Perhaps all would benefit if the Chair were to reflect on the matter overnight.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this is a first, dealing with the last item on routine proceedings as the last item of business on a government day. The following questions will be answered today: 1,521, 3,530, 3,789, 3,839, 3,840, 4,072, 4,610, 4,613, 4,775, 4,912, 4,922 and 4,940.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Order Paper Questions

[*Text*]

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO MONTREAL

Question No. 1,521—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. With reference to the Prime Minister's trip to Montreal on or about January 31, 1975 (a) what exact means of transportation was used (i) was it government-owned (ii) what was the total cost to the taxpayers (b) how many persons accompanied the Prime Minister at public expense and what were all their names?

2. Was one of the items on the Prime Minister's Montreal agenda an address to a Liberal Party Fund Raising Dinner, and, if so, did or will the Liberal Party pay a portion of the cost of the trip and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, how much and on what date?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): 1. (a) The Prime Minister travelled by official automobile. (i) Yes. (ii) In addition to gasoline, chauffeur's expenses and overnight accommodation, $53.55 (b) The following members of the Prime Minister's staff were in Montreal during the period January 31—February 1: P. O'Neil, Miss M. Macdonald, G. Dufault, R. Coleman, J. Moore, Miss A. McCabe; travelling expense totalling $551.23.

2. Yes. The visit also included official meetings with the Premier of Quebec.

P.E.I. COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN—PHASE 2

Question No. 3,530—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the Public Accounts for 1974-75 on the Fund for Rural Economic Development (a) for each programme and project in PEI under the category of Social Development, what (i) was the approved programme (ii) were the actual expenditure figures (iii) are the reasons for the difference between each approved programme and actual expenditure figures (iv) happens to those funds which were not spent in the fiscal year for which they were approved (b) what are the reasons for the expenditures under Resource Adjustment and Development exceeding the approved programme figure?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

	(a) (i) Approved Program	(a) (ii) Expenditure	(a) (iii) Revised Program
Education Capital Funds	3,790,772	2,609,108	2,752,772
Adult Education and Related Training	611,920	478,226	507,920
Housing	1,207,241	1,889,618	2,064,241
Urban Development and Community Services	1,603,347	427,514	519,347
Total	7,213,280	5,404,466	5,844,280

(a) (iii); (b) Amendment No. 3 to the First Memorandum of Implementation (Schedule "A" to the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan Agreement) provided that "... the Ministers may, by agreement expressed in writing, in order to meet the program implementation requirements during the period April 1, 1973 to the end of the first phase of the Plan and on the recommendation of the Joint Federal-Provincial Advisory Board established under Article 13 of the Agreement, from time to time re-allocate, among the components of the Summary of Cost Sharing, the funds to be provided by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and by the Province. For the

purposes of this sub-article, "the Ministers" means the Premier of the Province and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion of Canada—" Such a reallocation of the components of the Summary of Cost Sharing did take place with respect to fiscal year 1974-75. The original and revised allocations are shown below for each program:

	Approved Program	Expenditure	Revised Program
Development Grant	3,146,000	3,146,000	3,146,000
Resource Adjustment and Development	5,640,579	7,000,783	7,401,579
Social Development	7,213,280	5,404,466	5,844,280
Resource Supporting and Commercial Services	3,116,030	2,374,925	2,637,030
Implementation	987,862	969,576	1,074,862
Total	20,103,751	18,895,750	20,103,751

(a) (iv) The First Memorandum of Implementation provided for maximum FRED contributions of $81,937,000 during the first phase of the agreement (which was terminated on March 31, 1975). An examination of expenditures reported in the response to Question No. 3,531 will show that the federal government has contributed 99.2 per cent of that maximum.

JOB CREATION DURING OLYMPIC GAMES

Question No. 3,789—**Mr. Matte:**

Will jobs be created for the duration of the Olympic Games and, if so (a) how many (b) what type (c) for what length of time (d) at what cost?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): We are unable to provide any specific information on job creation in this regard during the 1976 Olympic Games as we are not involved in the actual management of the Games. However, COJO advises us that: (a) approximately 30,000 temporary employees will be hired for the duration, including some 10,000 students from Quebec, thousands of volunteers and staff supplied by the Department of National Defence; (b) apart from supervisory positions, most of the jobs will be for unskilled labour, i.e. hostesses, guides, ticket collectors, program distributors, ushers, cleaners, messengers, etc.; (c) the jobs will last from three weeks to six months, the average being about six weeks; (d) we were unable to obtain an estimate of the cost of this manpower. The actual cost will, of course, not be known until after the Games.

P.E.I.—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,839—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, have measures been taken since the Plan's inception to develop the capability in PEI for processing of specialized fish products and, if so, what have been the results?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: Yes. Measures have been taken to develop capability in the processing of specialized fish products such as chowders, smelts, fish cakes, breaded oysters and clam strips. In addition, measures to improve merchandising methods such as new packaging techniques for lobster and development of retortable pouches and improved labeling are in advanced stages.

[Mr. McIsaac.]

P.E.I.—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,840—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, is one of the objectives of the sectoral strategy to provide longer-term employment for workers in fish processing plants and, if so (a) what measures have been or will be implemented (b) on what date (c) at what cost?

2. Has any evaluation been made of such measures under Phase 1 and, if so (a) what were the conclusions as to their effectiveness (b) what changes in emphasis will result under Phase 2?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

1. Yes. (a) Measures taken have been: the production of new products, harvesting of fish over a longer period, and encouragement of more storage. New measures may be taken in the future. (b) These measures are part of the program started in 1969, and the date of adoption of any part of a measure by an individual fisherman is not recorded. (c) Records of the cost of each project do not allow for the breakdown of cost as requested.

2. (a) The measures were of limited effectiveness because of circumstances beyond the control of the implementing agency such as the finite quantity of fish available and the number of fishermen involved. (b) The objective is the same but changes in emphasis in the strategy are being discussed with the province.

DREE INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 4,072—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. From 1969 to date, how many DREE incentive grants to industries in (a) British Columbia (b) the rest of Canada were made in respect of (i) new industries (ii) expansion of existing industries and, in each case, what were the amounts?

2. (a) How many such industries failed (b) what amounts were lost?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: The information requested in both questions is provided in the following table:

RDIA offers made and accepted between April 1, 1969 and September 30, 1975

		Number of Net Accepted Offers	Amount of Incentive Grants ($000's)
1. (a)	In British Columbia		
	(i) New Industries*	30	4,421
	(ii) Expansion of Existing Industries**	11	1,184
(b)	Rest of Canada		
	(i) New Industries*	2,011	417,013
	(ii) Expansion of Existing Industries**	1,267	115,223

		Number of Total Cessations (other than fire)	Amount of Payment to be Recovered ($000's)
2. (a)	In British Columbia		
	(i) New Industries*	2	219
	(ii) Expansion of Existing Industries**	—	—
(b)	Rest of Canada		
	(i) New Industries*	101	10,328
	(ii) Expansion of Existing Industries**	10	227

*New industries includes the following categories: (a) new facility (b) new product expansion (c) expansion and new facility (d) expansion and new product expansion (e) modernization and new facility (f) modernization and new product expansion (g) new facility and new product expansion (h) expansion, modernization, new facility (i) modernization, new facility, new product expansion (j) expansion, new facility, new product expansion (k) expansion, modernization new product expansion (l) expansion, modernization, new facility new product expansion.

**Expansion of existing industries includes the following categories: (a) expansion (b) modernization and (c) expansion and modernization.

LOANS TO QUEBEC HOUSING CORPORATION, ABITIBI COUNTY, QUEBEC

Question No. 4,610—**Mr. Laprise:**

Did Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation grant a loan to the Province of Quebec for the construction of senior citizens' homes in La Sarre, Amos and Palmarolle and, if so (a) on what date (b) in what amount?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows: CMHC made loans to Québec Housing Corporation to finance the construction of housing for elderly persons in the towns of Amos and La Sarre, and the municipality of Palmarolle, as follows:

Municipality	Date Approved	No. of Units	Hostel Beds	$000
Amos	December, 1968	—	175	1,225
	May, 1969	10	78	726
La Sarre	September, 1966	4	38	291
Palmarolle	May, 1969	—	29	203

NATIONAL DEFENCE—INJURIES THROUGH ACCIDENTS INVOLVING ANTI-TANK WEAPON M-72

Question No. 4,613—**Mr. Whiteway:**

Have Armed Forces personnel been injured through accidents involving the light anti-tank weapon M-72 and, if so (a) how many (b) how many have lost limbs or part of limbs?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, (a) 2; (b) 1.

Order Paper Questions

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES BOARD

Question No. 4,775—**Mr. MacKay:**

Who are the members of the Regional Development Incentives Board?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: Mr. J. D. Love, Chairman, Deputy Minister, Regional Economic Expansion. Mr. M. R. Daniels Assistant Deputy Minister, Planning and Coordination, Regional Economic Expansion. Mr. A. M. Guérin Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Industry, Trade & Commerce. Mr. J. L. Manion Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Manpower Employer Services Branch, Department of Manpower and Immigration. Mr. L. Edgeworth Assistant Deputy Minister, Environmental Protection Service, Department of the Environment. Mr. E. A. Oestreicher General Director, Economic Programs & Government Finance Branch, Department of Finance. Mr. G. Howarth Deputy Commissioner, Foreign Investment Review Agency.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—ACCOMMODATION, GAGETOWN

Question No. 4,912—**Mr. Howie:**

Has the Department of National Defence identified one hundred PMQ units at CFB Gagetown as surplus to the Department's needs and have the units been offered for sale and, if so, for what amount?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes. However, the units have not been offered for sale.

MAN-DAYS LOST IN PUBLIC SERVICE AS A RESULT OF STRIKE OR LOCK-OUTS

Question No. 4,922—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since January 1976, how many man-days were lost in the Public Service as a result of strikes or lock-outs?

2. What was the (a) number of work stoppages (b) number of man-days lost in each province (c) number of workers involved in each work stoppage (d) the average increase of income of each group following the work stoppage?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of Treasury Board): 1. None.

2. N/A.

CANADA MANPOWER CENTRES FOR STUDENTS

Question No. 4,940—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. How many persons did the student manpower centres across Canada have in their employ in 1975?

2. By province, how many (a) applications were filed for jobs at the centres (b) jobs were available from the centres?

3. By province, what was the total cost of the project?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. The CMC's for students employed 1,070 students in 1975.

2. (a) Registrations in 1975: New Brunswick, 15,346; Nova Scotia, 19,257; P. E. Island, 2,547; Newfoundland, 7,484; Quebec, 146,839; Ontario, 235,898; Manitoba, 16,035; Saskatchewan, 10,965; Alberta, 35,486; British Columbia, 51,518. (b) Number of vacancies notified in 1976; New Brunswick,

7,388; Nova Scotia, 10,613; P. E. Island, 1,903; Newfoundland, 3,085; Quebec, 50,766; Ontario, 82,537; Manitoba, 8,110; Saskatchewan, 7,552; Alberta, 23,768; British Columbia, 22,080.

3. Total cost by province of CMC's for students program: New Brunswick $135,023; Nova Scotia, $166,292; P. E. Island, $24,928; Newfoundland, $72,757; Quebec, $1,329,400; Ontario, $1,569,000; Manitoba, $22,113; Saskatchewan, $221,468; Alberta, $31,323; British Columbia, $354,500; N. W. Territories, $8,858; Yukon, $16,500.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock, Orders of the Day!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CRIMINAL CODE—SUGGESTED COMMITTEE STUDY OF OTHER METHODS OF APPLYING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, during the past few months the Canadian public has once again been subjected to a flood of articles, editorials, commentaries, and so on in the media on the issue of capital punishment. For nearly a decade this debate has been raging, and I believe I reflect the sentiments of many in hoping that this present parliament will resolve the issue of capital punishment once and for all. In numerous articles that I have had the opportunity to read on the subject it seems to me that those who favour abolition of the death penalty are making a concerted effort, in some instances almost a blind crusade, to cloud the issue by attempting to make people believe that those who favour capital punishment are neanderthal, blood thirsty, mindless individuals.

It certainly is a shame when those with so-called humanitarian motives act in the shabbiest of political manner. They are in many ways bankrupt humanitarians. It leads one to wonder why there is this effort to discredit those who call for the enforcement of capital punishment. It probably stems from the fact that an overwhelming majority of Canadians favour retention. There is a real tragedy when an elitist majority led by the Liberal government manipulates the system to effect its own will irrespective of public opinion.

When one looks at the results of surveys such as the one I conducted in my constituency of Winnipeg South Centre, where 90 per cent of all the respondents were in favour of having the death penalty made applicable to anyone convicted of premeditated murder, one awakens to the sobering fact that the government has no interest in the will of the people. The use of power to thwart the public will is another step in the erosion of parliament.

It is interesting to note that the Solicitor General's office conducted a survey on capital punishment, as a result of which 80 per cent supported the death penalty. The government is so concerned about eradicating the ultimate penalty that it even squandered the taxpayers' money to hire a consultant to report that the public is blood thirsty about hanging. In a report to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), one Mr. Fattah reported:

● (2200)

Uninformed or irrational public opinion is not a justification for bringing back the noose.

In the same report this abolitionist goes on to give negative connotations to those who support the death penalty. I suppose one could say, what else did you expect him to say? After all it goes back to the old adage of don't bite the hand that feeds you. I contend an elitist minority is at work; an elitist minority that forgets that since 1967 the murder rate has increased 100 per cent.

To suggest that 90 per cent of the people in my constituency, or indeed a sizeable majority of Canadians are blood thirsty and irrational, is indeed an arrogant and elitist attitude. An overwhelming majority of Canadians favour the retention of capital punishment because they want to live in a society not constantly plagued with fear and rising crime. The government has been negligent in enforcing the laws of the country and people are no longer going to accept such a law approach to law enforcement.

In recent years the government has built up a theory on which much policy has been based, that the rights of the criminal are more important than the rights of society. This has brought about a backlash in public opinion even to the point where one Liberal Senator, Louis Robichaud, said:

I have a fourteen year old daughter. If anyone rapes and kills my daughter and justice doesn't take care of that man, I will do it myself.

Senator Robichaud is by no means a wild-eyed redneck, and neither are the majority of law-abiding citizens who want à return to common sense and a healthy respect for the law.

The death penalty represents the final right of organzied society to rid itself of those who will not conform in any respect to civilized life. Such people are a minority and are not to be confused with others who may take life in a moment of passion. There are abolitionists who would lead people to believe that those who favour retention want blanket capital punishment. That is a falsehood. The vast majority of Canadians are normal citizens who find the death penalty a distasteful subject to discuss. Common sense warns them that the removal of the final right of society to carry out the supreme punishment tells the criminal that, no matter how horrible and vicious the crime, his own life will be protected by a society for which the criminal has no respect.

In the many letters and phone calls I receive from constituents, they share with me their concerns about being safe and that their children will grow up in a safe society. They fear those individuals best described by the William Gold of the Calgary *Herald*, when he wrote:

Contemporary society is producing a singularly savage type of animal, entirely lacking in comprehension of, or respect for, the lives of other people. These psychopaths know perfectly well what they are doing is wrong legally and morally, but the act of murder causes them no sense of personal revulsion.

I reject the idea that society seeks vengeance. I call it simple justice and a desire for safety. Most people subscribe to the opening line of an Ontario Provincial Police advertisement which reads:

Let there be more respect for the law.

The government certainly has not subscribed to that notion. The government knows full well it has failed so many times to enforce existing capital punishment laws that abolition is its only way to cease its habit of ignoring the law.

I believe that so far in the course of my remarks I have made it clear I reflect the views of the majority of those who favour the retention of capital punishment. However, many people are saying that if executions are to remain on the books then people should be assured that the latest scientific and medical evidence is used to find an alternate to hanging.

When I presented a motion on February 10 of this year under Standing Order 43 to have the subject of capital punishment referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs to find a more humane method of applying capital punishment, I did so because of two overriding concerns; first, the majority of Canadians favour retention; and second, many people consider hanging barbaric.

I did not appreciate the answer of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who, in response to a question of mine relating to an alternate method, said that if abolition is not accepted then we could address ourself to the question of how we should destroy these people. His whole attitude seems to be "holier than thou," as if he believed that somehow he might become foul and base if he seriously discussed this matter. I still contend that we must look at this in a sober, realistic manner and come up with an alternative, whether it be the electric chair, the gas chamber, medication, or whatever. A more civilized and efficient manner would help to ease the qualms of those who are repelled by the rope.

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

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, in the last few moments of his speech the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) addressed himself to the original question he asked, which is what are the other more humane methods of execution of people who have committed crimes that we should investigate. Surely that is not the issue to which we should be addressing ourselves either in this parliament on in this country.

We should be addressing ourselves to investigating ways in which to protect society against violent crime and to deter others from committing horrible crimes. If members of the House are concerned with finding humane ways of putting people to death, I begin to wonder whether they are not ashamed to agree to capital punishment, because it has not shown itself to be a deterrent in the commission of horrible crimes. As we all know, some years ago in England hundreds of minor crimes were punished by the death penalty, such crimes as pickpocketing or petty theft. The penalty was public execution, during which other pickpockets had the opportunity to make more money and were doing far greater business. But at least society at that time had the courage to have the execution take place in full public view in the hope that it would deter others from committing this type of crime. It was not a deterrent then, nor is it now.

I think the people of this country must decide whether or not society can be protected from terrible crimes by adopting capital punishment, whatever means are used whether by rope or otherwise, whether in public or otherwise, or whether we should hide behind some more humane way of executing people thereby not accepting our responsibility as members of parliament and leaders in this country to execute people who have committed crimes.

I say we only have one justification for capital punishment, that is, to protect society and guarantee to society that there will be no more horrible crimes committed because we execute one or two people by whatever humane method we adopt. All the studies that have been conducted in this and other countries of the world have indicated that there is no perceptible difference in the crime rate whether there is capital punishment or whether there is not, especially so far as such crimes as murder and similar types of offences are concerned.

The hon. member hopes that this debate into which we are about to enter in one or two weeks will resolve once and for all the issue of capital punishment. I do also, and I hope it will resolve it in a way that will show Canada is a leader among the nations of the free world in the humane way in which it treats people and protects its society against violent crimes. I believe we should abolish capital punishment.

● (2210)

INDUSTRY—DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT, MALTON—MEASURES TO SAVE JOBS—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF AEROSPACE POLICY

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, last Friday and again this afternoon I directed questions both to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) with regard to the announced lay off of almost 150 workers at the Douglas Aircraft plant in Malton. I also asked the appropriate ministers to state when we can expect an announcement in this House about a comprehensive and sound policy for the Canadian aerospace industry.

I directed these questions to the ministers not only because I am sure all hon. members of this House are saddened by the announcement yesterday by the management of Douglas Aircraft in Malton, Ontario, of the lay offs of 150 workers, but also because of the uncertainty of the preservation and expansion of the aerospace industry in Canada, which not only includes the highly skilled workers in the aircraft plants but also the auxiliary help in research and development, whether it be at those plants, at our universities, or at the National Research Council, where we know many government grants have been frozen.

At one time in Malton, Ontario, there were employed approximately 8,000 workers. In 1972 this was reduced to 5,000 employees, and we believe that with this present impending lay off beginning tomorrow the workers and staff at the Douglas Aircraft plant will be reduced to a mere 1,200. That makes a reduction of approximately 6,800 workers in 10 years. I think this is a great blow to the present and future of the Canadian aerospace industry.

The current problems at Douglas Aircraft are the result of the cyclical nature of the aerospace industry which is prevalent in many countries, not only because of increased production costs, but especially because of the increase in the cost of aviation fuels brought about by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries since 1972. These additional and unforeseen fuel costs have added to the difficulties which have beset all airlines in the world in the past three years and, of course, resulted in a marked slowdown in orders for new aircraft.

While the people at Douglas Aircraft in Malton, Ontario, are confident of an increase in market demand, perhaps in the next two or three years, unfortunately no viable solution to alleviate the present situation has been forthcoming. The tragedy is that many of the skilled teams of Canadians who worked so ably to create this high technology industry are being dispersed because of the impending lay offs, and when the cycle once again enters an expansionary period much time will be lost in training new personnel.

Another point worthy of note is the fact that Douglas Aircraft Company of Canada in Malton, occupying some two million square feet of space within a confine of 110 acres, has developed into one of the most efficient aircraft parts manufacturing plants in the world. The quality of its product is of the highest order, and its productivity superior even to American aircraft firms. These statements are hard to refute when it is considered that employees' salaries equate with U.S. counterparts, that shipping charges on components sent to California are paid by the firm, and yet the components are still less expensive than those produced locally in California.

I might add that in the past ten years productivity at the Douglas Aircraft plant in Malton has generated $1.1 billion in sales, or about $150 million per year. It would be a pity therefore to lose those export sales, and so many highly trained, skilled workers.

It has been proposed that to save this country's aircraft industry, which includes Douglas, the three major companies, de Havilland, Canadair, and Douglas, should be amalgamated, the new entity to be known as Canadian Aerospace Limited. In this way specialization would be retained, de Havilland being responsible for engineering and development, Canadair for high technology manufacturing, and Douglas for components production, assembly, and possibly flight testing.

The new company would be staffed by Canadians and, at the beginning, could be assisted financially by the U.S. parent of Douglas and, later, through a financial arrangement entered into between the federal government and the consortium of three Canadian aircraft companies.

I mention this possibility for restructuring the Canadian aerospace industry because it is not only important but urgently needed. I hope the federal government, in particular the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce, National Defence, Treasury Board, Supply and Services, and Finance, which have been briefed about this proposal, will continue negotiations with the management of Douglas Aircraft in order to save the 150 jobs and to give Canada a better footing in the aerospace industry.

[Mr. Haidasz.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the hon. member for the concern he showed for the workers affected here and also for the interest he has always had toward the development of the aerospace industry in Canada.

It was necessary that the employees of the Douglas Aircraft Company of Canada Ltd. be sent their notices of dismissal because of the shortage of work at the Malton factory. The company does regret it had to take this measure, following the common efforts put forth by the company and senior Canadian government officers during weeks in an attempt to avoid these layoffs.

In January 1976, the company announced it expected to dismiss 800 to 1,000 employees because of cutbacks in the production of DC 9 and DC 10 aircraft. The move would bring the total number of employees from 1,650 to 650. We are already concerned by the fact that not only would this jeopardize the DACAN project but the layoffs would also threaten the operations of the suppliers of DACAN, and Fleet Industries in particular, where 105 employees out of a total workforce of 385 are now working on the DACAN project.

Following that announcement, meetings were held with representatives of the UAW on February 9, and with Messrs. McDonnell and Reece, on February 12. The meeting with Mr. McDonnell resulted in an agreement to postpone the announced layoff. In the meantime, the people concerned were to examine all opportunities to obtain other contracts for the achievement of the work or find a way to maintain production at its present level.

An interim solution was considered which was to keep about 1,450 employees as a result of stock financing, but it was rejected because it was not practical. At a subsequent meeting between senior officials of the department and Messrs. Sanford McDonnell and John McDonnell on February 24, the lease financing of 10 DC 9 and 50 aircraft to Eastern Airlines was discussed within the GAPP and EDC program. The department agreed to undertake a feasibility study in that regard.

[*English*]

The lease financing was later expanded to include other airlines and increase the time period. This approach is still being investigated although no specific customer has been identified or definite request received from the company. Because of the depressed state of the entire aerospace industry at home and abroad, no additional work has yet been identified.

The company has advised that lay-off notices will be given to 30 employees on Friday, April 2, effective eight weeks later. It is their objective to carry out a selective gradual reduction of approximately 30 people per week up to a total of 150 maximum by July 15, which is the beginning of their holiday shutdown period. This will reduce

total employment to between 1,300 and 1,350 at shutdown time. The lay-off will mostly affect indirect workers in an attempt to keep their overhead rate down. The company is trying to achieve a ratio of one direct to .65 indirect and will probably achieve .65 by July. The company will give us ample warning of any changes, up or down, to the above schedule.

● (2220)

The company said it appreciated the vigorous effort being made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) and the Canadian government, but said corporate responsibility to other employees and shareholders made it necessary to issue the notices.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CAMBODIA—INQUIRY AS TO CANADIAN PROTEST AGAINST VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Miss Bégin) here for this great moment we are going to have in this jammed House of Commons.

A few days ago I opened up the subject of human rights with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) by asking him a question concerning the terrible situation with regard to the violation of human rights in Cambodia. I attempted to go on at that time to discuss the very much related question of Canada's ratification of the United Nations covenant of human rights as an expression of our concern. I opened this question up because of the escalation of brutality toward human beings which we have seen in flagrant cases in Chile and Cambodia, to name but two of the outrageous situations of the violations of human rights in the world today.

I read recently the report of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. It makes chilling reading indeed as a catalogue of primitive brutality committed against Chileans by their own rulers. The report concludes, and I quote:

> Denial of human rights and fundamental freedoms, torture and inhuman, cruel and degrading treatment have become a pattern of governmental policies in Chile.

With regard to Cambodia, press reports from that country and neighbouring countries are conclusive in telling us of the mass executions in death valleys of Cambodians, mowed down in a cross-fire of bullets by Khmer Rouge forces. The old and the young are wasting away from starvation, disease, and exhaustion. All of this terrible violation of human rights has been confirmed by western diplomats in Peking. Therefore I ask what we in this country are doing to launch our protest to the United Nations about this violation?

I also ask why it is that, ten years after the U.N. covenant on human rights was passed by the United Nations, in the year 1966, Canada still has not ratified that covenant? There was a federal-provincial meeting last December 11 at which time the federal and provincial governments came to an agreement. Now, almost four months later, the necessary paper work still has not been done. We still have not ratified the covenant.

I received a letter from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) informing me of some of the reasons why Canada has not been able to move. It comes down to the question of one of the provinces being extremely slow in putting its signature on the document for ratification. It makes me wonder why it is in this country we have to be slowed down by constitutional battles in order to express in a formal way our shock and protest at incursions on human rights around the world.

I do not agree that it is an unimportant matter that Canada has not yet ratified the covenant on human rights. Thirty-five countries have done so. I realize that the covenant would only be applicable in countries which have ratified it, but what is necessary is that we get on to a sound course of human conduct by using the charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights as a basis of law, and proceed from there to the establishment of an international court for the enforcement of that law. This will require our creating instruments to express the standards and the obligations which countries of the world ought to respect. In other words, action by Canada in this regard would help to raise the moral climate of the world. Surely it is better to keep increasing moral pressure on nations than it is to keep quiet, thus appearing to tolerate the great evils which are taking place.

The final resolution of this matter necessitates the establishment of a universal court of human rights to which individuals could go for redress. Right now only countries can take such action. We have to move forward, as Sean MacBride, the distinguished Nobel Peace Prize winner says, to new ways of thinking, and bring about some form of supernational authority so that the individual can make claims under international law. This brings us right back to our immediate concern today. Canada must express, in the United Nations, its continuing protest against the violation of human rights, particularly in Cambodia and Chile, and expedite the ratification of the covenant on human rights, because it is a scandal that we should have allowed ourselves to be bogged down in our constitutional battles leading to our inability to take that action.

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat at a loss after listening to what has been said by the hon. member. I thought he was sincere in his questioning of the minister the other day, on March 24, on the situation in Cambodia. Tonight he made only passing reference to Cambodia after which he went on to speak of Chile, after which he criticized us for not having signed the human rights covenants. Then he went on to refer to a constitutional debate involving Quebec! As a result I think the House will understand if I found it difficult to follow the precise idea the hon. member had in mind.

With regard to the human rights covenants, which have not yet been signed by Canada, I can tell him that I represented the department at the federal-provincial conference, a meeting which went on very well. I would like the hon. member to reflect upon the fact, that maybe Quebecers somehow felt not very sure of their own rights when participating at the national level, probably because of abrasive statements such as the ones he just made.

I do not intend to speak about Chile; the subject has nothing to do with the question which was addressed to the minister the other day.

The hon. member spoke of Cambodia, and with a good deal of self-assurance he told us that everybody knew about Cambodia executing people on a massive scale—all the diplomats had confirmed it, Peking knew about it, all the journalists knew about it, as well as everybody else. But how did they know? The country has withdrawn into a state of isolation and has virtually cut off contact with the outside world. Canada recognized the present regime in April, 1975, but we have no official diplomatic accreditation to Cambodia. In these circumstances all we could do was to ask our embassy in Bangkok, Thailand, our diplomatic mission closest to Cambodia, to report on the situation there to the extent it is possible for them to do so.

● (2230)

If the case of alleged violations of basic human rights in Cambodia is true, we would have another problem in regard to taking unilateral action vis-à-vis the government of Cambodia. As with any other government, we would be expected to observe the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of another state.

There is one more avenue, albeit somewhat longer term, where we can act.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member accuses us of not being able to do anything, of being paralyzed because we did not ratify the United Nations covenant of human rights. This does not prevent us from following now the procedures of the United Nations through the agencies that are concerned with such questions.

When individuals, groups or non-government organizations that have direct knowledge of violations submit documents, they are analyzed by the United Nations sub-commission on Human Rights of which we are a member. Our Canadian representative is prepared to consider seriously any report on Cambodia which is communicated by this sub-commission.

To conclude I have a question to put to the hon. member: Why Cambodia and not all the other areas in the communist world or in the Third World where there are violations of the most fundamental human rights?

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.36 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 2, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR MINISTERIAL PERMIT TO JAN MORCINEK TO AVOID DEPORTATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In past years, the Government has given special consideration to individuals and groups of individuals from abroad in terms of the issuance of special ministerial certificates of acceptance into Canada, many of which were issued to self-proclaimed leftists from Chile who, at the cost of the taxpayer, were flown to this country, put up in Toronto hotels, fed, given spending allowances, clothing, job opportunities and all the other necessities. On the other hand, a 25-year-old Czechoslovakian political refugee, Jan Morcinek, who escaped from the Communist regime, who is currently employed and has all the necessary qualifications and guarantees for citizenship consideration, had his appeal refused by the Supreme Court this week and is being forced to return to Czechoslovakia where he could face imprisonment from five to 15 years. For humanitarian reasons, and for the sake of precedent, therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp):

That this House instruct the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to issue a special ministerial certificate to Jan Morcinek in order to avoid his deportation.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the terms of the Standing Order, the motion cannot be presented in the absence of unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

* * *

[*Translation*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO METHODS OF PREVENTING VIOLENCE TO COMBAT POLITICAL IDEAS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion concerning an important and urgent matter.

Given the serious revelations made by former RCMP officer Robert Samson concerning the secret activities of the police to check the political activities of some groups and since strong suspicions remain on the role of that same police in FLQ cells between 1963 and 1970, and in order to fully clarify the actions taken to oppose separatism in Quebec, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau):

That a special committee of inquiry composed of representatives of all the political parties of this House be created to examine this matter and prevent that violence be considered as a means of fighting political ideas.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore, the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ACCEPTANCE OF LIABILITY FOR WORK PERFORMED IN VIEW OF MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT FINANCING

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday, the minister stated outside the House—and I am quoting him:

There was a misunderstanding but I would almost say it was deliberate by Lockheed since my negotiators tell me they were given a clear understanding that Lockheed could arrange interim financing.

Is the minister saying that the government is prepared to accept, or does in fact accept, liability for $16 million worth of work which was commenced on the basis of a deliberate misunderstanding as we now know from the facts?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): We have tried to describe that in detail. That there was a misunderstanding is clear. We are now in a contractual or quasi-contractual relationship as described to the House yesterday by the minister responsible for the legal definitions, the Minister of Supply and Services. This

has been stated very clearly yesterday by my colleague the Minister of Supply and Services.

● (1110)

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ACCEPTANCE BY MINISTER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT FINANCING

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The question is indeed unclear with regard to the obligation. The attitude of the government is the issue. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister this question. Either we are going to do $1 billion worth of business with a company that has misled the government or we are burdened with an incompetent defence minister; that is the choice. Has the Acting Prime Minister asked the Minister of National Defence to confirm that his officials, though conscientious, were misled, or in the alternative is the Minister of National Defence going to take the responsibility he should as a member of the government in regard to this matter and resign?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I neither accept the preamble nor the conclusion.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUING NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The Acting Prime Minister never accepts either; that is one of the problems. May I ask him a final supplementary question. If the position of the government is that the situation is the fault of Lockheed—and the government's position is the important thing for us to understand—is the government now going to cut its losses rather than get involved in up to $1 billion with a company that the Minister of National Defence has said has misled the government and which the government has said it does not trust? I ask the Acting Prime Minister to justify this kind of shabby, sloppy business practice.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the negotiations that have been going on for some time has been to re-equip the Canadian Armed Forces with the kind of planes that are necessary to do the job that has been assigned to Canada by NATO.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Yes, we all know and agree with that.

Mr. Sharp: We are continuing these negotiations and I hope my hon. friend agrees with me that they should be successful.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ROLE PLAYED BY MR. GRANDY IN DECISION TO PURCHASE THE "ORION" AND "LOCKHEED L-1011"

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. On Tuesday, as reported at page 12265 of *Hansard,* the Minister of National Defence indicated, and not surprisingly, that he could give no details on the role Mr. Grandy, the former deputy minister, played in the government's preliminary decisions on the LRPA. Would the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce give the House a detailed answer on this question?

[Mr. Richardson.]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but since I have not got *Hansard* in front of me perhaps the hon. member would do me the favour of specifying what the question is.

Mr. McKenzie: The question was, Mr. Speaker: What was Mr. Grandy's involvement as deputy minister with regard to making a decision on the LRPA? Can the minister give us details on that?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, as to the making of the decision, Mr. Grandy had, of course, retired from the department several months before the actual decision was made, so in that sense of the word he had no part in the final decision since he was not in the department at the time. During his period as deputy minister, he would be carrying on the normal functions of that office in relation to the various activities of industry, trade and commerce and related departments in terms of the various assessments that were being made and the whole study leading up to the decision regarding the LRPA. But, as I say, he was not there at the time the decision was made.

Mr. McKenzie: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Was the former deputy minister also involved in discussions and decisions with regard to the purchase by Air Canada of the Lockheed L-1011? If the minister cannot give a complete answer to this question, I would appreciate a reply from the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Jamieson: Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the answer to that. This occurred a number of years ago, as the hon. member knows, and I would have to make inquiries, but it may be possible that some other minister can answer that.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ARGENTINA—ASSURANCES FROM NEW REGIME OF FULFILMENT OF TREATY OBLIGATIONS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government officially recognized the military junta which took over the government of Argentina? If so, may I draw the attention of the House to the assurance given by the Prime Minister on Friday, March 26, as reported at page 12182 of *Hansard,* that no such recognition would be granted until the new regime in Argentina had given assurances that it would fulfil its treaty obligations. I therefore want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if such assurances have been received from the new regime in Argentina and, if so, in what form, and what was the nature of the commitment?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, such assurances were received by a message from the embassy in Ottawa to the Canadian government that the new regime intended to live up to its international intergovernmental commitments.

Quite apart from that fact, we have also, in recognition of that, extended recognition to the new government, as have scores of other countries throughout the world.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If I understand the minister's answer correctly, Mr. Speaker, he is saying that he has this assurance from the Argentina embassy in Ottawa. Has the minister not received any written assurance from that government, either from the Prime Minister of the country or from the minister of foreign affairs? Has the minister any written commitment in respect of discharging the responsibilities which that government has assumed under the treaty, and will he table such a written commitment if he has one?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the message with regard to living up to the international agreements was transmitted on the behalf of the government of Argentina by the embassy in Ottawa. It was not a message that originated in Ottawa, it was a message that was transmitted on behalf of the government of Argentina in the form of a note. It is quite unusual, Mr. Speaker, to table such intergovernmental exchanges. It has not been done in the past. We will look at the matter to see whether in this case there would be any reason to do so.

* * *

ENERGY

SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF LOSS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a related supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the fact that the chairman of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited gave evidence before the standing committee to the effect that we stood to lose in the neighbourhood of $100 million on the Argentina agreement to sell them a CANDU reactor, and since it was possible to estimate the loss under the original agreement it should be possible to estimate what the financial position will be under the renegotiated agreement, would the minister indicate what Canada stands to lose under the renegotiated agreement, or how much have we reduced the $100 million loss? Can the minister give the House that information?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the House that information at this stage. This agreement is before my cabinet colleagues at the present time. I can tell the House that very substantial progress was made by the Canadian negotiating team in their renegotiation of the commercial terms.

[*Translation*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO METHODS OF PREVENTING VIOLENCE TO COMBAT POLITICAL IDEAS

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General.

The serious revelations made by former police officer Robert Samson are so serious that it is beginning to look very much like the Watergate affair. The minister said this week that he asked the RCMP to make an investigation on this subject but sometimes it must be rather difficult to make an objective investigation into and judge one's own case. Would the minister consider the possibility of establishing a special commission to shed light on this matter and prevent the systematic use of violence to fight political ideologies?

[*English*]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in this House earlier this week, we started that investigation to get as many facts as possible with regard to this incident. We have not ruled out the possibility of a further independent investigation if we cannot get all the information we want. This is still a possibility.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Could the minister tell us whether he is aware of the fact that, during other periods, namely between 1963-70 and even after, there were complaints made to his department which are similar to those revealed by police officer Samson.

● (1120)

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, at this time we are not aware of any other incident similar to the one complained of by Mr. Samson, but this will be one of the subject matters of the investigation I began.

ROLE OF FORCE IN RAID ON QUEBEC NEWSPAPER OFFICE—OBTAINING OF WARRANT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Has the minister been able to ascertain if any other police force involved in the raid on the Quebec newspaper, to which reference was made earlier this week, obtained a warrant? Also, did the RCMP play a main, subsidiary or supporting role in that particular incident?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, we know the RCMP played a supporting or assisting role in this investigation or raid. I have not yet been able to obtain a report from those who investigated this matter on behalf of my department and therefore do not know yet if a warrant was obtained.

Mr. MacKay: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister undertake to report as soon as possible on whether a warrant was obtained as, if no warrant was obtained, even if the RCMP played a subsidiary role, they

could be considered as accomplices if they did not act with proper legal authority.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite correct. The other day I promised to give the House as much information as possible, including information on the point raised.

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON ILLEGAL ACTS BY FORCE

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. As everyone is aware how serious this matter is, will the Solicitor General make an unequivocal statement to the effect that the Government of Canada does not condone in any way such illegal acts and that there is no justification for such illegality.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can give that assurance to the House. The direction of the government to the RCMP is this: the members of the force are not to act illegally in any way. Mr. Samson alleged that an illegal act had taken place. We shall investigate that, and shall see if there are any incidents of a similar nature.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

APPLICATION OF RESTRAINT GUIDELINES TO STAFF—POSSIBLE INCREASE IN NUMBER OF COMPANIES UNDER CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. As the staff of the Anti-Inflation Board of Canada is now almost as big as was the comparable staff operating in the United States at the peak of that country's control operation, although our country is only one-tenth the size of the United States, and as the Anti-Inflation Board is under the control of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, will the acting minister say if the restraint guidelines which apply to other federal government agencies apply also to the Anti-Inflation Board. If so, which guidelines apply and how stringently are they applied?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, just as stringently as necessary, but not so stringently that the board cannot operate.

Mr. Stevens: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the Anti-Inflation Board now regulates eight times as many companies as the United States board regulated at the height of phase II of the comparable program in that country, does the minister think that the AIB's propensity to regulate more and more firms will continue, or does he think that the rate at which the board will bring firms under control in future will decrease?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of regulation is at the disposal of the Anti-Inflation Board which is within the purview of the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman ought to direct that question to that minister when he returns on Monday.

[Mr. MacKay.]

* * *

THE MINISTRY

DATE OF APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my final supplementary question to the Acting Prime Minister. Noting that the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said he was resigning because he felt that his continuation in office would jeopardize the efficiency and value of his department in its work for consumers, and since the acting minister bears a great load on his shoulders in connection with other matters, would the Acting Prime Minister inform the House if it is proposed to appoint a new minister and, if so, when?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must say the acting minister is doing an excellent job, but that was not the only consideration. He would not take another ministry. However, I will consult with the Prime Minister and I will tell him how urgently the hon. member thinks another appointment is necessary. I know he would not want to reflect upon the present acting minister.

Mr. Forrestall: I would not bet on that.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY TRANSAIR WILL BE CARRIER TO PROVIDE REGIONAL SERVICE TO WESTERN MANITOBA AND EASTERN SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): My question is for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Now that the minister has arrived at a complete impasse in his negotiations with the province of Manitoba with respect to providing an air service for western Manitoba and eastern Saskatchewan, would he indicate whether Ottawa is considering going it alone and would one of the solutions contemplated be the offer of the regional carrier Transair to provide a daily jet service in this important area of Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am reviewing the option of going it alone in trying to ensure a service to some of the communities which have been involved in the previous discussions. Now that, as the hon. member says, an impasse has been arrived at, with Manitoba clearly not willing to put in as much money as they had been willing to put in when their own Skywest project was considered, I have had discussions with the communities concerned and I am very conscious of their desires, at least as reflected through certain spokesmen, and the option to which the hon. member refers is certainly one at which I am looking.

Mr. Dinsdale: In view of the fact that the service has been suspended for some three years, and in view of the Prime Minister's promise in 1974 that this service would be renewed, can the minister give an assurance that a service would be in place before the busy summer season?

Mr. Lang: I am not sure that I can give that assurance because there are certain complications in terms of the decisions by carriers and decisions by the CTC. But I can tell the hon. member that I consider the matter to be a high priority question and one to which I am giving close attention.

* * *

TRADE

REGULATIONS GOVERNING IMPORTATION OF EGGS—SUGGESTION DOMESTIC DEMANDS MET BEFORE CHANGES MADE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. On March 25, as reported on page 12136 of *Hansard*, the minister gave the assurance to the hon. member for Lisgar that he would look into the question which the hon. member raised with respect to the importation of eggs and matters related thereto. My question is founded on the proposal currently before the minister to give exclusive jurisdiction to the Canadians Egg Marketing Agency over importation of eggs to Canada. In view of the inability of CEMA to be able to adequately control its own production to satisfy Canadian needs, and in view of the fact that one Canadian processing plant has already had to close down in Winnipeg because of its inability to get a permit to have eggs brought into Canada, may I ask the minister if he will satisfy himself that the Canadian market demands are satisfactorily met before any changes are made in the jurisdiction which he has over the importation of eggs?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and I have been discussing this matter at some length. The proposal which the hon. member has outlined is being considered, but certainly it is not the only one. I am quite sure we will be able to arrive at an arrangement which will meet the hon. member's concern, namely that the market be dealt with properly. I will certainly assure myself of that and so will the Minister of Agriculture, I am sure, before any decision is made.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—ASSURANCE OF SUPPLIES FOR BAKERS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it his intention to take immediate steps to ensure that Canadian market demands are satisfactorily met and that the breakers' trade is able to get its supplies in order to make sure that the confectionery and bakery trades in Canada are assured of adequate supplies, and will he take immediate steps to ensure that the necessary import orders are granted to the Canadian breakers' trade?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have always said that if the marketing board could not make the proper supplies to the consumer market and the processing market, imports should be allowed into the country. But this is not as easy and as simple as the hon. member makes it sound, because I am told there are ample supplies in Canada. But some of the imports which are being requested at the present time are unwarranted because there are thousands of cases every week taken off the market as surplus and being put into the breaking trade.

* * *

● (1130)

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF PRICE OF GASOLINE SOLD TO FARMERS

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the increasing percentage of input costs which energy has been taking with respect to the production of food, and in view of the fact that these costs are ultimately passed on to the consumer, will the acting minister undertake to have the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs investigate reports that the wholesale cost of gasoline to farm distributors is two cents per gallon above the rate at which similar gas is being sold to wholesalers for regular consumption, and if this is the case, will the minister instruct his department to take corrective action?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will look into this as early as Monday.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION OF ANGOLAN REFUGEES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Can he confirm the report that the Prime Minister told some representatives of the Portugese community in Toronto that special consideration—I think he used the phrase "bend the rules"—would be given to the residents or former residents of Angola and Mozambique who are now living in destitution in Portugal with regard to admission to Canada? If such special consideration is contemplated, could the minister tell us the nature of the consideration to be given to them?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have looked at the transcript of the comments of the Prime Minister. He expressed sympathy, which I have expressed as well, and he indicated that we would look again, as we have many times, at

this situation. However, he told the representatives not to be optimistic in the sense that the Angolans in particular who have been displaced from the former province of Angola have gone to Portugal, of which they are citizens, and the move to come to Canada has been essentially one of economic hardship. We have indicated that we will expedite consideration of applications, particularly from Angolans with relatives in Canada and Portugese applicants with relatives in Canada, but we cannot declare this a refugee or a minority movement. That is the substance of what the Prime Minister indicated to the Portugese community in Toronto yesterday, according to the transcript which I have examined.

Mr. Hees: That is not the way it sounded on the radio this morning.

Mr. Brewin: I put it to the minister that there is a large number—I think about 300,000—of destitute people who have lost their homes and their jobs. We have a large Portugese community in Canada, and it would be consistent with Canada's generous attitude not to qualify refugees in different manners by legalistic phrases, but to admit at least a portion of those people, so that they can join their relatives and friends in Canada, without applying the very strict immigration rules which are generally applied.

Mr. Andras: I tried to explain this to the hon. member and certainly to the Portugese community. First, let me say that we all recognize that the Portugese people who have come here have made very fine Canadian citizens, so we applaud the way they have assimilated into our society. However, the description of the situation the hon. member has given is one I could apply to the people of many countries of the world. There is no question about that.

The Angolans in Portugal are now being helped to settle by the Portugese government. There has been a Canadian contribution of some $300,000 or $500,000 to the Portugese government to assist in that very endeavour, and beyond that I have indicated that we will entertain and expedite applications within the immigration laws which now exist, but we cannot establish the precedent of allowing these kinds of movements on the basis of economic hardship, particularly when we have, unfortunately, considerable unemployment in this country.

* * *

AIRPORTS

RUNWAY EXTENSION AT VANCOUVER—REASON FOR MINISTER'S SUPPORT OF NEW RUNWAY WITHIN DYKED PORTION OF SEA ISLAND

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. It refers to the Vancouver airport runway extension. In the minister's press release of March 12 he said that a decision will be made in the next few months as to whether environmental or urban penalties will result from the proposed parallel runway. Then, the minister asked that all interested parties present their views to him. However, then the release goes on to say that the minister thinks the better solution is a new runway entirely within the dyked portion of Sea Island. Can the minister explain why he is expressing support for this runway when this particular proposal was not studied by the airport planning committee and in fact was expressly excluded from the study of the airport planning committee?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, my expression of preference for the shorter runway within the dyked area was designed to focus attention on what I considered to be the most likely and reasonable alternative. In the course of the study this alternative did emerge more and more as a realistic one, and it certainly did in the eyes of the officials who advise me and who ordinarily judge what is possible and necessary with regard to airport facilities.

It also became apparent that the greatest area of concern which had a real and fundamental basis to it was the interference with the area beyond the dyke, and as a result I thought it better to indicate that this might not be necessary at all in considering another runway for Vancouver.

RUNWAY EXTENSION AT VANCOUVER—REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE STUDY OF ALL RELATED REPORTS

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): I will have to come back to this on Monday, but the question to the minister now is as follows: on July 9, 1975 at page 7391 of *Hansard* the then minister of transport, who is now the Minister of the Environment, said all reports on the proposed expansion of Vancouver airport—and that would include that of the airport planning committee and also the environmental study which has been put in by the former minister's department—would be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications for full discussion. Can the minister assure this House that the commitment of the former minister will be kept? Can the minister also assure us that in view of the recommendation of the environmental study that there should be no short runway within the dyke, of which the minister just spoke, unless it goes through the proper environmental planning stage, that there will be a referral back to the committee of this House and that the proposals to which he is referring will not be decided upon until it is also subjected to the departmental planning and assessment regulations of the government?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I can assure the hon. member that I will not be trying to rush any decision. I will be allowing for full time for appropriate discussions, but I will decide from time to time on the nature of those discussions and the kind which is, in fact, most appropriate. I will even give the hon. member time to make up his mind about whether he does or does not want some additional facility in Vancouver.

ENERGY

SUGGESTED APPEARANCE OF PREMIER OF NOVA SCOTIA TO COMMENT ON HIGH COST OF ENERGY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the conflict of opinions which appear to exist between the federal government and the government of Nova Scotia, namely, the opposing views held by the premier of Nova Scotia, who is also chairman of the Nova Scotia Power Commission, regarding energy and the exhorbitantly high cost of electric power in Nova Scotia, would the minister invite the premier and his officials who have expertise in the subject to appear before the appropriate House committee as soon as possible, not only to give their views on the subject, but also to try to reach a solution which would ease the crushing burden of the cost of energy on the people of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the premier of Nova Scotia is perfectly able to make that suggestion himself if he wishes to see this matter go forward to the appropriate committee. I do not think it is for me to invite another person to appear before a committee of which I am not a member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, come on.

Mr. Muir: I thank the minister for his reply, but it indicates his lack of interest in trying to help the taxpayers of Nova Scotia. I realize the finance ministers' meeting is going on at the moment, and from reports emanating from that meeting not much progress is being made. However, I am sure the minister will agree that the minister of finance of Nova Scotia is not an expert in energy and does not profess to be an expert. The premier of Nova Scotia seems to indicate he is an expert on this subject, according to the comments he has made about the minister to whom I am addressing this question.

To clarify the situation, does the minister not agree that it would be in the interests of all concerned, particularly the people of Nova Scotia who have a crushing burden to bear with regard to energy, to excel himself on this occasion and to be kindly by inviting the premier of Nova Scotia to come to Ottawa and discuss the matter?

● (1140)

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that question. The hon. member seems to have overlooked the fact that the federal government is already providing a great deal of assistance to the hard pressed users of energy in Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada—indeed, Canada as a whole—through the compensation program. I can understand the hon. member if he is saying he wants more assistance. I ask him to suggest to me what kind of additional assistance we should be considering at a time of government restraint.

Oral Questions

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

MONITORING OF COMPANIES TO ENSURE FULFILMENT OF COMMITMENTS AT TIME OF TAKEOVER—POSSIBILITY OF PENALTIES

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It is in relation to his responsibilities for FIRA. Is the government monitoring the degree to which companies that are given approval for a takeover are fulfilling all the obligations they agree to at the time that takeover is permitted?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is a monitoring process. Since the agency has only been in existence for 18 months or so, it is only now becoming urgent and important to do this monitoring because, normally speaking, the commitments involve an 18 months time span in most cases. We are working it out. There are some difficulties. I am holding discussions with the officials of FIRA to see how the procedure can be improved.

Mr. Gillies: Does the government propose to bring in legislation which will have specific penalties for companies that do not live up to agreements that are given under their commitments at the time the takeover takes place?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, nothing as specific as that is contemplated by me at the present time. However, I would be glad to discuss with the hon. member or anybody else interested just how such an arrangement might be made to work. In other words, one of the concerns is that we do monitor and ensure that the commitments are carried out, but just how we would phrase a penalty clause is something we are examining. As I said, I would welcome proposals as to how that might be done.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RECONCILIATION OF POSITION AT LAW OF SEA CONFERENCE WITH PERMISSION TO DRILL FOR OIL IN BEAUFORT SEA

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Given the strenuous arguments being put forward by Canada to the Law of the Sea Conference for international recognition of the principles in the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act because of the need to protect the delicate ecological balance of our Arctic seabed, can the minister explain how the government can reconcile this stance which it is taking externally with its current consideration of a permit for oil exploration in the Beaufort Sea, a project which could present extremely hazardous environmental conditions and which could jeopardize Canada's position at the Law of the Sea Conference?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I can assure my hon. friend that the problems posed by our general position at the Law of the Sea Conference and the pending decision upon exploration in the Beaufort Sea obviously is part of the consideration that is going on at present, and part of the consideration that is involved in our discussions with the

United States which has expressed similar concerns about this particular possibility. Obviously, the job of a good government is to reconcile sometimes difficult alternatives and to produce an acceptable solution. That is what we are trying to do.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, given the minister's answer and the tendency of this government to try to come down on all sides of a question, may I ask the minister if he in fact has his arguments ready to justify drilling in the Beaufort Sea when he next attends the Law of the Sea Conference?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have not got the arguments ready because I do not prepare arguments against contingencies.

* * *

TRADE

POSSIBILITY OF OPENING TRADE MISSION IN TAIWAN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. At the present time there are some 16 million people living in Taiwan and their per capita income is one of the highest in Asia. During the minister's recent trade mission to five southeast Asian countries, all of which trade with Canada, did the minister give any consideration to visiting Taipei with regard to the possibility of opening a Canadian trade mission in that city so that we could assist Canadian exporters to improve their trade opportunities in this area?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker, not in the precise meaning that the hon. member has stated. The specific basis of the mission was to visit the Asian countries. It was confined to that. The question of establishing some kind of trade relationship with Taiwan has been under discussion for some time. Without wishing to pass the matter off, I might refer it to my hon. friend, the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

CRITERIA FOR ISSUING MINISTERIAL VISAS—DEPORTATION ORDER AGAINST MR. MORCINEK

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It follows my motion under Standing Order 43 regarding a deportation case. Can the minister explain to the House the criteria used by his department in determining the issuance of ministerial visas vis-à-vis permitting and in fact recommending deportation orders to potentially sound new citizens, such as the case to which I referred?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, ministers' permits are not issued to people under deportation orders or when a deportation order has been confirmed in various levels of appeal. In the case of Mr. Morcinek, he entered Canada illegally as a ship deserter in July 1974, reported to immigration shortly thereafter and, quite properly, a hearing was commenced. It was adjourned when he made claim to refugee status. That claim to refugee status was heard by the interdepartmental committee and denied in August 1974. The inquiry was resumed and he was ordered deported, whereupon he quite properly appealed to the Immigration Appeal Board for a hearing on refugee status. The Immigration Appeal Board, which is an independent judicial body, examined his representation and decided that he did not have a valid appeal to refugee status and the deportation order was upheld. He subsequently appealed to the Federal Court and the Supreme Court. Only the other day was the Supreme Court decision issued to deny the appeal and uphold the deportation order. The hon. member's Standing Order 43 suggested a course of action I should take which is beyond my jurisdiction because Mr. Morcinek is now under a deportation order. I could not issue a ministerial permit for him to stay. The deportation order has to be implemented. He could, however, seek deportation to a third country. That is an option open to people in that situation. He could apply from that third country if such country would receive him, to return to Canada.

POSSIBILITY OF MR. MORCINEK LEAVING CANADA VOLUNTARILY AND THEN APPLYING FOR LANDED IMMIGRANT STATUS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, another option that the minister did not mention was mentioned in a letter dated February 13 to Mrs. Ann Ridley. I would like to quote one sentence from that letter:

> Fortunately, there is a provision in the Act whereby persons ordered deported may be allowed to effect voluntary departure if they can make their own arrangements to leave Canada and be accepted by a country of their choice, providing that they are willing and able to do so.

If Mr. Morcinek voluntarily left Canada, would the minister expedite an application for landed immigrant status from a country outside Canada?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I covered that option in my answer to the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley when I indicated he could take departure to a third country of his choice, either voluntarily or through deportation. In this case, the fact that he is being deported would not be held against him. However, he would have to apply from a third country and that application would have to be judged by the criteria we use in such applications. Therefore, I could not give that guarantee, but it is an option open to him.

* * *

TRADE

POSSIBILITY OF OPENING TRADE MISSION IN TAIWAN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that asked

earlier by the hon. member for South Shore to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia and Japan, just to name a few of the many nations that recognize Communist China but continue to have satisfactory trading arrangements with the free enterprise government of the Republic of China, can the minister indicate if he will take steps to see if a similar type of arrangement can be made with the government in Taiwan which would be of material assistance in overcoming the unfavourable trade balance Canada presently has with that country in the limited trade presently carried out?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we do have trade, as the hon. member pointed out in his question, with business interests within Taiwan. I do understand that there have been trading institutions; at least it is said that countries like the United Kingdom have maintained trading houses in Taiwan without jeopardizing their one-China policy. This is a matter which I have discussed privately with members of the House. I have taken into account some views which have been expressed by them and I hope to meet them at a later time with some results.

* * *

● (1150)

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

DEATH OF CHILDREN ATTRIBUTED TO SPRUCE BUDWORM SPRAY—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PREVENT

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is serious. I put it to the Minister of the Environment although it probably also concerns the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

As it now seems to have been established by a team of researchers at Dalhousie University in Halifax and also American researchers in the U.S. that four children died as a result of the presence in 1973 of certain solvents in the insecticides used against the spruce budworm in Nova Scotia, and as those solvents may possibly be used again this year, can the Minister of the Environment and possibly the Minister of National Health and Welfare assure this House that very strict controls will apply to avoid a possible recurrence of that tragedy this year as it is expected that the spraying program will be very intensive this year of eastern Canada's forests?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nova Scotia government cancelled a project involving the spraying of the province's forests with certain solvents.

I believe the New Brunswick legislative assembly may set up a committee to study the situation and examine the whole forest spraying program in that province.

Still, I should like to clarify one of the statements of the hon. member in his opening remarks. The Medical Research Council and my department have financed the studies of a group of scientists located at Halifax in Nova Scotia. Those studies are still underway but at this point in time they do not allow us to conclude definitely that the insecticides used are linked with the fatal diseases found in some children. It is clear that further studies and research will have to be pursued in that field. It seems too early to conclude that the insecticides caused the diseases that were diagnosed.

* * *

[*English*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PENSION SCHEMES

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the studies which have been made by the Canadian Council on Social Development with regard to public sector pensions and in view of the call which came recently from the Canadian Pension Conference for an inquiry into what is happening in the private sector with regard to pensions, will the minister consider undertaking a thorough review or establishing a public inquiry into pension policy, both public and private, so that we can be sure that things will go well down the road?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I have on several occasions indicated that this issue is currently under study by the government, in particular by my department and the Department of Finance. It might well be that a public inquiry will be useful or necessary but no decision to this effect has yet been taken by the government. At the present time, the studies are taking place on an official level, that is, on an interdepartmental basis, but I am not ruling out the other possibility if it is found necessary to expand those studies.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BILL C-83 AND ALLEGED RESISTANCE TO SEPARATISM

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. Solicitor General.

Since the minister has already ordered an inquiry into the disclosures made by former RCMP member, Mr. Robert Samson, and since it says in Bill C-83, clause 105(2) which is now being rammed through this House, that any defensive weapon may, without warrant, be searched and taken away from a citizen even in case of organized or apprehended burglaries, I wish to put the following question to the minister: will he tell the House whether or not there is a connection between Bill C-83 and the fight against separatism?

[*English*]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

AGRICULTURE

REASON FOR QUEBEC'S INTENTION TO OPT OUT OF CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the hon. gentleman received information from the dairy producers of the Province of Quebec that they have served notice of their intention not to be represented on the supply-management committee of the Canadian Dairy Commission for the coming year? If he has received such notice, can he explain the reason given by the industrial dairy producers from the Province of Quebec for wanting to opt out of the Commission?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): They have given notice unofficially, I believe, but I have not seen the official notice. They are wanting out and they have to give one year's notice before they can opt out. I think it is part of their strategy to try to renegotiate a new market share quota program because they are dissatisfied. In the Province of Quebec they have both an industrial milk marketing board and a fluid milk marketing board. Practically every province has a different organization for administering the milk marketing system. These are the groups which get together and decide how the quota is to be distributed. I do not decide this for them.

Mr. Murta: Since the implications are very serious as far as the future operations of the Dairy Commission are concerned, may I ask what plans the minister or the department have got to work with, or negotiate with, the dairy producers of Quebec to ensure that they will be in the plan for another year and that the future of the Dairy Commission will not be badly damaged as a result of this move?

Mr. Whelan: We are concerned that the Dairy Commission should operate in an efficient manner. There is a dispute as to how this quota should be divided among fluid producers and industrial producers. However, it is up to them to run their business. We, of course, would like to see it run as harmoniously as possible but the minister has no authority to direct the commission as to how it should operate its affairs. Under the Wheat Board Act the government can give direction by order in council, but this is not such a situation.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

NATIONAL FORESTRY POLICY—CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF PROPOSALS

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question, which is directed to the Minister of the Environment, is consequent upon the question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River with respect to forest policy. Since any initiative by officials of the federal forestry service in developing a national policy have been stifled by the government as a result of divided jurisdiction among at least 20 federal agencies meddling in this field, can the minister tell us whether it is the intention of the government at least to co-ordinate the various activities of these agencies, all of which, or many of which, may be in conflict or at cross-purposes with each other?

[Mr. Allmand.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think that this question is much more clever and a lot clearer that the one which was put to me yesterday regarding forestry policy in Canada. As the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte fully knows jurisdiction over forestry belongs mostly to provincial governments. Only federal territories and the Northwest Territories come under our jurisdiction. However we have been in touch with each of the provinces in the hope that they will cooperate with us in working out a national forestry policy. So far the responses have been extremely encouraging.

[*English*]

Mr. McCain: I cannot agree with the premise on which the answer is based. For that reason I ask this supplementary question. With regard to the proposed federal-provincial discussion on the matter of a national forest policy, will the minister indicate what form the consultation will take and whether he intends to establish a national policy, as in agriculture, fishing, etc., and assume the cost of such a national program, or is it the intention of the government, as in so many other recent policy statements, to transfer financial responsibility in full or in part to the provinces?

● (1200)

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will understand that before we can do anything in this field, since the provinces have the larger share of jurisdiction in this area, they would have to agree to have a meeting. I have received information from almost all provinces that they are ready to discuss with us and elaborate on some national policies in the fields I have mentioned.

* * *

HOUSING

REPRESENTATIONS TO ANTI-INFLATION BOARD ON BEHALF OF INDUSTRY—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. As the minister is aware, the housing industry is very sensitive to the economic cycle, and profits rise and fall depending on whether the industry is in a boom or a bust phase. With this in mind, can the minister tell the House whether he has made any representations to the Anti-Inflation Board on behalf of the housing industry, and, if so, what has been their reaction?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Certainly there have been boom and bust cycles, Mr. Speaker, and the booms have outweighed the busts by a long shot in recent years. I did meet today with representatives of the housing industry and discussed relationships with the Anti-Inflation Board. We are working closely with them. Fortunately, somebody must have been

doing something right, with starts up 200 per cent in the first two months of this year compared with last year.

Mr. Darling: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the House whether the Anti-Inflation Board is considering a modification of the profit guidelines for the benefit of the housing industry and, if so, can the minister tell the House when he expects clarification from the Anti-Inflation Board?

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, this question is properly for the Minister of Finance, but I am aware that discussions are going on, with a report expected very shortly. I cannot say anything more; it is the province of my colleague.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

COMMENT MADE IN YESTERDAY'S DEBATE

Mr. Raynald Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I only had the opportunity of giving you notice of my question of privilege when I entered the House because the French edition of *Hansard* was not available before 10:45. I therefore rise on a question of privilege pursuant to Standing Order 35 which reads as follows:

... No member shall use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof.

So, referring to yesterday's *Hansard,* on page 12386, one can read the words used by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin)—and I am very polite in calling him the hon. member for Lotbinière—who used offensive words against me, calling me a coward. The Acting Speaker at the time, the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger), deferred until today the decision on the question of privilege I raised yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 117, citation 133, reads as follows:

When the Speaker takes notice of any expression as personal and disorderly, and tending to introduce heat and confusion, and calls upon the offending member to explain, it is the duty of the latter immediately to explain or retract the offensive expressions, and to apologize to the House for the breach of order, in terms large and liberal enough both to satisfy the House, and the member of whom the offensive expressions were used. The Speaker's demand usually produces the required explanation, at once;

Mr. Speaker, those same words which appear on page 12387 of yesterday's *Hansard* were endorsed by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle)—I think he gave up since he is not here, this morning, Mr. Speaker.

To help you make your ruling, I should like to read the definition of the word "coward" in the Shorter Larousse dictionary. It means a person who lacks courage—

Mr. Matte: Right on!

Mr. Guay (Lévis): —fearful, shameful. I shall also ask the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) to withdraw when I have completed my remarks, because he just said:

Right on. I continue the definition: ... base and contemptible ...

Mr. Matte: This is the right definition!

Mr. Guay (Lévis): According to the Quillet dictionary, the definition of coward is: lacking in energy, funky, contemptible. "To give up" means to let go, surrender, abandon, and that is no doubt what the hon. member for Joliette is doing this morning: abandon his friends once again. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Joliette has already abandoned the Progressive Conservative Party for the party to which he has returned today. Maybe he has already left the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, to run for the leadership of the Union nationale in Quebec. Last night, when he supported the Social Crediter member, I wondered if he was not becoming a Social Crediter.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the comments made last night by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), with the support of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), I would ask that these comments be withdrawn and the question of privilege which I raised last night be maintained. I would not make the same kind of remarks as regards the hon. member for Lotbinière because I have been a member of this House for the last 14 years, I have always respected other hon. members and I do not think my colleagues and myself are cowards.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore ask that the hon. member withdraw his remarks immediately, as provided in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. Should you rule his comments as not being unparliamentary, I would in turn call each of those two members, one of whom is not here, coward, fearful, base and contemptible.

Mr. Matte: It is cowardly to make such comments in the absence of the hon. member.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, it is never easy to deal with a question of privilege. However, in this case concerning the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay), the situation is quite clear. Here is what is provided in citation 113, page 102 of the fourth edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, and I quote:

Members often raise so-called "questions of privilege" on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in the debates or the proceedings of the House.

And the citation goes on to say:

Wilful disobedience to Orders and Rules of Parliament in the exercise of its constitutional functions; insults and obstructions during debate are breaches of the privileges of the House.

And I would draw Your Honour's attention to the following words: insults during debate, which I did, according to the hon. member for Lévis or obstructions during debate, which I blame the hon. member for Lévis for doing when he prevented us last night from doing our work pursuant to Standing Orders. Therefore I think we must set the facts in their true light.

In what circumstances were those remarks made? After a motion was introduced to silence the opposition by allowing for a two hours maximum debate, I rose for a 10 minute period as every other member. I did not support the government's motion, and neither did any other member of the opposition. I said so frankly and clearly. I realize that

the hon. member for Lévis is perfectly entitled to disagree with me and with the opposition. That is quite normal since he is on the government side. However, it is my right and privilege to express my disagreement.

Anyone reading my speech will realize that I did not go beyond my rights under our Standing Orders. Every member however that was in this House yesterday evening will testify that the hon. member for Lévis did not stop for a minute interrupting me, shouting his disapproval, voicing protests while I was speaking. He repeatedly interrupted my speech, contrary to our rules.

That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why I told him to keep quiet while we were making speeches, as appears in the official reports on page 12386. This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing that problem. I show every respect for the hon. member for Lévis. And he knows it. I will not throw back to him what he said earlier about an absent member. I feel that attacking the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) in his absence, the way he did, is rather debasing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that Opposition members, in situations where they are constantly interrupted by government members, make this kind of remark, as "Let him stop bothering me during my speech. Let him stop railing at me. Let him rise to speak on the subject when his turn comes, if he has the courage to do so." This happens hundred of times during our debates. And the hon. member for Lévis knows it.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore submit I said nothing that went beyond my rights and privileges under our Standing Orders, and I respectfully wish that hon. members on the other side would let us make our speeches unhindered.

Mr. Speaker, it is enough that we are muzzled without being constantly interrupted when we speak in this House.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Chair intervened during the speech of opposition members from three parties. On pages 12383, 12372, 12367 and 12366 of *Hansard*, we find four interventions by the Acting Speaker who wanted to restore order in this House so as to allow the speakers to be heard, especially since speeches were limited to ten minutes. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that as recorded in *Hansard*, the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) interrupted me exactly eight times, while—

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, citation 113 in the 4th edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms says, and I quote:

> But a dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the last point that I want to make is this. The hon. member for Lévis, who feels so injured today, seems to forget that, as *Hansard* shows, he himself called me a coward yesterday. On page 12386, the hon. member for Lévis is reported as having said:

> . . . I demand that the hon. member for Lotbinière treat the others as they do him . . .

Which meant that he was calling me a coward.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lévis called me a coward in the heat of the discussion. I understand him and do not bear him any grudge. I just wonder why he himself dramatizes such things. As reported on page 12387 of *Hansard*, he himself said yesterday:

> . . . if we say we must muzzle the House, as the hon. member now seems to be trying to prove . . .

Mr. Speaker, this was not true. The hon. member was imputing motives to me. I was trying to prove exactly the opposite. No one would pretend that it was the opposition who introduced the closure motion under Standing Order 75C.

The hon. member for Lévis added

> . . . I think he is the one . . .

—talking about myself—

> . . . who should be muzzled for all the nonsense he is saying.

—talking about myself. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, that is not parliamentary language either. I think the hon. member for Lévis exceeds the limit. First, he gives a wrong interpretation of my words, he wants to muzzle me, prevent me from speaking in the House, and then he states plainly that I talk nonsense today in order to taint the reputation of the hon. member for Joliette.

Finally, as evidenced by the debates, the hon. member interfered with my right to speak by interrupting me more than eight times in ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I refer to the 18th edition of Parliamentary Practice by Erskine May, chapter XIX dealing with

> . . . Maintenance of order during debate . . .

In paragraph 2 entitled:

● (1210)

[*English*]

In Erskine May's eighteenth edition, chapter XIX concerning the maintenance of order during debate, paragraph (2), in reference to minor breaches of order, states:

> When any members transgresses the rules of debate, otherwise than by using disorderly or unparliamentary expressions, or makes any noise or disturbance whilst another member is speaking—

In that event, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the Speaker calls the offending member to order.

[*Translation*]

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am asking you today, to call the hon. member to order so that he will understand like the other government members that he must let the opposition fulfill its duty without degrading it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is always hard for the Chair to make a ruling on a question of privilege, especially when the matter concerns the definition of one word or other. It is obviously clear that often in the past, a member has been allowed to express the feelings of another member who had tried on many occasions to interrupt another member. Either one must have the courage to rise and take part in the debate. I therefore accept the explanation given by the hon. member for Lotbinière, whatever words were used during yesterday's debate. His intention was quite clear. Then again, I accept the explanation of the hon. member because, in my opinion, there is no question of privilege under the circumstances.

[*English*]

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, lately the opposition has been experiencing great difficulty in posing questions to ministers because when they are in the House they are continually visiting with their colleagues. Some days you allow the minister a chance to return to his seat. Today I posed a question to the Minister of Transport but you did not allow him to return. I would strongly suggest to the Acting Prime Minister that he issue a directive to his ministers that when they are in the House during the question period, they stay in their seats. This will help speed-up the question period considerably.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

TENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I, on behalf of all the members of my committee, have the honour to present the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, in both officials languages. If you will bear with me, Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment to clause 15 which says that this act shall be deemed to have come into effect on April 1, 1976.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

● (1220)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TABLING OF EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY RESPECTING SALARY REVISIONS

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to lay on the table an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Commissioners of Internal Economy held on March 29, 1976, concerning salary revisions of the staff of the House of Commons.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MOTION RESPECTING COMPLETION OF DEBATE

On the order: March 31, 1976—The President of the Privy Council.

That, on Monday, April 5, 1976, the House shall continue to sit between 6.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m.;

That, on Tuesday, April 6, 1976, the House shall not adjourn until the completion of the business provided for in this order;

That, on the aforementioned days, no private members business shall be taken up;

That, on the aforementioned days, the business taken up shall be the consideration of objections to reports of Electoral Boundaries Commissions;

That all objections to any given report be considered at the same time;

Electoral Boundaries

That the objections or groups of objections, as the case may be, be considered in the order in which the objection or first objection in the group, as the case may be, was laid upon the Table; and

That during the consideration of any objection or group of objections, as the case may be, no member shall speak more than once, nor for more than twenty minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), supported by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik), raised a point of order about the possibility that the House might give consent, yesterday, to the consideration of this motion. I have carefully considered the point of order. Of course, the motion today is properly before the House without the need for unanimous consent. The hon. member argued that since this motion concerns itself with debate on objections to do with the reports of several provincial electoral boundaries commissions, and since, according to the argument, there has been a technical or legal failure, or non-conformity with the act on the part of the province of Ontario in that the filing of this report was not accompanied with reasons, the House ought not to deal with this motion. Indeed, as I understand the point of order, the House ought not to deal with any reports concerning themselves with Ontario when it debates the matter next Monday and Tuesday.

I have carefully considered the points raised. First, since this motion may now properly be called without needing unanimous consent, I feel that the point of order should not interpose itself in respect of the calling of the motion today and should not interpose itself with respect to our dealing with two reports, at least, pursuant to the terms of the motion if the motion is adopted.

My reasons for so finding are simple and clear. This House must concern itself with the procedures and practices of this House, not with other legal practices or questions concerning non-conformity with a statute unless those questions relate to the Standing Orders of the House.

The House has before it a motion. The Chair must, therefore, ask if the motion is procedurally correct and receivable. If the House takes a decision on the motion, then that is a decision for the House and ought not to be the concern of the Chair unless there is some procedural irregularity.

Questions to do with reasons attached to reports, or whether those reasons comply with the statute in the first instance in fulfilling statutory requirements, are surely legal questions. They concern legal opinions and are matters to be taken up in debate when the debate takes place. Further, if there is some question of a legal nature which in any way would prevent this House from taking legislative action, commissions from acting in a certain way, of officers thereof from implementing any decisions of commissions in drawing boundaries, that is a legal question.

Again, if remedies lie in the hands of hon. members who brought forward the point of order, or in the hands of any other citizens, then surely the question goes far beyond the procedural confines which are under the authority of the Chair. Therefore, on procedural grounds I must find the motion properly before the House and eligible for consideration at this time pursuant to our Standing Orders. If the motion is adopted, the House cannot be prevented, on procedural grounds, from discussing the matter on Monday and Tuesday next.

Electoral Boundaries

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, on Monday, April 5, 1976, the House shall continue to sit between 6.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m.;

That, on Tuesday, April 6, 1976, the House shall not adjourn until the completion of the business provided for in this order;

That, on the aforementioned days, no private members business shall be taken up;

That, on the aforementioned days, the business taken up shall be the consideration of objections to reports of Electoral Boundaries Commissions;

That all objections to any given report be considered at the same time;

That the objections or groups of objections, as the case may be, be considered in the order in which the objection or first objection in the group, as the case may be, was laid upon the Table; and

That during the consideration of any objection or group of objections, as the case may be, no member shall speak more than once, nor for more than twenty minutes.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Actually, I would indicate at this time that I wish to raise a question of privilege on Monday and present argument, not about Your Honour's decision which I respect and acknowledge, but about important matters fundamental to this House and affecting all members of parliament, particularly those from the province of Ontario. I wish to enter that caveat now and reserve my right to argue the question of privilege on Monday next.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Standing Orders provide that the Chair must be given written or effective notice of such intention to raise a question of privilege. I cannot think of more effective notice than the kind of notice which the hon. member for Ontario has just given.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to do with the motion which the House just adopted. I think it would help if we could settle the order in which the various objections shall be considered. The motion provides, in part, that the objections or groups of objections, as the case may be, shall be considered in the order in which the objection or first objection in the group, as the case may be, was laid upon the table. That will be the general principle governing the debate. But there may be some confusion as to how that provision is to be interpreted. I should like to settle the question so as to avoid differences of opinion later.

The first of the objections tabled was with respect to Nova Scotia; then there were tabled, in the following order, objections respecting Alberta, the Northwest Territories, Ontario, British Columbia and Quebec. The House will remember that it has also taken under consideration some objections relating to Nova Scotia, Alberta and British Columbia. It is the opinion of the House leaders who have been consulted on the question that the order of consideration should be, first the Northwest Territories and then, in the following order, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Alberta, and British Columbia. I suggest that it would serve the purposes of the House and would result in orderly debate if that suggestion were to be made an order of the House.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, that is agreeable.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,733, 3,846, 4,776, 4,965 and 4,968.

[*Text*]

RETENTION OF LAWYERS IN OKANAGAN BOUNDARY CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 3,733—**Mr. Whittaker:**

1. What were the names and addresses of all lawyers and law firms in the Constituency of Okanagan Boundary, British Columbia who performed services for the Department of Supply and Services during 1973 and 1974?

2. By year, what was the total amount paid to each?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Nil.

2. Not applicable.

PEI—FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,846—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, what criteria have been used by the Joint Advisory Board in (a) evaluating the overall effectiveness of the sectoral strategy in relation to the Plan objectives (b) determining the effectiveness of the various programmes and projects within the sector?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: (a) The criterion used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the sectoral strategy in relation to the Plan's objectives is its contribution to Gross Provincial Product in relation to the dollars expended. (b) The various programs and projects are examined to ensure that their continuation will contribute to ultimate realization of the sector objective.

LEASE ON KOOTENAY INDIAN RESERVES—CRESTON RECLAMATION COMPANY

Question No. 4,776—**Mr. Brisco:**

Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development ever give written or other permission to the Creston Reclamation Company of Creston, British Columbia, to grant, demise, transfer or set over or by any other act cause any term or interest to be granted, assigned or transferred to anyone, all that portion of Lower Kootenay Indian Reserve No. 10, surveyed as Lot 999, Group 1, which lies North and East of the right bank of Kootenay River; all of Lower Kootenay

Indian Reserve No. 2, surveyed as Lot 10000, Group 1; all of Lower Kootenay Indian Reserve No. 3, surveyed as Lot 10001, Group 1; all that portion of Lower Kootenay Indian Reserve No. 5, surveyed as Lot 10003, Group 1, which lies South of a line drawn East and West approximately 12 chains South of the North Boundary of Section thirty-two (32) Township eight (8) of the lands of the Lower Kootenay Indian Band held in trust by the Crown according to the terms of surrender of October 1, 1934?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The Department has no record of written or other authority to Creston Reclamation Company to transfer or otherwise dispose of any interest in their lease on the Kootenay Indian Reserves.

EXCISE TAX COLLECTED ON AIRCRAFT

Question No. 4,965—**Mr. Kempling:**

How much excise tax has been collected through the 10 per cent tax imposed on all privately owned (non-commercial) aircraft since the budget announcement of 1974?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): The amount of Excise Tax paid on private aircraft owned by individuals is not available. The Excise Tax paid to January 31, 1976 on aircraft owned by individuals and corporations for which no exemption was available, was $2,594,208.55.

APPOINTMENT OF EACH PRESIDENT OF CADC

Question No. 4,968—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Since 1961, what (a) are the names (b) were the dates of appointment (c) were the public service classifications (d) were the salary ranges on appointment of each President of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

2. Since 1961, what was the (a) effective date (b) public service classification (c) salary range at time of departure of each President of Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

3. Since 1961, what job (a) was held by each appointee immediately prior to appointment (b) did each appointee move to after leaving the Corporation?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned: 1.

		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	(i)	Louis Richard	January 1, 1955	not applicable	$12,000—14,500
	(ii)	Jean Miquelon	July 18, 1967	see note (1)	24,000—30,000
	(iii)	Jack S. Glassford	December 20, 1973		28,000—35,000
	(iv)	Claudette Nadeau	August 11, 1975		25,500—32,500
2.	(i)	September 15, 1967	not applicable	$17,000—21,750	
	(ii)	September 14, 1973	see note (1)	28,000—35,000	
	(iii)	December 3, 1974		33,000—42,000	
	(iv)	not applicable		not applicable	
3.	(i)	Comptroller, CADC	Retired		
	(ii)	Deputy Registrar General, Consumer & Corporate Affairs	Member, Pension Review Board		
	(iii)	Asst. Dep. Minister, Science & Engineering Procurement (DSS) See Note (2)	(iii) Retired		
	(iv)	Self-employed	(iv) Not applicable		

NOTES: 1.Public service classifications do not apply to the President's position. Section 7 (8), R.S. c.S-20, allows the Board to fix the President's salary.

2. Mr. J. S. Glassford was seconded to the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation by the Department of Supply and Services and held, simultaneously, the positions of President, Canadian Commercial Corporation and President, Canadian Arsenals Limited.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On Wednesday, March 24, my notice of motion for production of papers No. 96 was passed, with the approval of the parliamentary secretary. When I made my latest inquiry of the parliamentary papers returns office I learned that the return had not yet been tabled. It consists merely of two letters, the resignation of the Minister of Public Works and the rejection thereof by the Prime Minister. Does it take this long to produce copies of two simple letters?

● (1230)

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to my notice of motion No. 68 for the production of papers. It is a very simple motion relating to Canada's $11 million claim against the government of France as a result of the opting out by France of the NATO military alliance. This is the second time that I ask whether I could get an answer to my motion. It is worth $11 million to Canada.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, with reference to both representations, I will take note of them and make sure that a reply is forthcoming.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions with respect to the order of business on orders of the day today. Having particular regard to the fact that the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs

reported to the House today, and the way in which the House might handle the debate with respect to Bill C-92, I should like to say that discussions have gone on and it has been generally agreed by representatives of all parties that in any event Bill C-92 be given third reading today, and that in the debate leading to third reading there shall be one speech from a representative of each party, such speech not to exceed five minutes in length. I hope there will be no objection on the part of the government House leader or others in that respect because it is the intention of all of us to get this bill passed by the House immediately.

I presume there is consent. If that is the case, then that would be the first order of business, and I want to ensure that in fact the bill will receive third reading today. If that is the case—and the government House leader might wish to join me in this suggestion—it might be necessary for a House order to be made with respect to that bill.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with this matter in a very extraordinary fashion, but the reason is evident. It is the general desire of all members of the House that the bill should come into effect as soon as possible. You will have noted, sir, that the report made by the chairman of the committee mentioned the one amendment that had been made in committee, namely, that the bill shall be deemed to have come into effect on April 1, so that its benefits will not be denied former prisoners of war until it comes into effect. We do not have formally before us the printed bill, but I want to say that if it is agreeable to everyone in the House, and I believe it is, I would like to call third reading of Bill C-92 as the first order of business today.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The report of the committee has just been received. To proceed to third reading on the same day would require the unanimous consent of the House. I must, therefore, ask whether the House gives unanimous consent to taking into consideration the further stages of Bill C-92 on this day.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House having given its unanimous consent, the Chair can scarcely ignore the advice that has been given by the hon. member for Mercier that the bill was in fact amended in the standing committee; at least, that is what I understood was referred to in the committee report, that there was an amendment as to the coming into force of the bill.

I would, therefore, again indicate to the House that it would require unanimous consent to proceed in the ordinary way with third reading debate at this time, in view of the fact that the bill has come from the standing committee with an amendment, because this would preclude the entire report stage of the bill. Not only would two stages be taken on the same day, but it would obliterate the report stage of the bill. So I want to be clear that the House gives unanimous consent to that procedure.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATION FOR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR AND THEIR DEPENDANTS

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that Bill C-92, to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war and their dependants, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time? By unanimous consent, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the House wishes an order to be made now that there will be one speech from each of the parties in the House, of five minutes duration. Is that understood by the House and agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. S. Victor Railton (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I feel very happy to be speaking at this time. We did not expect anyone to be speaking on this matter. Yesterday we had more evidence of the unanimity of all parties in the House. First we were going to limit the length of speeches and then, finally, after several more consultations, we decided to cut out further speeches, which would allow more rapid passage on second reading by unanimous consent. This morning we took it to committee, where we also had unanimous consent. This has been brought about because we think that the veterans in question have been waiting a long time and another delay of a month or so would be detrimental to them. I think the fact that we accepted the amendment which makes April 1 the date on which the law will become effective was a very wise move.

I will not make a speech in favour of the bill. We are all in favour of it as it stands. I would just like to make a few points. First, our minister had a great deal of support from our caucus and he pushed this bill through cabinet. It took him a great deal of effort to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Railton: I still think that the cabinet was very generous to find the necessary $10 million by scraping the bottom of the barrel, or by scraping it out of some other departmental projects. This shows the government's concern for our former prisoners of war. Also, we have particular cause to be proud of our Liberal caucus members and committee members because not one of them has taken

the opportunity to speak, just so we could get the bill passed before the weekend. I thank them all very much. I also give great credit to hon. members on the other side. This just shows that Canadians as a people are fond of their veterans and know that they should have continuing hearings with this committee and with this House of Commons until all their grievances and requests are settled to the best of our financial ability.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have been asked to speak on behalf of our party on this bill for the next five minutes. This bill is a very welcome one. Its content was unanimously recommended by the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I think it will especially be appreciated in those areas of the country where units were recruited which later were taken prisoner in Hong Kong or in Dieppe. These groups are the members of our forces, generally speaking, who were prisoners of war for the longest period of time. I am particularly pleased that the anomaly which exists with regard to the benefits already paid to Hong Kong prisoners of war has been removed.

● (1240)

I want to spend a minute or two to express my regret that the minister insists on creating another anomaly. I think it is a great misfortune that the definition of "prisoner of war" does not include evaders and escapers. This refers chiefly—not entirely, but almost entirely—to air crew members of the Royal Canadian Air Force who, along with other members of the allied air forces in those dark days from 1940 to 1944, when the invasion of Europe took place, were about the only harbingers of hope for the people of occupied Europe.

It was the duty of these people, if they came down in an occupied country, to attempt to escape. They were especially equipped and trained to some extent to do this. It seems to me morally wrong and completely unjust that those who were able to take advantage of a situation which allowed them to evade capture for a time, or to escape entirely, should be precluded from benefiting under this bill when, on the other hand, if they had been immediately captured and remained prisoners of war, they qualify under the bill. Instead of rewarding risk-taking and enterprise the reverse is true, these military virtues are being penalized. The reverse is true. When the legislation as amended is administered, some very hard cases will emerge whcih will be difficult for the minister to refuse, and I hope the law will be amended at a later time so that these people can be accommodated. They are very few in number, perhaps a couple of hundred as far as Canada is concerned, and I hope the minister will take what I have to say to heart and give further study to this particular problem.

It seems to me completely unjust that one man out of a crew who, under great hardship, succeeded in avoiding being made a prisoner of war for perhaps months, should be excluded, by virtue of that, from benefiting under this legislation. I want to tell the minister, as he probably knows, that under those conditions the greatest problem an escaping airman had was to reject the temptation in his mind and the terrible psychological pressure he was under to turn himself in, because in turning himslef in he would have been relatively safe and his next of kin would have known he was alive.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, some of us have pressed vigorously and for a long time for this legislation, and I am very happy to be able to participate in these few minutes in the final stage of Bill C-92 in this House. I believe, there are congratulations which can well be extended, and I will start with the minister. I suspect he had a difficult time in the cabinet getting this bill brought forward and that it was only the case he was able to make that won the day. We congratulate him on this important battle and on this important victory.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I also want to pay tribute to all the members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs representing all parties. I have seldom been involved in a project in the House of Commons where there was so much unanimity and such universal determination. I also congratulate the organizations representing veterans from Hong Kong, Dieppe and other prisoner of war veterans. They, too, did a good job in the material that they brought to our attention. We extend our thanks, also, to Dr. Hermann for his report which was the basis for the recommendations we made.

Of course, one cannot look at this bill without realizing that there are two or three things missing which we wish were in it. I support wholeheartedly the plea just made by the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) regarding escapees and evaders. In the recommendations of our committee which were sit out in our seventh report, we recommended that they be included. Unfortunately, they are not included in the bill, but I hope at some point, especially as the applications come in, that the minister will find it possible to amend the statute in that respect.

I also regret that there is nothing in the bill to carry out Dr. Hermann's recommendation and the unanimous recommendation of our committee that there be a change with respect to the way pensions are granted to widows of disabled veterans. Without going into detail, I am referring to the present 48 per cent cut-off. I remind hon. members that the Woods report suggested a change in that, that several reports of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs recommended a change in that respect, and that the report on which this legislation is based also recommended such a change, namely, that there be pensions for widows where the veteran's pension was less than 48 per cent on a pro rata basis.

As strongly as I feel about that and about the point raised by the hon. member for Malpeque, we do not want to hold back this bill. It is good that we are getting it. It will mean a great deal to Hong Kong veterans to have their position improved, and it will mean a great deal to those who were prisoners of war in Europe, after all these years, to have the recognition and the compensation which are provided in this legislation. I believe that in achieving this legislation the House of Commons has shown itself to be the kind of place it ought to be. The Chair reminded us this morning of all the difficulties because of the rules we are

setting aside by unanimous consent. No matter what objection there was, time after time the Chair heard the House say "Agreed." We are unanimous in supporting this bill. We are unanimously pleased that in a moment it will be passed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if it would be appropriate now to call it one o'clock and proceed directly with the next order of business at two o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we call it one o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 12.51 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, but I suppose we will have to wait a few moments because there is no one here who can move the next order of government business.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, since we cannot proceed with the consideration of the next legislation, maybe with the unanimous consent of the House we could resume the debate on Bill C-83, for I would be ready to speak now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. parliamentary secretary on a point of order.

Mr. Trudel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We are ready to proceed with the order established among the various leaders of the House, namely the consideration of Bill S-32. As soon as I have the permission to speak, I will give my remarks to the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I can understand the embarrassment of the parliamentary secretary. There is no one here to move the order of business on which he proposes to speak. But we have to observe the rules of the House and it is necessary for two ministers to be here. Perhaps the government whip could be prevailed upon to go up to the dining-room to get one.

Mr. Breau: It seems we will have to wait for the minister. I believe a resolution would be needed to change the orders of the day.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was merely going to point out to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) that we have one cabinet minister in his place, but we need two.

Mr. Breau: I know the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) does not like to waste any time. He might wish to use this interval as a grievance period.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I was thinking of moving that the House adjourn.

Mr. Poulin: I see that the official opposition has one member of its front bench here, and we have one cabinet minister. The other ministers are very busy conducting the affairs of the nation and looking after their departmental responsibilities.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): One of their responsibilities is to run the House.

Mr. Poulin: That is right. I think we should continue with this kind of agreeable comment. We are seated in a chamber which is within my riding, and it is pleasant to find this happy feeling prevailing. I see one member of the Creditiste party, and there are two members of the New Democratic Party—

An hon. Member: Why not recite the alphabet? We know you can count.

Mr. Poulin: That interjection made me lose my train of thought.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Of course, we normally take points of order in succession, but the point raised by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Poulin) is so long that perhaps we can allow the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) to intervene.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I was proposing to put a question to the hon. member. He has spoken graciously of the good feeling which prevails here, but I should like to ask him whether he is inclined to take the action which seems to be called for, that is, to telephone to see whether he can find a couple of ministers.

Mr. Poulin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. But as I was saying, the ministers have varied responsibilities other than sitting in the House. There will be a minister here very shortly. They are attending to their departments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council whether he has any news. Otherwise, we shall have to adjourn the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: Might I just say, Mr. Speaker, that the troops have just come in.

An hon. Member: Only one.

● (1410)

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

MEASURE TO AVOID DOUBLE INCOME TAXATION BETWEEN CANADA AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

Hon. Judd Buchanan (for the Minister of Finance) moved: That Bill S-32 (from the Senate) to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel. Moreover, in order that these conventions remain up to date after any amendment to the tax legislation in the countries involved, the bill provides that the Governor in Council may, subject to a resolution of Parliament, decree that any supplementary agreement has the force of law.

After the 1971 tax reform, Canada did undertake a major extension of its program of fiscal agreements with other countries. To this day, we have signed 16 such agreements and we intend to revise them all. As a matter of fact, once the agreement between Canada and France will have been ratified, it will replace the agreement signed in 1951 by the two countries and which is now in effect. Mr. Speaker, we hope that new agreements such as the one signed by Canada and Belgium and the one signed by Canada and Israel will be entered into in the same way between Canada and some forty other countries.

The extension of the network of fiscal agreements signed by Canada and other countries had been implicitly suggested in the 1971 tax reform for various reasons. For instance, before the tax reform, the dividends drawn by a Canadian corporation from a foreign branch were automatically exempted from corporate income tax in Canada; under the Income Tax Act, as amended in 1971, the universal exemption granted with respect to the dividends drawn from a foreign branch is restricted. Since January 1, 1976, only the active income dividends of a foreign subsidiary established in a country with whom Canada has agreed on the overall content of a tax convention are exempted. Tax reform has also brought about, for instance, changes in the taxation of capital gains and has provided that from now on foreign teachers will no longer have their Canadian-earned income exempted.

The three conventions on double taxation being studied have much in common. They take after the format and language used in the draft model convention prepared by the committee on taxation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, better known as the OECD. Canada usually accepts the wording of the provisions recommended in the draft convention. In some cases however, the content of the OECD proposals does not reflect Canadian policies and, therefore, cannot be adhered to in our bi-lateral conventions. The most important of these provisions are related to taxation by the source country of dividends, interests and royalties paid to non-residents.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that when they are negotiating fiscal arrangements, industrialized nations are inclined to ask for specific rates for tax deducted at the source, according to the pattern followed in OECD countries that is 5 per cent on dividends paid to parent or affiliated companies and 15 per cent on other dividends, no deduction for branch profits, 10 per cent on interests and no deduction on royalties. On the other hand, developing countries usually try to maintain higher rates for taxes deducted at the source because the greater part of the income flow moves from the developing country where the investments are made, towards the industrialized county where the investors are based.

● (1420)

In the course of its negotiations with the other countries, Canada has tried to get a general rate of 15 per cent on the dividends, interests and profits of branches and a rate of 10 per cent on royalties. However, we are prepared to accept higher rates, in the course of our negotiations with developing countries, only if those rates are consistent with those the country in question has granted in its tax conventions with other industrialized countries.

The conventions with France, Belgium and Israel provide that all dividends can be taxed in the country of which the company paying the dividends is a resident so that the charge shall not exceed 15 per cent.

A general rate of 15 per cent is also considered when interests coming from one particular country are paid to a resident of the other. A limited number of exceptions has been provided for certain categories of interests in order to promote better relations between Canada and these countries in the financial, economic and trading fields.

As for royalties, the conventions with France and Belgium provide a flat rate of 10 per cent and that with Israel, a rate of 15 per cent. The three conventions contain an exemption for royalties on copyrights for artistic works, but not including royalties in respect of motion picture films and works on film or videotape for use in connection with television. It must be noted that the Income Tax Act provides such an exemption for copyright royalties. The convention with France provides in addition an exemption on royalties in respect of cultural motion picture films such as defined in the convention.

There are some other points covered by the income tax conventions on which I would like to comment, especially about capital gains. The provisions on capital gains in the three conventions reflect the Canadian position authorizing the country at the source to tax gains from the alienation of immovable property, the assets of a company and the shares of an immovable company. For the purposes of the conventions, an immovable company is one whose assets consist mainly of immovable property.

I would like to bring in a few details concerning teachers. According to most tax conventions in force in Canada, foreign teachers benefit from a fiscal exemption during two years. These provisions have certainly raised a lot of dissatisfaction and the white paper on fiscal reform stated precisely that this concession would be removed from new

Canadian tax conventions. The conventions with France, Belgium and Israel do not contain such provisions.

Canada has also upheld its general right to tax pensions and annuities paid to non-residents. Moreover, the three conventions reflect the provisions of the Income Tax Act in providing a tax exemption on pensions paid to veterans.

As for double taxation, the provision dealing with specific procedures to eliminate double taxation is obviously one of the most important of a convention concerning double taxation agreed to with various countries. The Income Tax Act contains unilateral rules whose objective is to relieve Canadian residents from double taxation on incomes from foreign sources. The rules applying to foreign income credits are usually satisfactory but, because of their unilateral character, they cannot make allowances for the particular circumstances inherent in each case. A convention for the avoidance of double taxation gives Canada the chance to adjust its rules on foreign tax credits to accommodate the specific problems that may come up when a Canadian taxpayer receives income from a foreign country. In addition, as I indicated earlier, Canadian companies can be forgiven certain dividends they receive from their subsidiaries only if there is a double taxation convention. Those two objectives are achieved by the conventions with France, Belgium and Israel. To encourage the flow of capital and investments, the three conventions stipulate, of course, that France, Belgium and Israel will do away with, in appropriate fashion, the double taxation in the case of income taxes paid in Canada.

The convention with Israel contains, in addition a stipulation commonly known as the provision for fictitious income tax credit. Let me explain myself, Mr. Speaker. That is a technical means of ensuring that fiscal incentives granted by Israel, through legislation on progressive industries, will in fact benefit Canadian enterprises and that those benefits will not be transferred to the Canadian treasury. This result is achieved in the following way: Canada accepts to include, for the purpose of calculation of foreign tax credit, the amount of Israeli tax which would have been paid without this special incentive legislation. Those provisions will apply to business profits, dividends and interests that a Canadian resident derives from Israeli sources. It is to be noted that in practice the cost for such a provision would probably be very low since there is already an exemption for dividends, which means that there will be no tax payable in Canada for dividends generated by an investment abroad.

● (1430)

One last recommendation: discrimination on the basis of nationality is not allowed under the conventions to ensure that a Canadian citizen will get fair and equitable treatment by the three countries concerned. However, certain tax incentives—tax deduction for small businesses and tax credit for dividends—available, independently of their nationality, to Canadian residents to induce them to invest in Canada will not be affected by the non-discrimination provision since they are applied on the basis of "residence" as opposed to "nationality".

Finally we must aim at working out a policy to keep the conventions up to date. In the past, a bill had to be introduced in Parliament to implement any further amendment to the tax agreement. Considering the expected extension of the tax agreement network in Canada, as I have already said, this method will shortly require much parliamentary time, only to consider technical changes in most cases.

To avoid this and make sure that tax conventions are kept up to date following changes in the bilateral tax relationship between Canada and other countries, part IV of the bill provides for the Governor in Council to be empowered with the implementation of future amendments to the agreements with France, Belgium and Israel, through an order in council subject to the approval of a resolution by Parliament.

Clause 12 of Part IV provides, if both Houses pass regulations such as was described above, for the implementation of those regulations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the terms of the conventions with France, Belgium and Israel provide for a solution which is equitable and in many respects favourable for Canada to the problems raised by double taxation between Canada and those countries. Therefore I urge the House to pass the bill to implement the conventions.

[*English*]

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, having regard to the debate on Bill S-32, I think the House should first of all consider part IV, the part with which the parliamentary secretary has just dealt. It is important that we review the provisions of that part of the bill because in my mind they demonstrate the rather cavalier attitude on the part of this government to the role of the Parliament of Canada in relation to the cabinet.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: We have sat here for 20 minutes, from two o'clock until 2.20 waiting for two cabinet ministers to come in, in order that we might start this debate on a bill that I would suggest is much more important than the government has indicated so far.

The three clauses I should like to refer to in Bill S-32 are 10, 11 and 12. If I may, I would put on the record certain comments concerning those clauses. It is our belief that clause 10 of Bill S-32 allows the governor in council to conclude supplementary agreements which would be made effective by proclamation. I believe the parliamentary secretary referred to this point. These are the supplementary agreements to the tax treaties between Israel, France and Belgium that we are now being asked to ratify. Clause 11 purports to set out a negative resolution procedure whereby this executive action can be disallowed if parliament objects, and clause 12 provides that when parliament acquires its own Standing Orders on negative resolutions, the temporary provisions of clause 11 will lapse.

There are two fundamental problems, I would suggest, with this approach. First, the procedure described in clause 11 is useless, because procedurally any resolution would have no claim to the attention of the House. Second, clause 12 anticipates procedural changes here and in the other place which are not even under discussion at the present time, to the best of our knowledge. The government may have something in mind, but it has not allowed the official

opposition to know the nature of whatever rule changes it is now contemplating. If a negative resolution procedure is to provide any guarantee to parliament, we suggest that it must provide, first, means whereby a member can move a negative resolution which will appear elsewhere than under private members' motions on the order paper.

Second, there should be a guarantee that the motion will actually be brought before the House and receive adequate discussion. Third, there must be an opportunity for a decision on the matter before the statutory deadline expires. Fourth, there must be a procedure whereby a negative resolution will be brought before the House, other than the way in which it was introduced, in time to be dealt with before the deadline date has overtaken us.

The procedure in clause 11 does not do any of these things. All it really does is to ensure that the supplementary agreement will be tabled in both Houses of Parliament. The bill goes on to say that unless both Houses object within 30 sitting days, the agreement is in effect. In short, this changes the onus. Instead of the treaties having to be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, they may, as far as supplementary amendments to these agreements are concerned, be ratified by order in council and it is up to this House and the other place to move. If they do not move in the fashion I have just described, the order in council is effective.

Where does the negative resolution come from? What member in this House would propose it? Who puts it on the order paper, and where; and who calls it for debate, and when? What obligation is there to reach a decision on the resolution? Is it dealt with simultaneously in the other place and, if not, who guarantees it will be considered there within the deadlines to which I have referred? A negative resolution procedure that neglects these questions is so cynical as to be an insult to members who supposedly being respected by these provisions.

Members are invited to look at section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act to see a negative resolution procedure with some significance, despite the timing ambiguity of which the government has taken full advantage. It states that where an objection is filed the House "shall" take it up. That is a definite direction which the government cannot ignore. In clause 11 of Bill S-32 the House, which is fully controlled by the executive, making any agreement must "resolve that the order shall have no effect". I repeat, what use is that if there is no objection to bring any proposed resolutions before the House for debate and decision?

Clause 12 holds out the hope, if you like, of changes in our own rules and refers to a time when we might have a negative resolution procedure in the Standing Orders. Then clause 11 will lapse. As this debate develops, perhaps the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) will inform the House whether he has something in mind. Does he have an amendment to the Standing Orders which will provide for some type of procedure to deal with negative resolution with which we are not familiar at the present time? In the Senate banking, trade and commerce committee, Mr. Cohen, the witness from the Department of Finance, said:

> Clause 12 is contemplating a point in time when each chamber will have established its own set of procedural rules for handling this concept of both affirmative and negative resolutions in terms of the Interpretation Act. What we have tried to do here is anticipate that when the houses have established their own rules, those rules will apply, and clause 11 will no longer do so. Clause 11 is an interim step, which will function until the procedural rules have been ironed out and evolved in the two chambers.

In response to that, Senator Lang said:

> As a member of the Senate Committee on Standing Rules and Orders, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have never heard of these contemplated changes in the rules. What makes you think, Mr. Cohen, that there are going to be changes in the House rules?

Mr. Cohen then said it was his "understanding and impression". We must echo, on this side of the House, the words of Senator Lang. We in this House have never heard of these proposed Standing Orders. None of the subcommittees of the procedure committee are dealing with them. There is no promise to bring them forward that anyone on this side of the House has ever heard of. I see the President of the Privy Council now looking at me. He was chairman of the procedure committee, and perhaps he can tell us about this, or we would be glad to hear from his parliamentary secretary who was also on that committee. What does the protection of parliament's rights in relation to these treaty amendments come to? I suggest it is a meaningless, procedural, magic trick in the present and less than an empty promise in the future.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be allowed to ask the hon. member a question. Is he urging that one of his members on the standing committee bring this matter forward? I would certainly have no objection, if he is dissatisfied with the initiative on this side. Of course, any member of the committee can bring it forward, but it is a matter deserving very careful consideration.

Mr. Stevens: In reply to that question, I would point out to the President of the Privy Council that this is the government's initiative. I should have thought that either in the other place or in the introductory remarks of the parliamentary secretary today in the House there would have been some explanation of why clause 12 has been inserted. All this says is that the government did plan to put a proposal forward to cover this point. What is the government's thinking. After all, it proposed the inclusion of clause 12. It deserves further explanation. I submit that the President of the Privy Council should give a concrete explanation of how the government expects to bring in these procedural changes.

● (1440)

Although in essence this bill ratifying the three treaties referred to encompasses but four pages and 12 clauses, it is a pace-setter with respect to new treaties which Canada will enter into. This is the first time since we passed the tax reform bill that we have been asked to ratify new treaties. In a sense, this bill deals with the fall-out effect of that tax reform legislation. In short, we made such drastic changes in that tax reform legislation that it has now become necessary to renegotiate previously existing treaties which we entered into with various countries. My point is that this bill is a pace-setter. We ought to consider to what extent the international consequences of our tax reform legislation have been desirable or undesirable.

The parliamentary secretary talked about the capital gains tax and how that tax is to be dealt with in the treaties we shall ratify. The capital gains tax is a complicating factor in these treaties and presents difficulties connected with entering into such treaties at present. The interests of capital exporters conflict with those of capital importers. Naturally, those who export capital do not favour a capital gains tax in the country in which they invest. On the other hand, importers see nothing wrong with levying such a tax on the gains accruing from the capital invested. Hon. members must not feel that this is merely a technical bill, that we are doing something similar to what we did in the past. Actually, we are dealing with the first fall-out effects of the tax reform legislation, effects making themselves felt in international treaty agreements of the sort we are now contemplating.

In the committee of the other place, Mr. Cohen, to whom I have referred, said that at present 36 treaties are to be negotiated or are waiting to come forward, and in the end we may need to deal with between 50 and 100 various other treaties. I understand that the committee of the other place scrutinized the matter much more carefully than in previous years.

In amending treaties or entering into new treaties, parliament must exercise special vigilance. We ought to look carefully at the initial treaties and examine carefully any amendments. I say this because we live in a world of complicated capital movement. There are great interchanges of capital; there are great international flows of capital. If we arbitrarily do something which may jeopardize the well-being of Canadian-based international companies, we will act most unfortunately. On the other hand, we must make certain that we clamp down on the activities of companies whose offshore operations are really tax avoidance schemes.

It is our responsibility, as members of parliament, to remain vigilant and oversee what the government does in its international dealings. Certainly, there is little evidence of co-operation between various departments of government. The Department of Finance apparently has gone in one direction, the Department of National Revenue in another, and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in still another. One wonders how much co-ordinated thought went into the drawing up of the treaties we are considering. What, exactly, was the involvement of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce? Judging from the testimony taken before the committee of the other place, the Department of External Affairs was not even involved.

I am raising these points because if one examines the broad picture of international taxation two possibilities present themselves: first, Canada has left itself unduly open in the sense that we have allowed the existence of tax loopholes through which huge amounts of money escape untaxed and do not find their way into government coffers. We are losing money because we are too lax. That is one danger and one possibility. The other possibility is that we are too strict; that our companies cannot compete internationally with competitors who are more liberally treated under their country's tax system.

There is evidence supporting the first view. Last June, in Ottawa, the then minister of national revenue in a dramatic speech said that this country is losing, literally, hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue as a result of the offshore activities of certain companies. He said that the government wanted to crack down, wanted to hire more investigators and wanted to tighten the entire system. That was said last June. Our newspapers gave extensive coverage to the minister's speech.

The present Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) also spoke on this subject. The *Globe and Mail* of November 19, 1975, printed an article headlined "Tax dodgers major target of study group". According to the Washington article—

> A special task force on taxation has been set up by Canadian and U.S. authorities aimed at catching tax dodgers in both countries.
>
> The force has been told to submit recommendations by the end of this year that may lead to a new Canadian-U.S. tax treaty, revenue minister Jack (Bud) Cullen said.
>
> Canada's aim is to recoup an estimated $1.6 billion a year that is being lost through tax avoidance or fraud.
>
> Mr. Cullen said that multinational corporations, through dealings with subsidiaries in other countries, are suspected of being the major offenders . . .
>
> "We want to see if we can do this through existing tax treaties," Mr. Cullen said. "If not, we may need a special agreement."

Last February 25, Peter Cook—who wrote the original story concerning the previous minister of finance—wrote another story. He wrote as follows in the *Financial Times*:

> The government has shelved plans to close a "tax loophole which costs the country hundreds of million of dollars" because Ottawa cannot afford the expert investigators needed.

Which article is right? Last November we heard that Canada is losing possibly $1.6 billion through the offshore activities of Canadian-based companies. In February we were told that the government could not afford to hire investigators to check this. If $1.6 billion was at stake, could not the government afford investigators whose work might lead to recovery of that revenue?

● (1450)

Last June, the former minister of national revenue, now Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), said that the practice was costing hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue and he promised a series of proposals to significantly strengthen Canada's efforts. Department of National Revenue spokesmen said that the government's austerity measures have put the project "far down the road". I hope that the Minister of National Revenue, who is in the House today, will clarify this. What, in fact, is the truth? Is there a chance that we have been losing $1.6 billion in revenue as a result of what apparently are tax evasion schemes around the world, and in spite of that fact they have said they cannot get sufficient investigators as a result of this austerity program? Surely that is not a credible story. However, I should like to hear the Minister of National Revenue give his version.

I have indicated that this is one side of the question before us today. When we are considering tax treaties we have to consider whether Canada is, in effect, being ripped off as a result of multinational corporation activity or any other type of international activity concerning tax evasion which should be stopped. But the other thing that we have to question is whether we are being unduly harsh on our own corporations by subjecting them to tax treatment that

is much more harsh than one finds in other comparable jurisdictions. After all, in our committee meeting this week, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) stated, after questioning, that perhaps the luscious area in the world today, so far as tax incentives and tax breaks or grants are concerned to get companies active within their boundaries, is the Republic of Ireland.

I asked the minister whether he could give us some type of synopsis or a review of the relative position, nation to nation, around the world, the position of the main trading nations of the world, concerning how they treat tax write-offs, grants and other incentives to enable people to open up to advantage within their country. He has promised to do that. I think that type of consideration is something we should also be asking ourselves, certainly in committee when we consider these treaties. What is the relative position of Canada as against the United States, Ireland, Japan, Mexico and many of the other countries which have commercial concerns with whom we have to compete?

In dealing with this question, I found in the September-October, 1975, Canadian Tax Journal an interesting article written by A. M. Pilling, entitled "Tax Haven Subsidies". Mr. Pilling is a lawyer in the city of Toronto. He is well regarded, and I find it very interesting that he takes up the comments made by the Minister of Justice to which I have referred. He referred to that speech in Ottawa. If I may, I will quote directly from the Canadian Tax Journal. Mr. Pilling says that the minister's comments—

—were contained in an address to the ninth general assembly of the Inter-American Centre of Tax Administrators (CIAT) in Ottawa on June 12, 1975. The address was largely about the elusiveness of multinationals in the tax context". The minister noted in connection with the "tax haven problems" that:

"Since 1968, our tax avoidance and special investigations groups have been searching out and challenging tax haven situations. A substantial number of reassessments, some involving prosecution, have been issued, and the related tax recoveries have amounted to many millions of dollars.

At present, there are more than twenty important cases, either under investigation or in the appeal process, concerning substantial diversion of income from Canada.

Although Mr. Pilling deals with the speech in the context of the aftermath of the recent case with which most of us are familiar, the *Dominion Bridge v. The Queen,* it was pretty strongly held by the Canadian Federal Court that an offshore operation which in any way appears to be a sham or a dummy will simply be wiped out, and that the taxation will be looked upon as if the entire operation, irrespective of whatever other jurisdiction is involved, is a Canadian operation. Mr. Pilling, in his rather thoughtful article, tries to look at the consequences of this decision and of the perhaps new and rather active approach of the Department of National Revenue. He states:

First, the judgment suggests tests to determine whether or not a tax haven subsidy is a sham. Secondly, shortly after the judgment the Minister of National Revenue stated that "we now intend to move, with more confidence and vigour, against other similar arrangements".

"Similar arrangements" was the term used by the Minister of National Revenue. Mr. Pilling then goes on to state as follows, after reviewing some of the highlights of that case:

Of broader interest is the question of whether, as a result of Revenue Canada's renewed confidence in dealing with tax haven abuses, it is now necessary to introduce the distinction between active business income earned by a foreign affiliate in a treaty, as opposed to a non-treaty, country . . . While after 1975 active business income earned by a foreign affiliate in a tax haven country will not be subject to Canadian tax until repatriated to Canada, if the affiliate is regarded as a puppet of its Canadian parent its income will be subject to Canadian tax whether repatriated or not.

Mr. Speaker, in committee I would like to go into more detail concerning the actual wording of the existing tax act, the intention as far as these treaties are concerned. But the point I would like to get to in Mr. Pilling's article is in the final paragraphs of the article where he asks whether there should be a time for reappraisal. He says:

The proposal, however, ignores the competition that Canadian business faces overseas from multinational companies with vast resources, from companies located in low wage countries, from companies whose governments are in a position to and do help in securing contracts and from companies whose domestic law permits the use of tax havens without the necessity of paying domestic tax on repatriation of earnings accumulated abroad.

He gives examples of where this is the case and, oddly enough, one of the examples he gives is France: he says that through the use of a special company, the French authorities permit—actually encourage—the use of the tax haven in relation to their domestic taxation. I would point out that we are dealing with a tax treaty involving France in Bill S-32. Mr. Pilling goes on to say:

It can be argued that a country with a limited domestic market and a heavy reliance on foreign investment benefits from encouraging its domestic companies to expand overseas. While no one would contend that tax haven operations play a significant part in developing Canadian trade overseas they can be significant in some areas. For example, in technologically-oriented industries R & D staff and program can be maintained if order books can be filled with overseas business when domestic business is lean. For the engineering and construction companies the uncertainty of bidding in foreign countries can result in margins for which the only protection in many cases is a low tax rate in a company located in a low tax jurisdiction on some portion of their contract income.

Mr. Pilling continues:

If the over-all objective of encouraging the expansion of Canadian trade overseas is of greater value than the fiscal advantages resulting from the proposed international tax system, and the writer submits that it may well be, the incentive of using a tax haven country should be made available to Canadian business as it is to many of its competitors. This would suggest that the treaty-non-treaty country distinction be abolished—

Here is an authority on this general international tax question suggesting that perhaps the old-fashioned idea of having these international treaties should be abolished. I certainly do not know. I am simply looking for some comment from the government benches, having considered this suggestion, the reason they persist in going ahead with the treaties we are being asked to ratify today.

● (1500)

Mr. Pilling goes on to say that the distinction should be abolished, and I quote:

. . . that all active business income of foreign affiliates be allowed to be repatriated to Canada free of Canadian tax as in the past. This is not to say that sham operations or the artificial diversion of income from Canada should be permitted. But if a company can establish an overseas operation in a tax haven country which can withstand the management and control tests and puppet and sham tests, which are no more stringent than those applied to domestic subsidiaries, there would seem to be no reason for Canada to tax its earnings when repatriated, and

particularly not if the location of the subsidiary is an incentive to develop markets for Canadian products overseas.

Surely the debate on Bill S-32 should broaden to the point where we can get some explanation as to what extent the government has considered the trade implications of its whole tax approach, bearing in mind that there were rather dramatic changes made when the legislation was recently passed, and bearing in mind that certain provisions in these treaties begin, and can only begin, as of January 1 of this year. For example, I refer to FAPI.

I think we have before us a pace setting piece of legislation which we should debate thoroughly in the House at second reading. We should also intensively review the treaties and proposals in committee. I suggest that unless there can be a reasonable explanation for Part IV of the bill before us, that part should be amended substantially before it comes back for report stage in this House.

I am nervous about the possibility that we might be over zealous and that the negotiators will be running around the world entering into so-called treaties to avoid double taxation, and hitting countries with which, for some reason or other, they find it difficult to negotiate. Certainly they do not want to come up with a treaty which would be closely scrutinized in this House, and they end up deciding to have a token type of treaty, knowing that from then on all they need is an order in council to strengthen the agreement with subsequent amendments, and there is little possibility that this House will consider in a meaningful way what they will have done.

For example, in committee I noticed that Mr. Cohen suggested that the negotiators are now negotiating with certain communist nations to sign new treaties. I find this very interesting. I do not know exactly how you enter into a tax treaty between a communist nation—when you consider their ideology and their system—and a capitalistic or free enterprise system. I am not sure how you can put those apples and pears together, but presumably it is felt that there is some way to work out a tax agreement and protect Canadian interests at the same time. I believe Rumania is a country which is high on the list.

In short, we have an important bill before us today, Bill S-32. I hope that we, as members of parliament, will be vigilant before we pass the bill, and I believe that as this is a pace setting piece of legislation we must be careful that we do not unwittingly jeopardize Canadian business activity with regard to international trade, and second, that we do not allow—and I should like to hear more on this—any type of loophole to continue to exist whereby taxation which should rightfully fall to Canada does not do so. And certainly if it is to the extent of $1.6 billion per year which is being lost, as the Minister of National Revenue apparently indicated, I think it is time the government did something about it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, when we are considering Bill S-32 we would be remiss if some hon. members on this side did not point out the cost to the Canadian taxpayers of the reluctance of the government to take material steps to tighten up the tax laws by which it is possible for multinational corporations and their subsidiaries to divert income out of Canada, and therefore to lessen their tax liabilities, and therefore their taxes payable to the Government of Canada. As is well known by hon. members this is done by multinational corporations underpricing exports, overpricing imports, and charging artificially high expenses to their subsidiaries.

I want to read into the record an example taken from the files of the United States Internal Revenue Service which demonstrates how a multinational corporation can actually cheat governments out of tax dollars. Of course I will not use corporation names. I shall simply call the company involved company A. This is right out of tax files, and I suggest under the existing tax laws in Canada this could happen and likely does happen right here in Canada.

It reads as follows:

> . . . manufacturing company (A) in the U.S. had a wholly-owned subsidiary in another country that extracted raw materials. The multinational had another wholly-owned subsidiary shipping company in a tax haven country that chartered ships from unrelated companies.
>
> Most of the shipping company's activity was in transporting raw materials from the mining subsidiary to the parent manufacturing company in the United States.
>
> But the shipping company also supplied shipping services in a small way to other companies which were not related to the parent. The key point is that it charged the unrelated companies the same shipping rate as its parent company.
>
> On the surface this appeared to be reasonable, but on closer examination U.S. Revenue Service officials decided the shipping company was charging its parent company much too high a rate.
>
> By inflating the shipping costs the parent company was increasing its expenses allowable against income and therefore decreasing its tax. It was also increasing profits of its wholly-owned subsidiary, the shipping company, in a tax haven country.

So it can happen, and it does happen. It happens to the degree that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) suggests that it is responsible for a loss of revenue to Canada of $1.6 billion. I disagree with the minister. Like others, I think it is closer to 10 per cent of the total revenues of the government of this country, which would put it at $2.7 billion. Like Mr. Smallwood, the former premier of that great province of Newfoundland, I like to reduce things down to their lowest common denominator so that people such as myself and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan) can understand them.

Mr. Buchanan: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: To understand what $2.7 billion can buy, one could use a Toyota Corolla, a 1200 model. I know ministers on the other side would not know what that is. That is a car which people other than cabinet ministers drive and have to buy. Let us take a Toyota, because we are in an affluent society, and put a radio in it of whatever colour we like.

Let us start in Victoria and put Toyotas together, bumper to bumper across British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, the keystone province of Manitoba, wind our way on the trans-Canada highway around the Great Lakes, through the Ottawa valley, down through Gaspe, the all Canadian route to the Maritimes, down through New Brunswick to the great town of Truro, Nova Scotia, to Halifax, take the trans-Canada to Cape Breton, put all the Toyotas we can possibly put on the ferry across to Newfoundland, all the way to St. John's, Newfoundland, and right up to the front door of Joey's oratory, and we would

have 17 Toyotas left over. As if it were not bad enough that the Government of Canada takes all these Toyotas, it deprives the people of Canada of the 17 left over. That is what they are talking about in lost revenue to the people of Canada, revenue that was legitimate revenue.

● (1510)

The two dictums of taxation in this country, the two principles which every Canadian can understand and probably would agree with, are that taxation be fair and universal, and that governments spend taxes in a responsible and constructive way. My friend, the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen), says yes, after they get them. That is the whole problem. We do not get $2.7 billion of taxation that we ought to get. I suggest that is not fair taxation. It is not fair that all Canadians are taxed and yet multinational corporations can rip off, if we accept the estimate of the Minister of National Revenue, $1.6 billion. That $1.6 billion is not out of the minister's pocket, but out of the pockets of taxpaying Canadians. This government was elected to act, not to tell us what it wants and hopes to do.

The predecessor of the Minister of National Revenue made a promise. That, of course, is a word that the government takes rather glibly. I am not sure it even knows the meaning of the word promise. However, the former minister promised proposals. He said, "I promise significantly to strengthen Canada's compliance effort." In other words, he promised to take action to recover for the people of Canada taxation that is lost because of tax havens, subsidiaries, and the arrangements we have with other nations with regard to the multinationals.

Since then that minister has risen and fallen, moved on to other things, and we are left with the same state of disarray and bewilderment as before. However, there is hope. One thing that always lifts our spirits is that we have this great hope of better things to come.

We now have a new Minister of National Revenue. He has not been idle. He has been about the country and about the world. He is a man of great compassion. There is no question about that. He has even been to our city of Winnipeg opening temporary centres. I suppose he is attacking the multinationals in Winnipeg.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not mind being called compassionate, but I certainly do not like being misquoted. I never at any time indicated that the loss of revenue was $1.6 billion. I did indicate there was a significant sum. If the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) will re-read the article, he will see that part is not in quotes and is not attributable to me. I never made that statement.

Mr. Whiteway: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister might inform the House of his estimate.

Mr. Cullen: That is a good question. It is significantly less than $1.6 billion.

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has the floor. He does not need to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, I would gladly yield the floor to the minister if he would be more exact in his remarks to this House. If he says it is significantly less, he must have some figure in mind. To my mind, significantly less means less than half. Would the minister like to inform the people of Canada of his estimate of lost revenue to Canada? The minister has a blank look on his face. I do not know whether it is because he does not want to answer or because he does not know. In any event, until he comes up with a figure to refute mine, my estimate will be as valid as his. Until he explains, I will suggest it is $2.7 billion. Until the minister proves me wrong, that is where we will stand.

The minister says we cannot afford to hire experts. Before he rises in his place I ought to say the minister was reported as saying we cannot afford to hire the experts who could evaluate the cost of goods and services and material shipped in and out of Canada and assess a fair tax. The minister shakes his head when I say that that is what he is reported as saying. Is that not in fact the position of the minister?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I again rise on a point of order. I do not know how far ranging this debate should be. I thought we were talking about tax treaties and the treatment of them. I had the estimates before the committee where these questions should have been raised. If the subject matter is so interesting to the hon. member, maybe he should save this speech for another day. The hon. member says I am reported to have said that. I again indicate to him that I never made that statement. I challenge anyone to show that I made that statement.

Mr. Whiteway: The minister says I should save this speech for another day. That is what is wrong with the government. It always wants to save the problems for another day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: He is the minister. Why does he not get on with it now? They have been in government long enough.

An hon. Member: Too long.

Mr. Whiteway: Yes, I should rephrase that. They have been in government too long. Nevertheless, it has been long enough to have more of an answer than that my speech should be saved for another day.

I would like the minister to address himself to this question. We ought not to be asking whether we can afford the cost of hiring experts. Surely our brains in Canada can equal the brains of the world in terms of tightening up our tax structure. I believe we have that brain power. I do not think the question should be whether we can afford to hire them, but whether we can afford not to hire them, if for no other reason than to break even.

I know the way this government spends money. However, I cannot imagine it costing $2.7 million to tighten up the tax structure. The government will probably spend all

of that to get the job done. Even if it did spend all that money to get the job done, Canadians could at least go to bed knowing that this unfairness and inequity in terms of our tax structure in this country would be eliminated. There would not be one tax for the multinationals and another for the common people of this country.

The minister has made some useful suggestions. He suggested a simultaneous audit from country to country to correlate the various kinds of activities of the multinationals. That is a good suggestion. I give the minister full credit and I commend him on that kind of suggestion. However, the problem is that that is all it is, a suggestion. The difference between being on the minister's side and on my side is that I suggest, but he can act.

● (1520)

Surely you must have something more for the people of Canada than to say, "I am making suggestions." We do not need any more suggestions. We need actions. These whimsical notions you get from time to time have to be translated into legislation, and surely you could present something better to the House of Commons than this dismal effort, as good as it is, which does not really address itself to the real problem facing Canada. I understand the difficulty of getting to the root of not being able to catch these multinational corporations in their tax games. I know the lag which occurs when they exchange information from country to country. I know the large number of tax havens in which they can get involved. But the government was elected not to identify problems only but to present programs and actions to right the wrongs.

I conclude by saying that if the government will bring in legislation to tidy up these tax loopholes I have no doubt that we on this side will give our support. Surely they are known to the department. Given the kind of staff the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has in his office I should think you could borrow a few dozen of them and he would still have plenty around to run his office. I say this for the reason that the Canadian people expect no more and deserve no less.

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, as I take part in this debate on Bill S-32 I cannot but reflect on the history of taxation in this country and the conventions we have entered upon in the past with many other states.

First of all, I should like to refer to the words of Senator Lang when he introduced the bill in the other place. He made reference to the so-called tax reform law which parliament passed in 1971. He referred to the fundamental changes which were made at that time and said these changes in the tax laws were so basic that they had necessitated renegotiation of the tax treaties in effect at that time between Canada and 16 other countries. It is now four years later and it is worth noting that the three tax treaties we are now examining are the first to be renegotiated according to the evidence given in the other place. The words of the hon. Senator were these:

> The first three conventions to be successfully renegotiated out of the 16 extant at the time of the tax reform legislation are reproduced in this bill.

The next day the Senate was informed that this information was incorrect. There had been 16 tax treaties in effect, all of which would require renegotiation because of the major changes made by Canada in its own tax law. However, the three treaties we are examining today are not among the 16 in force in 1972. The question thus arises: are these renegotiated conventions or are they new conventions? The implication is that we actually have 19 now, rather than 16.

It is difficult to know just what the government has planned in this regard. I refer to a list of tax conventions published by the CCH Canadian Limited under "Income Tax and Regulations." The information given here, and I think we might take it as being reliable, refers to the international tax conventions and states there are 16, and that since 1971 Canada has not concluded any treaties related to the avoidance of double taxation or of fiscal evasion. The reference here is to the Canada-France Treaty which was actually signed in May, 1975. Now, in April, 1976, parliament is being asked to examine it and approve it. I shall not read the list, but it runs from Austria to Zambia, and names 37 countries with which Canada is presently negotiating tax treaties.

The interesting thing is that the tax treaties with the United Kingdom and the United States, to name just two, are listed with those presently under negotiation. The reason this is strange is that the government does not seem to be aware of the treaties those countries are negotiating. The 16 countries with which we had treaties in 1971 seem to be in limbo. Mr. Speaker, you cannot have a treaty which is in effect if it is also being renegotiated, especially when the government has apparently no idea of the status of those treaties at this moment.

I attempted to ask the minister this morning what was the status of the Canada-United States tax treaty and what interim measures the government was relying on since there is no doubt, when one looks at the personal income tax forms of Canadians, that some relief is given to taxpayers in their dealings with that country.

Most of the bill we are asked to consider, indeed all but four pages, consists of the treaties themselves. I shall refer later to the contents of those four pages and I am sure the committee will be giving full scrutiny to the contents of the treaties as well.

I do not think many members will disagree with the principle involved here, which is that we should set down our tax relations with other countries in a proper and forthright manner. Before we get into some of the details I should like to examine the underlying causes of the need to be renegotiating these treaties at the moment. At the very least, the present debate emphasizes the failure of the government's so-called tax reform measures back in 1971 and the months prior to that. The stated purpose of the reform was, to put it in a few words, to achieve equity and simplicity. This is a commendable aim and it is sad for Canada that we were unable to achieve either of those qualities.

If anyone needs examples to show we have failed to achieve either equity or simplicity as a result of the tax reform it will not be necessary to look very far. I should like to give a little evidence right now. I refer to the government's tax statistics for 1975 analyzing the returns of individuals for the 1973 taxation year. It appears from the summary, table II, that the poorest sector of Canadian society, those earning less than $7,000, paid no less than $1

billion in income tax. Yet the government's agencies tell us that the poverty level is something less than $8,000 a year income. I am certain the people earning under $7,000 and who have paid $1 billion in taxes do not think the situation is very equitable at the moment.

● (1530)

Another interesting figure in table II of the statistics reveals that 46 per cent of the personal income tax bill is paid by Canadians earning less than $12,000, which after all is only one half the level of pay of the lowly backbencher of this House. A little higher up the scale we find that fully 65 per cent of the total personal income tax bill of the federal government is met by those earning under $16,000. The low income earners of Canada are also suffering from galloping inflation, and even with personal exemptions indexed their tax bill is high. Indeed they are suffering the combined effects of our bad tax laws and inflation.

What else, Mr. Speaker, does our present tax system do? Instead of giving us equity it also seeks to penalize the hard worker. This does not necessarily mean someone who is a huge income earner, though the tax system affects that person as well. I have in mind a tradesman who has a certain skill of the kind Canada needs. Such a person is encouraged not to work overtime, because although he earns a big buck while doing his normal work he knows that taxes will take away so much that it is not worth his while to continue to work hard. As for those in the higher income brackets, the really high earners, our tax laws not only deter them from bending their efforts to their best advantage but also tempt more than a few of them actually to quit living in this country.

A little later on I shall be making reference to that particular problem, but I think we are all familiar with examples where really able Canadians who can contribute to our society have been frightened away by this so-called tax reform and have gone to some other place, probably a tax haven. I shall cite some figures in a few minutes showing the huge write-offs required by Canada since we are unable to follow these incomes and collect some taxes.

Let me examine for a moment one other aspect, and this is the tax simplicity that the government promised. Along with equity we were going to get simplicity. In 1917 Canada introduced a temporary tax through a measure at that time called, I think, the income war tax act. Interestingly enough, income tax carried this name till 1949, when we had another kind of tax reform and passed the plain, ordinary, Income Tax Act. I had a copy of a 1917 tax return in my possession a few years ago. It was a one-page document with no schedules or fancy calculations required. It was simply a matter of paying 5 per cent of your income to the government. That is what I call simplicity, Mr. Speaker. In the government's efforts to achieve so-called equity, we all know what has happened to this simplicity over the years, and of course the equity has gone as well.

In 1951, 25 years ago, I had the privilege of completing my own income tax return for the first time and I still have it in my possession. It really is a thing to behold. It is a simple document that would fit into the breast pocket of your jacket and is known as the T-1 short form. I am sure that everyone remembers them, but they are now a thing of the past, having disappeared along with the old, outdated war tax act. I do not know whether I have it with me today, but I am sure we are all familiar with the 1976 version of the taxation form for 1975, known as the T-1 general. It consists of many pages. It is supposed to be simple to complete, but the government takes no chances and provides you free of charge with a 53 page booklet to guide you through your new simplified tax return just in case you find it a little bit complicated or have some trouble getting through it.

An hon. Member: Like the yellow pages.

Mr. Clarke: Yes. These 53 pages tell you how to complete the form. This would all have been unnecessary had we been allowed to coast along with our old tax law. However, I think people still have difficulty with their returns and tax services are booming businesses in Canada these days. Banks, trust companies, and even department stores are now selling a tax service so that the poor individual who just cannot through his forms get some relief, albeit at the lifting of some dollars from his pockets.

Before I came to this place I was in the accounting profession, and I well remember how accountants and lawyers were tearing their hair out trying to overcome the problems created by tax reform as presented by the government. This may have been overcome to some degree by now since they have been working at it all day and every day, but I think it is obvious that very few of them will agree precisely on what course of action should be followed because even they are confused by the regulations. Accountants and lawyers have one slight advantage over others in that they get paid for worrying about these problems, and in view of the professional fees being asked today I think they are doing very well.

What are the things, one may ask, that are so confusing to the poor taxpayer? What does he find so difficult to understand? I have thought of a few answers, Mr. Speaker. How do you explain to a widow who is surviving on pension and dividend income, for instance, the operation of grossing up? Why should she have to pay tax on $600 when she knows very well she received only $400? To answer that is impossible, Mr. Speaker. I have only been able to tell them to take it up with the government at the next election. I do not think the government itself has ever properly explained that.

Then there is reference made in the booklet and on the tax forms to the income averaging provisions of the Income Tax Act. There are many examples of income averaging, but a simple one that applies to everybody every year is if their incomes have changed by more than 20 per cent over the previous year. The tax department, however, does not suggest that you try to calculate what effect the general income averaging provisions, as they are called, will have on your income, because they know it will be difficult for people to understand them. So they recommend that taxpayers do not bother doing anything with that, but that the department will feed it into the computer and get an answer. Then these taxpayers will get some money back if that is what the computer says. No thought is given to the fact that a person might want to question the computer, or that the computer might be wrong, a

frustrating experience as those of us who have had this experience know.

● (1540)

There are various kinds of annuities available to the taxpayer, the income averaging annuity, for example, which the taxpayer can decide to buy if he has received a fairly large capital gain. However, the taxpayer is very hard pressed to decide whether he is eligible to buy such an annuity or whether it would be to his advantage. I certainly would have difficulty advising anyone on that.

There is another kind of annuity which I think is really mandatory for a taxpayer, although many of them do not understand this, and this is the case with hundreds of thousands of Canadians every year. Every Canadian who reaches age 70—

Mr. Blais: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly this information about annuities is very interesting. The treatise of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke) on annuities is undoubtedly of value, but we are dealing with a tax measure that seeks to enforce international treaties. I fail to see what the advantages of annuities has to do with the bill under discussion. I would commend to the hon. gentleman the provisions of this bill and its clauses so that he might himself be informed as to what we are debating.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, and with the greatest respect to the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) and his point of order, of doubtful value in any event, I do not believe any representative of any government which cannot start the business of this House until 20 minutes after starting time should complain about the content of speeches later in the afternoon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I tried to make a serious point, contrary to the intervention of the hon. member who—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I think perhaps the parliamentary secretary has made his intervention, and one bite is probably all that should be allowed under the rules. The Conservative House leader has also made his point. I hope at this juncture prudence will take over and that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke) will be allowed to continue his speech. The debate does concern Bill S-32, an act to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium, and Canada and Israel. Having said that, perhaps I have outlined as much as the Chair should regarding the contents of the bill.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your direction. I really cannot understand the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) making such an intervention. It would appear that he has not paid attention to what I said in my opening remarks. Perhaps I should start again.

An hon. Member: Oh, no!

[Mr. Clarke.]

Mr. Clarke: I am well aware of the purpose of the bill and I will have something to say about that in a few moments. I thought it was important to establish the base upon which we were working, and hence my preamble. I was merely trying to establish that the government brought upon itself these very unnecessary and complicated negotiations, which have taken some four years to produce three treaties, those we are being asked to examine today.

I was talking about annuities, which are very confusing to many Canadians. Many thousands of Canadians every year who achieve the age of 70 have taken advantage of the government's provisions which allow them to defer a certain amount of their earned income through the purchase of a registered retirement savings plan. Many taxpayers are caught in a terrible bind because they do not understand the simple rules put forward by the government which allows them to defer some of their income and, therefore, some of their tax.

Unfortunately there is a penalty for the unwary taxpayer who arrives at age 70 and finds he has some money in his registered retirement savings plan and is required by this simplified tax law either to take it out into income in his 71st year, or buy a life annuity. This completely ignores the fact that this is a penalty in itself to the unwary taxpayer, because the rates for a life annuity at age 70 these days require an amount of cash almost identical to the amount that would be received if only the interest were taken into account.

Perhaps that is enough about annuities, but I do not think it is enough about the so-called simplicity of the tax system. Many taxpayers have great difficulty in finding their way through the capital gains rules. We all know that half the capital gains are taxable and put into income. We all do not know about the adjusted cost base and the other complicated terms that can lead us into traps.

As a result of these capital transactions we have an inequitable situation that allows someone to sell a capital asset and make a capital gain, providing he has invested and the value has gone up. He then has to pay a capital gains tax, but finds himself no longer in a position to replace that asset because of rising market prices, or because the tax has been paid on the gain. As a result this is not really a gain at all, it is really a tax on inflation which the taxpayer happened to have rolled into his hands.

Of course there is also the roll over provision which would allow the taxpayer to reinvest, but that has to be done within a certain time frame. I am not sure how many taxpayers understand the roll over provision. In addition, this does not always seem to work.

There is another difficulty which came to my attention the other day about this so-called simplified tax system, and this relates to a form produced by Revenue Canada Taxation. We know it is a valid form because it was revised in 1975 and is referred to as the T-5 form. There is a provision on this form regarding who shall complete it. There is also a relieving provision. I am only going to refer to the relieving provision that is of interest to me. It says that this return is not required to be filed for interest paid on money on loans from banks, financial houses or other institutions, or from persons whose ordinary business includes the lending of money.

That seems to be quite clear. It refers to money borrowed from a money lender or someone whose ordinary business includes the lending of money. This does not have to be a money lender, but could be a doctor who makes loans, or something like that. If you borrow money from a person whose ordinary business includes the lending of money, and that includes a bank, you do not have to file the T-5 form.

However, I ran across a taxpayer the other day who had not filed this particular form within the required time because that was not necessary. For the benefit of some people with whom he was doing business he decided gratuitously to file the form. The department officials came along and said that was fine, and they thanked him for filing it, but told him he would have to pay a $20 late fine.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clarke: Some members laugh, but the department was right in this case. It was the form that was wrong. Regulation 201 covers the filing of these forms and states who must file them on dividends, interests and so on. It seems that in 1971 when the tax form went through, intentionally perhaps, the relieving provision which allows the person not to file the form for interest on loans from banks and other lending establishments disappeared. It would appear to me now that the government is checking this up and perhaps we will have a proper answer, hopefully from the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) on this point. It appears that anyone who has borrowed money from a bank and does not issue the bank with a T-5 slip may be in breach of the tax law.

● (1550)

Speaking to the Canadian Tax Foundation, the former minister of national revenue, now the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), said that he was concerned about the tax law. He said that he considers tax reform as a continuing process and asked business to help keep the system in balance by continuing to press for changes in the law. Well, members of the House on my side, and certainly the taxpayers of Canada, want to see progress in this regard. The minister also apparently was in favour of a "softer" government attitude to ministerial discretion, technical amendments, and all demands for files and records.

We all know that the Department of National Revenue carries the big stick. If you do not obey the law and pay your tax, the department can do terrible things to you, that is, if you are still in Canada. Later we shall deal with what happens if you have left Canada. Apparently the minister was concerned about ministerial discretion and those powers in the area of tax law that allow the Department of National Revenue to decide whether a transaction is aimed at avoiding taxes.

As lawyers in this House know, a man should be entitled to so order his affairs as to minimize the incidence of taxation. It was the view of the department that it knew better, that it ought to decide this question, not the taxpayer, as if it were a crime to claim your rights under the law and reduce your taxes. I am sure that lawyers in this House, and taxpayers outside, will be delighted to note that the courts recently decided that a man still has the right so to order his affairs as to minimize the incidence of taxation.

I hold in my hand another press clipping which illustrates the sort of thing that can happen when our so-called tax reform law fails. It is the hope of members on my side that, in addition to avoiding double taxation, the treaties we shall enter into with other countries will allow us to close certain tax loopholes. Just over one month ago the *Financial Times* reported that:

> The government has shelved plans to close a 'tax loophole which costs the country hundreds of millions of dollars' . . .

Why did the government decide to shelve those plans? Apparently Ottawa could not afford the extra investigators needed. This country employs 300,000 or 400,000 civil servants, depending on who counts them, and how the counting is done. It strikes me as odd that anyone should say we cannot afford a few expert investigators whose work may lead to the recovery of up to $2.7 billion. I think we heard that figure. At any rate the money lost to this country is enormous, and the work of the investigators would enable us to enforce collections against taxpayers who have left. The former minister of national revenue admitted that the loophole was costing hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue. He promised a series of proposals to "significantly strengthen Canada's compliance effort". I hope that this bill, and the treaties we expect will follow, will go some way to correct the difficulty.

Department of National Revenue spokesmen said that government austerity measures have put the investigation project "far down the road". I remind the House that an article written in November of last year dealing with tax dodgers and evasion outlined how the government was to attack this difficulty. According to the article appearing in the *Globe and Mail* of November 19, 1975:

> A special task force on taxation has been set up by Canadian and U.S. authorities aimed at catching tax dodgers in both countries.
>
> The force has been told to submit recommendations by the end of this year that may lead to a new Canadian-U.S. tax treaty, . . .
>
> Canada's aim is to recoup an estimated $1.6 billion a year that is being lost through tax avoidance or fraud.

I think the minister denied that the figure was $1.6 billion. The article mentions the figure, but I will not insist on attributing it to the minister. Without doubt the minister was interviewed. According to the news report he said:

> We want to see if we can do this through existing tax treaties . . . If not, we may need a special agreement.

It remains to be seen what we shall do. If existing treaties are responsible for our present position, we may need to examine dozens more of these treaties.

As I wish to make some further comments, may I call it four o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. It being four o'clock p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper. I understand we are to consider first notices of motions. The Chair understands that Notice of Motion No. 42 is to be proceeded with. Therefore Notice of Motion No. 2 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), No. 15 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan), No. 19 in the name of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr.

Watson), and number No. 20 in the name of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) shall stand at the request of the government. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FRESHWATER AND INLAND FISHERIES

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Standing Orders of this House should be amended to provide that there shall be a Standing Committee on Freshwater and Inland Fisheries, distinct from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, to which shall be exclusively referred all matters relating to the freshwater and inland fisheries of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to speak on this motion. The freshwater fishery of Canada is close to my heart and to the hearts of my constituents. The commercial, gill net freshwater fishery in many constituencies represents an important way of life. Freshwater fishing in Manitoba provides an important economic base and it is my concern that this valuable industry shall be kept alive and fishermen allowed the opportunity to remain in the freshwater fishing industry despite drawbacks—and believe me there are many—which have plagued them for years.

I am also concerned because freshwater fishermen are being short-changed because they do not receive from Ottawa the same recognition which coastal fisheries receive. I specifically refer to the present inability of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry to deal adequately with the freshwater fishing industry. It is my conclusion that this standing committee does not—nay, cannot—spend enough time monitoring the workings of the freshwater fishery.

Today I shall propose to hon. members of this House that a separate committee be established to deal solely with the freshwater fishing industry of Canada. In doing so I have endeavoured to assimilate enough facts so that I can cogently present my ideas as to why a standing committee on freshwater and inland fisheries is desirable and, indeed, necessary.

● (1600)

First, let me review the history of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, the federal Crown corporation which, in effect, is the commercial freshwater fish marketing board in this country. I will then show how difficulties with the corporation and with the freshwater fishing industry in general have not been adequately dealt with in the respective standing committee of the House in the past.

The Freshwater Fish Marketing Act was assented to on February 27, 1969, and came into force May 1, 1969, at which time the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was established for the purpose of marketing and trading in fish, fish products and by-products, in and out of Canada. The corporation has the exclusive right in inter-provincial and export trade to market the products of the commercial fishery of the provinces participating in the program. The provinces, under Section 25 of the act, include the Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and western Ontario. As well, the object of the corporation is to increase returns to fishermen, promote markets, and increase inter-provincial and export trade.

The quality of the commercial freshwater fish that is regulated and handled by the corporation is comparable to any in Canada. Indeed Canada is unique in having a freshwater fishing industry that in many cases is the livelihood of hundreds of individuals and is the sole economic base of many regions.

Fishermen, however, have run into difficulties with their seasonal occupation since the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act was implemented in 1969. First of all—and this would especially apply to the province of Manitoba and in particular to my riding of Churchill—many fishing operations were disrupted as they were turned over to local co-operatives that would act as agents to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Fishermen were lost and some fishing was abandoned at this time because of alternative local job opportunities in the fields of farming, lumber, and logging, mechanics, carpentry, and general contracting, although hydro development in the north was a major controlling factor.

Many of the large commercial freshwater fish operations were out of production between 1972 and 1974. This was a crucial changeover period, the beginning of a regulated freshwater fishing industry that set the stage for a whole new area of responsibility for members of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Then there was one of the most devastating examples of how fishermen in Manitoba and other member provinces were adversely affected by the actions of the corporation. I am talking now of the long standing strike at the freshwater fish marketing plant at Transcona, Manitoba. If members will recall, that strike began with a walkout of plant employees on October 11, 1974, after they had worked without a contract since March of that year. The strike that officially went into effect the following day ended with a new contract settlement five weeks later—after the near destruction of the freshwater fishery in Churchill constituency, and throughout the province the Transcona strike caused losses for fishermen who were not able to catch their quota before the strike began. This is unacceptable in light of the fact that the corporation was aware that its employees might eventually strike once their contract had expired. Yet no additional cold storage facilities were made available, and fishermen were ordered to pull up their nets and stop fishing.

These fishermen had virtually no one to go to bat for them. They had no federal body which they felt confident they could turn to, so many of them blamed the provincial government for inaction in regard to settlement of the strike. Had there been an exclusive freshwater and inland fisheries committee—or at least a special committee to which these fishermen could have presented their grievances—then the situation could have been different. The Fisheries and Forestry Standing Committee, as it is pres-

ently structured, is simply unable to monitor effectively the freshwater fishery.

There are other problems with which fishermen had had to contend. These are problems that fishermen themselves have brought to me, or that the co-operatives have tried to solve through resolutions—the majority of which, unfortunately, have fallen on deaf ears in the past. Not only has there been an over-all reduction in the number of fishermen, as I mentioned earlier, but there has been a marked decrease in the pounds of fish harvested. Fish not removed from lakes in the 1973-74 fishing season, for example, represented a total loss to the northern Manitoba economy of $2,123,336.

One of the most obvious reasons for this loss—and again, let me assure you there are many—is in the area of economics. Money lost through transportation costs represents by far the largest loss to fishermen. Rail and air transportation costs have risen to such an extent that freshwater fishermen in Manitoba are having a hard time absorbing costs. For example, air transportation from lake to railhead went up from $1.80 per ton mile to $3.20. Railways have doubled their freight rates. They have suggested that freight equalization be applied on the lake to rail, and rail or highway transportation.

The co-ops have also been faced with rising equipment costs. In fact these have doubled in the last few years. Wages for hired labour have increased from $300 per month to $600 per month. Even more shocking is the fact that, under present circumstances, fishermen are unable to dispose of their licences to heirs, successors, or to other fishermen. The average age of fishermen who fish Lake Winnipeg is 60 years of age. It is so difficult for young men to obtain operators' licences that many have given up fishing or have not even attempted to get a licence.

We know that the freshwater fish produced are of a high quality and are of a species readily marketed. Why then are fishermen dissatisfied with the way in which their operations are being handled, and why then do they think that a separate standing committee to deal with freshwater and inland fishing is so important to the success of their operations? A letter I received from the manager of Northern Co-operative Fisheries Limited best answers that question. The letter stated that:

> ... Generally speaking the fishermen, the agents, the corporation are trying to work on 100 cents on the dollar, while the actual cost is 125 cents on a dollar.

One paragraph of the letter effectively summed up the feelings of fishermen. It went like this:

> I could almost assure you that it, lack of recognition, will destroy the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board within a year or two and I am saying this because the signs of erosion are all around us.

For example, the letter goes on to state:

> The 1,400 fishermen belonging to 25 co-operatives and associations in the province of Saskatchewan have already delivered their ultimatum to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation that they will no longer deliver their fish in the traditional manner. Instead, they are asking the corporation to market their fish on a fee for service basis. Failing to accept this proposal, they will ask their minister ... to withdraw the commercial fisheries from the participating region of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

● (1610)

A resolution submitted to the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan and Manitoba Co-operatives Fisheries held in Prince Albert March 23, 24, and 25 of 1975 stated, and I will read this resolution in its entirety:

> WHEREAS commercial fishermen in the Province of Saskatchewan and Manitoba are continuously experiencing difficulties in communication with the federal government,
>
> AND WHEREAS the fishing operations are being complex and requiring assistance similar to the East and West Coastal Fisheries,
>
> AND WHEREAS the present Parliamentary Fisheries Committee is made up of Eastern M.P.s who are not acquainted with the inland fisheries program,
>
> BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Honourable Roméo LeBlanc, Minister of Fisheries, appoint an inland freshwater fish parliamentary committee to assist the freshwater fishing industry in their problems which lie within the jurisdiction of the Federal Committee.

This resolution refers to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

Let me say that I first presented the idea to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry quite some time ago. In fact it was in 1974. I want to emphasize that again I am asking that consideration be given to this proposal.

I wish to refer to the resolution as submitted at the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan and Manitoba Co-operatives Fisheries held in Prince Albert on March 23, 24 and 25 of 1976, just this past week. At that meeting there were representatives from all the major fisheries in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, and Ontario. This is the resolution, and it is hoped there will be a more positive response to it:

> WHEREAS the 1975 Resolution No. 10 requested that the Honourable Roméo LeBlanc, Minister of Fisheries, appoint an Inland Freshwater Fishery Parliamentary Standing Committee to assist with the problems relating to the Freshwater Fish Industry within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.
>
> WHEREAS, the Honourable Minister replied that there are three (3) Members on the Committee who represent the Freshwater Fisheries and that Quebec and New Brunswick also have a freshwater fishery and both Provinces have representation on this Committee.
>
> THEREFORE, be it resolved that another request be made to the Honourable Minister of Fisheries pointing out the volume of the freshwater fishery production in other provinces, such as Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Northwest Territories and that he give his utmost consideration towards appointing a sitting Member from each of the above-mentioned Provinces and Territories to the proposed Standing Committee of Fisheries in the House of Commons.

The resolutions of 1975 and again of 1976 came from concerned fishermen. They did not come from agents and so forth. They came from people who are trying to make a living from commercial fishing in the freshwater fishing industry. In Manitoba a group of fishermen from north of the fifty-third parallel have formed the Northern Commercial Fishermen's Association. Fishermen throughout the north are becoming more and more concerned. They are not operating in a piecemeal manner. They are operating as a group, but they want to get a fair return for the effort they put into the fishing industry. They have been in it all their lives. At one time they could make a fairly reasonable living from fishing, but the high cost of transportation today seems to be the most important aspect of their problem. I ask the minister to consider very seriously having a separate committee to deal with the freshwater and inland fishery. That is a resource we have had for a long time, and it is renewable.

We seem to spend an awful lot of time looking to the north for our energy resources, but we are not spending very much time considering the natural resources we have. In my opinion many of these natural resources are more important at the present time than much of the exploration work which is going on in the Arctic islands. I ask that every consideration be given to the immediate appointment of a separate committee to deal with this very complex problem and to help the fishermen solve this problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to speak on the motion of the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) requesting the appointment of another Standing Committee on Fisheries to which all matters concerning freshwater and inland fisheries in Canada will be referred.

The sponsor of this bill is a very active member of our Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forests. I do not wish to question the sincerity and the good intentions of the hon. member in presenting his motion, and without being an expert on the matter of fisheries, I believe that we are all sincerely working towards the improvement of the fishermen's lot and also to assist as much as possible fish processing plants, whether they are in the East, the West or even in the centre of Canada.

While I find many of the hon. member's arguments valid, I still cannot support this motion, since I believe that another standing committee of this House will not improve the freshwater and inland fisheries of Canada.

If my hon. friend is aware of the complexity of establishing committees in this House and the constant difficulty in having a quorum, he will realize it would be very difficult to find members to sit on that other committee.

● (1620)

As recorded in *Hansard* for March 31, 1976, this House has 20 standing and special committees, and six joint Senate and Commons committees. Most of these committees include 20 members. There are 30 members on each of the External Affairs, National Defence and Agriculture committees. Joint committees such as that of the Library of Parliament include 16 senators and 22 members of this House, 38 in all.

The hon. member for Churchill, quite coincidentally, sits on the same committees I am on, that is Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and also Fisheries and Forestry, where we also deal with environment. The hon. member is also on the Committee of National Resources and Public Works. It will be realized that when a member sits on three committees meeting at least twice a week, this means he has to attend at least eight to ten committee meetings each week.

Mr. Speaker, apparently the official opposition have some difficulty in making suggestions in this House. Apparently, that party lacks leadership and cannot agree on a particular matter. No doubt the hon. member for Churchill already discussed the proposals for a new committee on Freshwater and Inland Fisheries. He will have discussed it in caucus. But I doubt whether the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) agrees with him to establish another standing committee of this House, because on October 28, 1975, if I remember correctly, the hon. member for Peace River, in a statement dealing with the Standing Orders, had this to say, and I quote:

[Mr. Smith (Churchill).]

> . . . the government should introduce some flexibility in the control they are exercising on committee programs and chairing. Certain documents and reports tabled in this House should be automatically referred to committee, and certain committee reports such as that on public accounts for instance, should be debated in this House. Committees should be empowered to make inquiries when members feel they are needed. Committees should be reduced to a more limited size. Chairmen should be appointed in a more objective way, probably by a neutral source, and provision should be made for appealing the chairmen's decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat these remarks by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin): ". . . committees should be reduced to a more limited size . . ." This necessarily entails reducing the number of standing committees of this House, now totalling 30.

Mr. Speaker, why increase the number of committees when there are already too many. I believe that hon. members, as the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), would agree to reduce this number and have between 15 and 20 committees. Most members now sit on three or even four committees and it is difficult, indeed impossible, for a party like the New Democratic Party or the Social Credit Party to send a representative to each one of these committees.

That is why members of these parties, which have only 10 to 15 representatives in the House, are forced to run from one committee to another every day. For instance, in the fisheries and forestry committee on March 30, and the hon. member for Churchill could corroborate my statement, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) arrived in the committee room at about 9:45 p.m. and as the Committee was to adjourn at ten o'clock he could not put his question. He was told that at the next sitting of the committee he would be the first to question witnesses. So the hon. member came to the committee and was recognized first to ask his question. It took from 15 to 20 minutes, then he had to leave for another committee of which he was also a member. Mr. Speaker, how is it possible for members who have to attend the debates of 4, 5 or 6 committees the same day to be really efficient and perform their tasks conscientiously? I say this is not possible.

Mr. Speaker, the committees or the House are always faced with the same problem; the governing party has to keep the quorum, so when the provisions of a bill are about to be adopted or when budgetary estimates are to be voted, the party whip as to run from one committee room to another and try to get the quorum. I wish we would have discussed a motion proposing to reduce the number of the standing committees of the House, and not to increase them.

In his motion, my good friend the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) requests that the new committee be responsible exclusively for the questions concerning freshwater and inland fisheries in Canada. This proposal might cause much discussion and bring about a constitutional debate with the provinces.

I shall ask a question to the hon. member, if he wants to answer it later: has he consulted his province concerning

his proposal that the federal government take exclusive control over freshwater and inland fisheries in his province? I can tell him that my province will not easily agree to let the federal government extend its responsibilities to the lakes and rivers of Quebec. It will be the same for the province of Ontario and for the other provinces, in the Prairies, in the Pacific or the Atlantic regions.

Mr. Speaker, in the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, we have many very interesting sittings, since members from all provinces are most interested and our chairman, the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Béchard) is doing a tremendous job, and I also ought to mention the cooperation of our vice-chairman, the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. Pearsall). We discuss all problems, those of the Atlantic region as well as those of the Pacific, and those of the fisheries in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and those of the Great Lakes. We always have the cooperation of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Baker).

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could take fifteen, twenty or thirty minutes at the meetings of the committees on which I sit, particularly the committee of fisheries and forestry, to explain the requests of Quebec fishermen and the demands of processing plants owners; but it is impossible because every member must be given an opportunity to participate in the proceedings of the committee regardless of the area he represents. This is why in most committees the interventions of members are limited to fifteen minutes during the first round, then to ten minutes and finally to five minutes.

In Quebec, Mr. Speaker, and particularly in the Gaspé Peninsula, there are years when the fishing industry suffers ups and downs. As far as the fishing industry and particularly the salt and dried fish processing plants are concerned, the plant owners have had to face very serious problems these last few years.

In the Committee on Fisheries, I have taken the time that was allotted to me by the chairman to explain to the minister and his officials the sorry financial plight of Gaspé producers. Two representations convinced the minister to send his officials around the Gaspé Peninsula in order to make a field study and attempt to find a solution under existing regulations.

Recently, at a meeting of this committee, we considered the new policies on redfish quotas in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ocean. All members had enough time to express their views. I made several suggestions to the minister who will apparently take them under serious consideration when he drafts the new policies and establishes the redfish quotas for the years 1977 and 1978.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to underline the satisfaction we find in the Committee on Fisheries in working with the Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc), and I believe that all committee members share this view. I also want to emphasize the dedication of his parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker). I have represented for many years in the House of Commons the beautiful riding of Gaspé and a group of citizens for whom I like to work, the fishermen. I must say that we have received a great deal from the central government. The work was not done so much in this House but rather in committee. I must also admit that we always had good people in charge of this department, both under the Pearson administration and under this government, under the direction and wise guidance of our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not mention the dedication of the officials of the Department of Environment, in particular the Fisheries and Marine Service, who are really concerned about the problems of fishermen as regards freshwater as well as the Atlantic Ocean, in Nova Scotia, in Newfoundland or in British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, for the various reasons I have mentioned, I cannot support the motion of the hon. member for Churchill. Knowing how hard he tries to find more effective ways of helping fishermen, I am sure he will know how to convince them that his suggestion is not necessarily the best one.

● (1630)

[*English*]

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a good experience to stand and support a motion presented by my colleague from Manitoba. My colleague from Churchill is a man of vast experience, and everyone in the House knows it. He is a man who is close to the people, a man who is not prone to speaking in philosophical platitudes but one who has the capacity to grasp the problem, to see the need, and to respond to it. When I hear the kind of debate I have just heard it makes me wonder whether the hon. member on the other side even knows where Manitoba or any of the inland fisheries are.

Miss Bégin: Ungracious!

Mr. Whiteway: It is known in the west that the inland fisheries are in trouble. There is a problem of great magnitude. In 1969 when the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was formed the catch in the province of Manitoba was 75 million pounds of fish. Last year, for the entire area covered by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, the catch was only 32 million pounds. Anyone from western Canada, anyone from any of the inland fisheries can tell you what the problem is.

If we want to understand the problems of the coastal fisheries we consult, for example, my colleague from South Shore. He can tell you about draggers, he can tell you about the continental shelf, he can tell you about the techniques which are used, he understands about Decca Loran and all the sophistication of electronic gear aboard modern trawlers. I can tell you that fishermen in my area, and in the area of which my colleague from Churchill speaks, have not even seen Decca Loran. My colleague from South Shore understands the problems of the coastal fisheries, but he does not pretend to know the problems of the inland fisheries or the solution to those problems.

It bothers me when we hear members opposite standing in their places as though they are the epitome of wisdom and pontificating upon solutions when they do not even know the problems. I can identify some problems very quickly for the benefit of members opposite. There are problems inherent within the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation itself. At the formation of that organization back in 1969 it was guaranteed by the then president that

they would handle every pound of fish for a cent or a cent and a half. We find, six or seven short years later, that one or one and a half cents has risen to 80 cents per pound. Between the time one pound of usable fish reaches the corporation and the time it leaves, 80 cents is gobbled up and lost forever to the fishermen.

As was stated by my colleague from Churchill, the objective of the marketing corporation when it was formed was to increase returns to the fishermen, not to build a conglomerate for the inland fisheries. That was not the purpose. Back in 1969 there was no talk of processing fish. It was to embody the concept of a one-desk marketing agency. For members opposite to stand up and maintain that everything is O.K. in the west and that if you understand fisheries, fisheries are fisheries anywhere in Canada, is to display ignorance of and a kind of indifference to what happens in western Canada.

Mr. Goodale: Nonsense!

Mr. Whiteway: The hon. member opposite says, nonsense.

Mr. Epp: They put their building right in a wheatfield.

Mr. Whiteway: The hon. member opposite says it is nonsense. If he wants to hear about nonsense I will tell him about nonsense. I will put nonsense on the record for him. Down in the maritimes when you want to build a processing plant, generally you build it by the wharf, by the water so that the ships can unload readily. That is the ordinary, common sense thing to do. But not the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Its building stands in the riding of the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), right among the wheatfields! There stands this great modern fish processing plant, and the closest water anywhere is 55 miles away as the crow flies.

Hon. members opposite want to talk about nonsense. Mr. Speaker, they are the originators of nonsense when it comes to inland fisheries. Oh yes, and as always with this government, although the original cost was locked in, guaranteed, fixed at $3 million, by the time construction was finished, with the landscaping done and the flags flying in the cool breeze of western Manitoba, and the sun shining down, the balance sheet showed $5.5. million, almost double the original figure. Who paid?

Mr. Epp: We, the people of Canada.

Mr. Whiteway: Mr. Speaker, if that were the case all would be well. The people who paid were the very people this great corporation was established to help. It was the fishermen who paid. They paid for it, pound by pound, fish after fish.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Sucker after sucker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whiteway: They thought the fishermen were a bunch of mullets. And anyone knows, if he understands the fisheries, that the equivalent expression is "suckers". The fisherman in western Canada may only know about fishing, but they have more common sense in one little finger than one can find on the whole of the treasury benches.

I could go on and talk about the effects of inflation which have hit the inland fisherman, just as they have affected coastal fishermen. I could talk about the problems of the quota system. Some fishermen in Manitoba particularly on Lake Winnipeg, are locked into the prices of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation quotas. The government says that they can catch no more fish at that price, period.

● (1640)

My hon. friends opposite can go on talking nonsense, but we have more important things to talk about in this motion of my colleague, which is not an unreasonable one. He simply wants a separate committee. He wants certain members of this Chamber who know something about the inland fishery to band together in a little group so that they do not waste the time of the existing committee on fisheries. He wants a little group of members of parliament from the west to form a committee to deal specifically and only with the inland fisheries. Though their numbers be few in western Canada, surely the fishermen of western Canada deserve no less than that.

In addition, I think the committee structure of the House ought to be reviewed in terms of numbers and the function of committees. The numbers are certainly too large in most cases. I am calling for a review of the committee structure and I am asking the government to think again. If hon. members opposite were to repent, fall to their knees, shed tears of true repentance, and say they have changed their minds, that on closer reflection and on more critical analysis they have decided to support our suggestion, I know my hon. friend from Churchill would accept it. I know he is not a vain man and that he would go back to the west and give the government its fair share of the credit for recognizing that there is a problem in western Canada that is unique, one that needs special and specific responses from the government.

The kind of response that is needed in western Canada is not exemplified by what happened a week ago today in the province of Manitoba when the Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc) denied the fishermen of Manitoba and the north the transportation subsidies they need to make their industry viable. These people were not talking about hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker; they were not even talking about $1 million. They were talking about less than $1 million—the difference in transportation costs which would make the fisheries viable, that would make the difference between existing and not existing. This is the kind of sober second thought that my hon. friends opposite should give, instead of the kind of nonsense that has characterized the entire attitude of the government.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in the remaining time may I take a few moments to lend my support to the motion before us proposed by the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith). I have come to respect the hon. member for Churchill for one specific quality that he has demonstrated not only in the House but in committee, and which is recognized by the majority of Manitobans.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I have respected him all along.

Mr. Epp: I am pleased to hear the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) agree with those words. The hon. member for Churchill came to this House after the election of 1974 a relative unknown in Manitoba, and he has demonstrated that he knows the north intimately, that he has staked his claim in the north, if I can put it in that way. He has presented to this House a number of unique viewpoints that can only come from a person who knows the north intimately. I would like to thank him for that contribution. I think this view is shared by members on all sides of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: I may say that I for one am proud to have the hon. member for Churchill as a colleague of mine. Coming specifically to the motion, I should like to respond to the view of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr) that the committee structure at the present time is complex, that as members we have difficulty sitting on committees, that we do not review our work in committee sufficiently, and that we are not well enough prepared in committees. I accept those criticism and agree with them. But I wonder whether using that tack is not putting our finger on the difficulty we so often have as members in communicating with our constituents.

I am sure that all members of the House have had constituents come to them with a serious problem that can be solved, yet we come back to the Hill and become so wrapped in procedure and with making our little operation "efficient" that we lose sight of the very request that moved us to act in the first place. This is not unique to this government. I think it is in the nature of the thing, if I can put it in that way. So often we lose sight of the very real problems that people back home have. We say action cannot be taken for this reason or that. While efficiency might be sacrificed at times, the first job of all members is to respond to the needs of their constituents. To solve the problems they present to us is our obligation and is really, I suggest, the only reason for our existence.

The problem that concerns me about the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is this. We know the corporation was established by joint agreement between the federal government and various provincial governments, in particular the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development through its responsibilities in the Northwest Territories. The way I understand the subsidy question at the present time—and the hon. member for Gaspé alluded to this—it is questionable whether the provinces would want the federal government to get involved in jurisdiction over the inland waterways, lakes, and so forth. Yet there is already an association in the minds of the fishermen, at least, that the federal government has become involved with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation because of the very fact it has become operative.

I wonder whether here we are not discussing the same problem that I referred to earlier, and that is that the federal government has raised a constitutional question—rightly or wrongly I am not going to argue because I do not have the time. The fishermen are not concerned about constitutional problems. They are concerned about how they can retain a viable industry, one that has had real difficulty in the past. Efforts have been made by all parties to get the people who constitute this industry—their average age in Manitoba is over 60—to the point where they can retain their self-respect and earn their own income, so they can make their own way in life instead of constantly having to come to the government for subsidies.

I should just like to give a brief quotations from an article that appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on Wednesday, March 31, as follows:

> The federal minister turned the requests down on the basis that the federal government isn't responsible for inland fisheries.

There is the constitutional question that he raised.

> "I was just incredulous. I couldn't believe his blunt statement disclaiming responsibility for inland fisheries," Mr. Bostrom said. "It puts northern fisheries in real jeopardy."

I am not quoting a Conservative, Mr. Speaker. I am quoting a constituent of mine who happens to be a minister in the present NDP government in Manitoba.

I should like to return to the motion of the hon. member for Churchill. He has made this suggestion. Surely members of good will can get together on this. If it turns out that a committee is not the right vehicle, let us develop some other structure. Surely through the House leaders we can take this step whereby a committee or subcommittee is formed to which a full time fisheries minister would report directly on inland fisheries. In this way members such as myself, who cannot sit on the other Standing committee on fisheries because of other responsibilities, could sit on that committee and represent the interests of our fishermen, for instance those along the eastern shores of Lake Winnipeg and in the northern parts of my riding. This is all the member is asking. I am sure hon. members opposite see his point of view.

● (1650)

Let us get together in that manner, with that kind of co-operation, in order to help those people who are asking for a minimum. This will give us a chance to help those who represent a very small number but are important to the well being of Canada. It is on that basis that I welcome the motion of the hon. member for Churchill and thank him for again making the House aware of the needs of these people.

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I think today you are seeing in the House what happens in the Standing Committee on Fisheries and the Environment when a discussion on freshwater fishery comes to the fore. There you will see other hon. members back off and make room for the worthy gentleman, the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith), and for the somewhat histronic, at least today, hon. gentleman from Selkirk, and for the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp). The committee always makes much room there for members who are inland fisheries oriented when it is time to discuss such important matters as the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

The hon. member for Churchill has requested that a special House committee be struck to deal exclusively with the concerns of freshwater fishing. I am sure the hon. member is just as sympathetic to the concerns of people on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts as we are to his. However, I

believe it would be really quite extraordinary for us to attempt to augment the already 26 House committees with yet another committee especially devoted to freshwater fish.

When I began to think of this, Mr. Speaker, I began to think of the number of specialized group in fisheries which could very well be served by a single committee within the House. I think of coastal surveillance, the coastguard, production marketing and research, small craft harbours, vessel subsidies and vessel contruction, and Environment Canada which, by the way, the hon. member for Provencher will be interested to know, has responsibility for Northwest Territories fisheries.

Then we might also consider special species subcommittees. We would have one for lobsters, molusks, crustaceans and shellfish. We would have one for salmon, of course, the noble fish on the west coast, on which I am sure the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) would be glad to serve. We would have one for herring, groundfish, halibut, and all those other exotic Atlantic varieties.

We could then, of course, think of our friends at the Saltfish Corporation as well as the fish oil producers. We could have a special committee for some of those marine menaces of which we have an abundance on the west coast, and which represent a very serious problem to our fisheries. I have in mind the dogfish which load down the gill nets to such a degree that the fishermen must cut their corklines allowing their $3,000 lines to sink, because there is just nothing they can do about the dogfish.

Then there are those other menaces of the sea such as the lamprey, the harbour seals, and scavangers of all kinds which would have to be the subject of special committees. We could have a committee for the smoked saltwater and smoked freshwater fish, both varieties pickled, and all kinds canned. Then there are the meal producers who, of course, would want to be part and parcel of any special committee we would strike.

I believe all of these things are valuable and many of them have been the subject of discussion by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. In fact this infinite variety of concern has been the matter of discussion at the standing committee. I have seen that committee deal with the whole spectrum from seal pups to pipeline threats to salmon smolts; from spawning grounds and ultra high frequency communications between vessels to everything else. This is an everyday occurrence at that vital committee.

Members opposite have played a very active role on that committee. Indeed I would say it is one of the least partisan committees on which I have had the privilege of serving since coming here. The present system is not perfect, but to single out one area of importance equal to at least ten others for a special committee is simply impossible and impractical. The 26 committees of the House would be augmented on fisheries concerns alone by 56 committees, and they in turn would have to be augmented ad infinitum. I might say that even with the committees we now have it is often difficult to get a quorum, in spite of the ambitious members on the other side.

It is interesting to note that the attendance at the committee dealing with the environment was very large the other day, but when fisheries came up for discussion the other night members opposite were indeed few to be found. It is interesting to note also that when we have a discussion on a question of very great importance to those hon. members, the members on our side back off, as I said in the beginning, and refuse to enter into the discussion so that more questions can be put in respect of those areas where we indeed lack expertise.

The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway) does not have to tell me that I do not know what kind of fish swim in the water in his part of the country, but then again he does not know the difference between a troller and a trawler. However, that makes no difference to me. There are many places where co-operation, not partisanship, shines forth, and one such place is the present standing committee.

This is a government which has shown a concern unmatched by any previous administration in its positive actions on behalf of fishermen. The painstaking debate in New York on the extension of the 200 mile limit at the Law of the Sea Conference is but one example of the devotion and expertise that the Minister of State for Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) brings to his task.

There are fisheries enhancement programs in British Columbia. There are programs in respect of safety at sea. This has seen changed in surveillance and tracking and rescue techniques. This will result in greater search and rescue ability in this country, and this is the value of the new policy forthcoming on search and rescue.

There is also the Indian fishermen's assistance program whereby native fishermen can make their way into a business they once dominated. I like to think, as a native Indian in my part of the country always says, they are not using anything that is theirs when they are taking the salmon but rather they are taking their grandchildren's salmon. I should like to think that this committee would not become so specialized that I cannot take as much interest in the legacy of the grandchildren of the hon. member for Churchill as he does in the legacy of my own grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Indeed the hon. member may. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. It being five o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 2 p.m. Have a nice weekend.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The same to you.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 5, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ENERGY

PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP THE NON-FOSSIL FUEL GENERATED POWER POTENTIAL OF EASTERN CANADA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the maritime provinces have presented to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) a series of briefs on the rising power costs of their economies, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald):

That this House instruct the Minister of Finance to convene a special meeting with the first ministers of each of the Atlantic provinces and Quebec with a view to instituting a crash program in order to facilitate the early economic development of the tremendous non-fossil fuel generated power potential in eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CUSTOMS

REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF ALLEGED UNDERSTAFFING OF STATION ON BORDER BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND BRITISH COLUMBIA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the continuing line-ups causing Canadians to be detained for up to three hours when returning from the United States at the Blaine and Douglas border crossings in British Columbia, and in view of the statement by Canada area collector Orville McRae that "Canadians are now discouraged from crossing the border, that to improve the staffing would only be a temporary panacea, and as soon as people start hearing it is easier to get across they will begin coming down in droves", I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds):

That this matter be referred to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Cullen) for a statement on motions to explain if it is now government policy to discourage travel to the United States by understaffing the border crossings.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be presented only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE REGULATIONS DEVELOPED UNDER MARITIME CODE WILL NOT AFFECT FREIGHT RATES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I, too, move under the provisions of Standing Order 43 a motion that I hope will be of some concern to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang). In light of the failure on the part of the government to continue, as they undertook, the consultative process with respect to regulations under the maritime code leading to the development of regulations which will give substance to the verbal assurances given by the former minister of transport, now the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), to the Council of Maritime Premiers and the authorities in the appropriate coastal provinces, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain):

That this House direct the Minister of Transport forthwith to convene a meeting or a series of meetings between the appropriate officials of the coastal provinces and Department of Transport officials for the purpose of developing regulations which will not unduly affect freight transportation costs in Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY COMPANY WOULD BE PERMITTED TO BORROW WITHOUT GOVERNMENT OF CANADA GUARANTEE

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be allowed to begin, on behalf of my colleagues and probably the House, by welcoming back to the House of Commons the first Canadian politician to be invested with the Order of the Companion of Honour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1410)

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Supply and Services, but in his absence I could perhaps direct it to the Prime Minister. Last Thursday the Minister of Supply and Services confirmed that the government agreed to pay a maximum of $16 million in order to keep negotiations open with Lockheed until April 30. I wonder whether the Prime Minister can tell the House if last Wednesday night, at the time of deciding to grant another month to find interim financing from Canadian banks, the government had in its possession—

I see the minister is back. My question was to the Minister of Supply and Services, and I should like to know whether as of last Wednesday night, at the time of the decision of the government to grant another month to find interim financing from Canadian banks, the government at that time had in its possession any formal indication from the United States Emergency Loan Guarantee Board that Lockheed Limited would be permitted to be the "technical borrower" of $200 million to $300 million without, and I emphasize the word "without", a guarantee from the government of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask the Minister of National Defence whether he had that assurance.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark: In view of the inability of the Minister of Supply and Services to answer, I wonder whether the Prime Minister could answer the question directly, or will he have to pass that on to the minister, and could he advise us which of his ministers is negotiating this contract?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Perhaps the hon. member would repeat the question.

Mr. Forrestall: Get up on your feet—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: There is too much noise; you better start again.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, there are in fact two questions. One of the questions is to seek from the Prime Minister an indication as to which of his ministers, if any, is involved in negotiating this contract? Secondly, I should like to know, as I think the House would, if at the time the government decided to grant another month to Lockheed to find interim financing from Canadian banks, the government of Canada had any formal communication that the United States emergency loan guarantee board would permit Lockheed to be the "technical borrower" of the $200 million or $300 million, without a guarantee from the government of Canada?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Trudeau: On the first point, Mr. Speaker, the arranging of the financing and the supervising of the execution of the contract are the responsibilities of the Minister of National Defence. On the second point, there were two possible alternatives the government was examining and discussing with the Lockheed Company. One was that it would finance itself, with or without the support of the guarantee of the government of Canada and, secondly, that the money would be borrowed in Canada from Canadian banks by Lockheed.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ALLEGATION COMPANY DELIBERATELY CREATED MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT FINANCING—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Then, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the government of Canada does not at this stage have any assurance that the Lockheed Corporation is going to be in a position to be the technical borrower? The Prime Minister could perhaps indicate whether that is correct. In view of the fact that *Hansard* of last Tuesday at page 12265 indicates that the Minister of National Defence said that Lockheed had said it could provide the financing for which it was asking, and since the Minister of National Defence was quoted in the press last Friday as saying there was some misunderstanding, "but I would say it was deliberate by Lockheed", I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is also the position of the government of Canada that the confusion as to the terms of financing was caused by a deliberate attempt by Lockheed to create a misunderstanding?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): That is certainly not the position of the government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. I have no knowledge of the quotation the hon. member just put before the House. I would have to have a look at it.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence is not present, and in his absence I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the minister will be here during the latter part of the question period, if he knows?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—OBLIGATION TO PAY COMPANY PRIOR TO SIGNING OF AGREEMENT LAST WEDNESDAY

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services. Could the minister inform the House whether the government had any legal obligation to pay Lockheed one cent prior to its signing of an agreement with Lockheed last Wednesday night at midnight?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I have already explained in the House that we advised the Lockheed Corporation at the end of December last that we eventually intended to sign a contract with that company under some reservations.

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely the reason I asked the question I did. I wish the minister would now answer it directly. Given the fact that the government has said in recent weeks that it expected from its understanding that Lockheed would raise on its own the front-end financing for the project, was that one of the considerations the government had in mind before it considered itself to have any legal obligation to pay Lockheed any money, and if so why did the minister sign the contract as he did last Wednesday night?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: No, Mr. Speaker; since the beginning of the negotiations and since questions have been raised here I have always indicated to the House that the basic problem which we had to face was one of financing. I have also indicated to the House that due to international events concerning the Lockheed situation, we wanted to be much more careful before signing a formal contract with the company and make sure among other things that it could assume all its responsibilities.

[*English*]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON FOR SIGNING AGREEMENT TO PAY $16 MILLION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of National Defence was quoted outside the House as saying that in his view, as one of the two principal negotiators for the Government of Canada, he had been deliberately misinformed by Lockheed—and he did not take the opportunity to correct that on Friday in the House—I should like to ask the minister, given at least that minister's view of the corporation with which he is dealing, why the government did commit itself for the period the minister referred to in the House by signing this $16 million contract. Even if the government goes ahead with the deal, which many of us think would be inappropriate, does the minister agree that the Lockheed Corporation is now over a barrel with the Government of Canada and would be under immense pressure to raise the money on its own, and if so why did the government lock itself into paying an unneeded $16 million.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, obviously, I cannot speak on my colleague's behalf and even less about things which were said outside the House. But what I can say is that in all the negotiations with Lockheed I did not have to complain at any time about the behaviour of the company nor about their ethics. This is the basis on which we negotiated, for we knew the financial difficulties facing the company, we assessed them and we finally reached the conclusion that the company was in such a financial situation that we could consider signing a contract.

Once again, however, if negotiations were so long, it is because we wanted to be sure that we were not negotiating with a company which would run into greater difficulties in the near future.

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: A final supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FLOODS

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL AID FOR VICTIMS IN GATINEAU AND OTTAWA AREA—POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL GRANTS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of the Environment.

Given the tragic floods now occurring along the Ottawa and Gatineau rivers, did the department of the minister receive requests for assistance from the province of Quebec or the municipalities involved to help victims face this situation?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Strictly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I did not yet receive any request from the provinces.

● (1420)

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary.

Did the federal government earmark some funds to help these people should assistance from the federal government be needed?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I believe the only federal legislation concerning help to victims of disasters is the law administered by the Minister of Finance under which the federal government can contribute up to an amount higher than $1 for each inhabitant of a province. If there are 6,500,000 residents in the province of Quebec and if damages are over $6,500,000, it would mean then that the federal government can contribute.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO STIMULATE PRODUCTIVITY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. As it was reported last week that industrial productivity in Canada during 1975 decreased by 2.4 per cent, by far the worst performance this country has experienced during the past 30 years since we first started recording industrial productivity, when does the Prime Minister intend to make a statement in the House regarding what the government intends to do to correct this serious situation, which he promised to do two months ago when on February 5, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 10656 he said:

I can assure the hon. member that the government is very concerned with it and that we will find the first opportunity to discuss further this important question of productivity with the House.

And on October 30, as recorded at page 8691 of *Hansard*, he said:

It is very important that we realize that we have to make serious improvements in productivity.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a few short days ago, I believe something like a week ago, I gave a rather substantial answer to the hon. member, listing around ten initiatives which are being taken in that area. If the hon. member would care to look back in *Hansard* he would see what is underway and what is proposed. As to the debate which he wishes, we will and do talk about this every time the economy comes up for discussion. There will be an occasion in May at budget time for the hon. member to make his point again. The House leader advises me there are also several opposition days. I think it would be, indeed, a good question and a very important question to have discussed, perhaps on one of the hon. member's party's opposition days. He has this one idea which he has been using since October, and it would be a shame if it were wasted.

Mr. Hees: As the Prime Minister said five months ago on October 30 that it was a very good idea in which he was extremely interested and he was referring it to the Department of Finance and to the Privy Council for study, I am surprised he has not taken an opportunity to say something about it in the meantime as he promised to do.

Regarding his reply that he gave a list of the studies that were going on, I went into those studies and I find they are all vague, general studies. I have checked with the people in government and I find that none of them are expected to be reported to cabinet before at least six months, which shows that there is no immediacy in the Prime Minister's mind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: I would therefore ask the Prime Minister as a supplementary question, as virtually all economists are agreed that the anti-inflation program cannot really be successful until very great strides are made towards improving productivity, when he intends to stop playing the role of the great procrastinator, get on with the job and get something done?

Mr. Trudeau: Soon.

Mr. Hees: The same old "soon" as five months ago. Soon never gets sooner with Pierre.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

NEGOTIATIONS WITH PROVINCES ON REFORM—REASON FOR DELAY IN SENDING MATERIAL TO PROVINCES

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister as well. Early last week the Prime Minister is reported to have indicated in respect of constitutional reform that for the last year he had been carrying on secret negotiations with the province of Quebec and, as a result solely of the leak to the press of these negotiations, the Prime Minister was going to send to all the provincial premiers within a few days of last Monday the whole file of the documents relating to these negotiations. My question to the Prime Minister is twofold: first, has that file yet been sent out to the premiers or to the governments of the other provinces; and second, why has it taken a year for this material to be sent out to the other premiers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is some misconception in the form of the question which was asked. Perhaps the hon. member will permit me to set the record straight. The discussions have not been only with the province of Quebec. When the ten premiers and myself agreed last April that we should try to make progress on this thing by way of talks on a bilateral basis, talks in effect did go forward with every province on the subject of patriation and the formula. The only province which was not involved was British Columbia because Mr. Barrett did not find time to meet the federal representatives before his province's election and his eventual political demise. There is a meeting scheduled for early April with Mr. Barrett's successor. So to that extent the discussions were carried on with all provinces on this precise question.

The letters have gone out to each premier reporting on the negotiations as they went on between the various governments and the federal government, so that all could be informed about the general picture. Those letters went out some days ago. I asked the premiers if there were any objection to those letters being tabled next week in the House, unless they have any serious objection, I plan to do so.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MANNER IN WHICH MINISTERS SHOULD MAKE REPRESENTATIONS TO QUASI-JUDICIAL BOARDS

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. In light of the recent ruling of the Prime Minister arising out of the dial-a-judge affair about how ministers in future should approach the courts, namely, through the Minister of Justice, a ruling which ought not to have been necessary at all because what most of us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member have a question?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is, of course, the proper manner of dealing with the courts. However, can the minister assure the House that the same course will be followed in respect of representations which ministers or the government may wish to make to administrative and regulatory tribunals such as the Anti-Inflation Board, the CRTC, the CTC and so on?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Prime Minister, in case the hon. member has not read it, indicates that the same guidelines

apply to quasi-judicial administrative tribunals which were constituted as courts of record.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Will the minister also assure the House that in future all representations will be made through counsel in open court, in the judge's chambers in the presence of opposing counsel or publicly before the tribunal and not by telephone or by unrecorded and private means?

Mr. Speaker: That is precisely the question put earlier in the session by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN EQUALIZATION FORMULA AS RESULT OF INCREASED ENERGY COSTS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It is with respect to the conference last week of finance ministers and the specific request for assistance from the finance ministers of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia concerning skyrocketing electrical costs.

In view of the difficulty the minister had in accepting their request, the resistance expressed by other provinces and the specific suggestion of the minister of finance of Ontario, Mr. McKeough, with respect to the change in the equalization formula in order to take into account the skyrocketing energy costs for the two provinces, will there be specific reconsideration of this proposal, and will there be some report back to the finance ministers or to the first ministers?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will be discussing this with my colleagues. I think this might be a question which could be resolved prior to the meeting of the first ministers on energy at the beginning of next month.

POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN REDUCING ENERGY COSTS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Since the Minister of Finance seemed to think there was some problem in presenting the direct request for assistance, I wonder whether there was any consideration at that meeting with respect to assistance in converting present power plants or in developing alternate means of energy which would be much more economic and efficient for these two provinces, realizing the disastrous effect continuing high electrical costs will have on the whole pattern of regional development.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As the hon. member probably knows, for a long time there have been a number of federal initiatives to transfer from dependency upon imported petroleum to energy from other sources. Of course, the offer with respect to the CANDU has been taken up by New Brunswick. The reactor is now under construction. There are offers outstanding to assist a closer integration of the Atlantic provinces, indeed, of all the eastern provinces in a hydro grid. In this respect the provinces have insisted that any discussions on closer integration should be entirely at their own initiative and that the federal government should not be involved. To that extent I agree with the hon. member. It would be wise to have an eastern grid, but it is critical that the five provinces should get together and reach a basic agreement on closer integration, as I mentioned to the ministers at the conference.

* * *

● (1430)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGATIONS OF FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH CONTRACTS FOR CLEANING GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Solicitor General, may I address my question to the Minister of Justice? Five months ago I wrote to the minister, to request a police investigation into possible fraud and conflict of interest involving contracts for cleaning government buildings. I have said nothing publicly about this so far. Since the RCMP last week raided a Department of Public Works office in Toronto and seized relevant documents, I now ask the minister if he can report to the House on the progress of the investigation and the nature of the documents seized in the police raid; and, does he expect charges to be laid?

Hon. Ron Basford (Acting Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's sending me, in my capacity as Acting Solicitor General, notice of this question at one o'clock. The material he sent me, which was referred to in the question, was immediately referred to the criminal law division of the Department of Justice and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for investigation. I have not, since one o'clock, been able to obtain from the RCMP the results of any investigation. I cannot say more than that at this time.

Mr. Benjamin: Phone the judge.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

POSSIBILITY OF CLEANING CONTRACT BEING AWARDED TO PUBLIC SERVANT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I submit a supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works? As I have in my possession strong evidence showing that at least one contract worth over a quarter of a million dollars has been awarded by the Department of Public Works to a company owned by a public servant employed in the Federal Government, and his wife, may I ask the minister if it is the practice of the Department of Public Works to award contracts to companies owned by public servants and their families? If so, does he consider that practice proper?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the latter part of the question, the guidelines governing public servants are clear. A contract between the Government of Canada as employer and a company in which a public servant has a direct and immediate personal interest is not allowed.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a final supplementary question? Will the minister please answer the first part of my question? Is it the practice of the Department of Public Works to award cleaning or maintenance contracts to public servants and, of so, does the minister consider that practice to be legal or proper?

Mr. Paproski: Just moonlighting, eh, Bud?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, without knowing the particular circumstances of this case, I can generalize and say that it is not the practice of the Department of Public Works to award contracts, or cleaning contracts, to public servants who are in the continuing employ of the government.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGES IN METHOD OF FINANCING CANADA PENSION PLAN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of representations made by the provincial treasurer of the province of Ontario concerning the financing of the Canada Pension Plan, will the minister advise if he is having this "query" looked into, and if he will make a statement in the House in the next few days on whether the CPP is to be overhauled?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the brief which the Ontario minister put before the meeting represented nothing substantially new but involved the consideration of whether the Canada Pension Plan should be continued on a partially funded basis, as now, or go entirely to a pay-as-you-go basis. We have paid some attention to this question. I cannot assure the hon. gentleman that we will react to the question in the next several days although, obviously, it is of long-term importance to the government.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the House if payments into the Canada Pension Plan, based on income, at this point are balancing payments out?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, at the moment more is being paid in than is being paid out. The crossover point has been identified as a result of changes made in this parliament in the last several years. By 1983 the amount of contributions from individuals available to the provinces under the plan will be exceeded by the carrying charges of the outstanding obligations.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INCARCERATION OF MR. VICTOR FISHER IN MEXICO—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO OBTAIN RELEASE

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It relates to Mr. Victor Fisher of Delta who, for over 92 days, has been a prisoner in a Mexican jail on a charge which his bank and the Mexican consul in Vancouver say is a mistake. Is the government prepared to demand Mr. Victor Fisher's immediate release from jail in Mexico?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have been following this case—

An hon. Member: Yes, for over 90 days.

Mr. MacEachen: —which has already been drawn to the attention of the department. We got in touch with our embassy with respect to the case in Colima. They report that there have been no abnormal delays in dealing with this case, that the magistrate's hearing with respect to the case was to take place on April 1, and that Mr. Fisher will be represented by counsel. We are now awaiting the disposition of the court, to learn if Mr. Fisher will be released or held for further investigation.

Mr. Reynolds: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As many agencies, including the Mexicans themselves, say that Mr. Fisher is innocent, will the minister answer my first question? Is the government prepared to demand the immediate release of Mr. Fisher? Also, is the government prepared to spend money on advertising in this country, to tell Canadians that if they are arrested in Mexico, there is no bail and they must spend their time in jail until their case is disposed of?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we shall have to await the disposition of the case by the Mexican court.

* * *

AIRPORTS

RUNWAY EXTENSION AT VANCOUVER—REASON RUNWAY WITHIN DYKED AREA NOT CONSIDERED IN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. As the Minister of Public Works favours a new runway entirely within the present dyking system at Sea Island when the Vancouver airport expands, can the minister explain why, if this proposal is now being considered, it has not been subjected to the environmental impact assessment procedures which were laid down by the government?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I understand that we received a report on the environmental impact deriving from the expansion of Sea Island Airport at Vancouver. We have this report. We are aware of the impact of this expansion on the estuary of the

Fraser river, and I understand that we will have the opportunity to discuss this problem with the Department of Transport and the Department of Public Works before taking any decision.

[*English*]

RUNWAY EXTENSION AT VANCOUVER—REQUEST THAT ALL REPORTS BE CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I point out that the environment and airport planning report which is now in the minister's possession does not consider the alternative about which the minister spoke. I ask the minister to check the facts. Also, can he advise the House if he will keep the commitment he made when he was minister of transport, namely, that all reports on the Vancouver airport expansion will be referred to the standing committee of this House for discussion? Can he say if the present Minister of Transport will keep that commitment?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I will inquire of the Minister of Transport.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HARBOURS

CONSULTATIONS WITH QUEBEC ON TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER MONTMAGNY AND ISLE-AUX-GRUES FACILITIES

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport.

During the month of March the federal Minister of Transport had discussions with the Quebec Minister of Transport. Could the minister tell the House whether, on this occasion, there was mention of the two wharves, the one in Montmagny and the one on Isle-aux-Grues, which serve as points of communications between both sides and which are inadequate at present? In the light of the release which has been handed to us, have those questions of communications and wharves which are to be transferred under Quebec jurisdiction been the subject of particular discussions with respect to those two wharves?

● (1440)

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the two specific wharves being discussed while the minister and I were present. I will have to check to see whether the subject came up during the official discussions which occurred at the same time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Since the matter is very urgent, would the minister be prepared to give it very special consideration in order to expedite the discussions concerning an eventual agreement between Ottawa and Quebec?

[*English*]

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would first want to inform myself better about the present status of the wharves.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

PRICE OF CANDY—SUGGESTED REDUCTION IN VIEW OF REDUCED COST OF SUGAR

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. It has to do with the rolling back of prices, specifically with regard to officials in the candy bar industry who have stated that the increase in their prices is due to the increase in the cost of sugar. As the cost of raw sugar has now declined, can the minister give some indication whether this industry will consider, as well, reducing its prices?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Anti-Inflation Board has been following the question of candy bar prices with great care. As the hon. member has stated, I am advised that there has indeed been a drop in the price of sugar. In discussions with the industry, there has been some indication that the weight of candy bars will be expanded to take account of the difference in cost.

* * *

TRADE

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL FOR IMPORTATION OF EGGS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that the Anti-Inflation Board, through a statement by the vice-chairman, has come out very strongly against the proposal that the minister now has before him to grant exclusive importation rights or first receivership rights to the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency, will the minister now reconsider this proposal and at least defer a decision until consumer groups, the egg processing trade and the breaker trade have an opportunity to make their views known to the minister?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, had a decision been made, I guess it would have been possible, as the hon. member suggests, to reconsider it. However, the fact is that no decision has been made. Certainly the kinds of representations the hon. member has mentioned will be welcomed. I have made note of them. No final decision will be made until all of these matters have been considered.

Mr. McGrath: In light of this very important statement by the vice-chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board, will the minister or his officials contact the board to enter into discussions with them so that the views of the board will be well known to the minister in his consideration of this matter?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the hon. member has been able to give in such a detailed manner the views of the vice-chairman of the board indicates that they are well known. If it is necessary to hold further consultations, I see nothing to prohibit that.

* * *

TRANSPORT

PROPOSED CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCES ON REGULATIONS GOVERNING COASTAL TRADE

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. It arises out of the growing urgency to ensure the appropriate authorities in the coastal provinces of Canada that the regulations under Bill C-61 will in fact meet the assurances given by the former Minister of Transport with regard to protection of coasting and so forth. Is the minister now prepared to reconvene the meetings which have taken place in the past? In addition, will he expand those meetings with the authorities of the council of maritime premiers to include all provinces in Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to have a little trouble following procedures that are in fact being followed. I indicated, as well as my predecessor, that in discussions with the four western ministers and also in discussion with the four Atlantic ministers there were agreements that the regulations proposed with regard to coasting trade would be discussed fully with all of them and in the Atlantic meeting, we agreed about the procedure. As far as I know, the Atlantic ministers of transport are fully satisfied with the procedure and the consultations they know will take place.

Mr. Forrestall: In the most recent communique from the council of maritime premiers, they expressed dissatisfaction with the direction the development of regulations is taking. Can the minister indicate to these people that he will, at the earliest moment possible, reconvene the meetings between his officials, the officials of the maritime provinces and indeed invite officials of other coastal provinces to join in those meetings?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to be reasonable. I have been following procedures and consultations which satisfy the ministers of transport in the regions of the country that are affected. As far as I know, those consultations, as they are going on, are satisfactory to them. I will be glad to ask them to make more widely known their satisfaction with regard to the process.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING COASTAL TRADE—DATE OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Will the minister advise when he is going to convene the meeting of the special committee to which the hon. member for St. John-Lancaster and the hon. member for Comox-Alberni have been named as joint chairmen? This is an ad hoc committee to ascertain the views of members of parliament with regard to the development of regulations under Bill C-61. If the minister will not listen to the premiers, will he advise when and under what circumstances members of parliament will have an opportunity to make their views known to this ad hoc committee?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member drawing attention to the fact that in addition to the consultations going on with the provinces, I want to bring members of parliament fully into the consultations because, certainly on this side of the House, they all represent their regions very well. I have been having discussions with the two members to whom the hon. member referred. I look forward at an early date to the meeting to which the hon. member has referred.

RATES ON INTERPROVINCIAL FERRIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON INCREASE

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a question for the Minister of Transport. Has the minister been in consultation with the Atlantic provinces' governments, especially the government of Prince Edward Island, with regard to the proposed rates for passengers and vehicles on interprovincial ferries? If so, has an agreement been reached as to the magnitude of an increase, if any, and when will the increase be announced?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions. The subject was raised at a meeting with the Atlantic transportation ministers and some follow-up discussions took place, particularly with Prince Edward Island. It is fair to say that, like anyone else paying rates, they prefer lower rates rather than higher rates. I would not want to make it sound as if they are delighted by any increase at all. However, within the framework, knowing that we felt some additional money had to be brought out of that service and having regard to the increase in deficits, we have had some useful discussions about the kinds of increases and where the increases ought to go.

Mr. MacLean: In light of the fact that much of the commerce carried on these ferries is of primary products and the persons concerned have no means of passing the additional costs on to the consumer, will the minister take action to advise the people concerned as to what the increase in rates will be at as early a date as possible so that they can make plans accordingly, especially in cases where the margin of profitability is so low that even a minor increase in cost may destroy the viability of the commerce?

Mr. Lang: Naturally, it would be our hope to have some period of notice between an indication of an increase and the actual implementation of the rate. However, that may have to be a very short period. Part of the delay in making the decision in principle to increase ferry rates generally has been because of the tremendous interest of colleagues of mine from the region and members of parliament from the Atlantic region to ensure that to the extent possible, the increases are as easy to accept as that can be possible.

● (1450)

COMMUNICATIONS

EFFECT OF ACCOUNTING CHANGES BY BELL CANADA ON REQUEST FOR RATE INCREASE

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications. Will the minister confirm that her department conducted an internal analysis of the various accounting changes made by Bell Canada, leading to the conclusion that Bell's recent rate increase request amounting to over $100 million would have been significantly less had these accounting changes not taken place, and will the minister table this report in the House?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, we did not ourselves make a study of the accounting practices used by Bell Canada. These studies were undertaken by the Canadian Transport Commission, which was given authority to do such a study.

The facts referred to by the hon. member are not true. But it is true that the Department of Communications checks the information it receives from the CTC. We think that the study was very useful and will help us better understand why Bell needs to change its rates in the future.

[*English*]

Mr. Symes: I am aware of the CTC analysis but I believe there was also a separate one conducted by the hon. lady's department. I should like to ask whether the CTC analysis and any analysis done by her department were taken into consideration when the cabinet turned down an appeal by Action Bell Canada against the recent rate increase?

Mrs. Sauvé: The CTC has done the study and there is no way the Department of Communications is going to duplicate that study. But we are equipped within the department to analyse the study, and this we did. It is on this basis that we are able to advise the cabinet to accept, vary or rescind decisions of the CTC.

* * *

MANPOWER

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COUNCIL OF CANADA ON JOBS, PROGRAMS AND GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE—SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In the light of the far reaching implications of the report of the Economic Council of Canada affecting people, jobs, programs and government performance, will the minister be making any comments by way of a statement in the House regarding this extremely important report?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): There are many interesting comments and useful suggestions contained in the report of the Economic Council which I have now had an opportunity to examine, though somewhat superficially at this stage. I do not anticipate making a statement in the House though I look forward to discussing the subject and answering any questions when we meet in the standing committee to discuss the main estimates of my department.

Mr. Alexander: The main estimates are one thing, and this report, in which I am particularly interested, is another. Having regard to the importance of the report and the need for it to be given some study, might I ask whether the government House leader will use his good offices to see to it that this report, which affects people, jobs, programs and government performance is referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for study? Surely the minister realizes that this document is worthy of that type of action.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I find myself in sympathy with the hon. member. I did discuss at one time the project of referring the council's report and, perhaps, the annual report of the Bank of Canada, to the Finance Committee rather than to the committee to which he referred. I believe it would be useful to have the reports of the Economic Council given much wider study and I am quite sympathetic to the hon. member's views. I would be in a much better position, however, if we could manage the affairs of the House in such a way that there could be an opportunity for debate in this chamber after the reports are made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

TRANSPORT

REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON AIR-SEA RESCUE POLICY—DATE OF DECISION ON INQUIRY INTO SINKING OF "SAN JUAN"

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): A question for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman indicated some time ago that the task force review of the air-sea rescue policy would be presented to cabinet by April 1. Can the minister tell us what progress has been made by cabinet on this issue? Will the report be tabled? Will it be referred to the Transport Committee?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I do not believe those were my dates. The review is still under way.

Mr. Marshall: Has the minister reached a decision with respect to causing a judicial inquiry to be held into the sinking of the fishing vessel *San Juan* and, if so, may I ask when the inquiry will take place?

Mr. Lang: The final report on that matter, preliminary to any such decision, is not yet in my hands.

Oral Questions

CUSTOMS

NEED FOR ADEQUATE STAFFING OF BOOTHS AT DOUGLAS CROSSING DURING TOURIST SEASON

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of National Revenue. Spring has finally come to Ottawa, only another reminder that it came a long time ago to White Rock and the greater Vancouver area. It also heralds the tourist season which will bring thousands of people to the beautiful beaches of White Rock and Crescent Beach.

An hon. Member: This is a commercial.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a question to ask?

Mr. Friesen: Can the minister give some assurance that all seven of the customs booths at the Douglas Crossing will be staffed this year to process the tourists coming into Canada?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): I cannot give that assurance in view of the government's restraint program and the cutbacks—

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Cullen: However, it is our hope that during the peak periods we would have adequate staff so that there would be few delays and people could get to the beautiful area the hon. member is talking about.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

EMISSION STANDARDS FOR SYNCRUDE PROJECT—CONFLICTING PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL STANDARDS—POSSIBILITY OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of the Environment. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources with regard to Syncrude that it will be up to the provinces to set environmental standards, may I ask whether this means that the provinces could set and implement lower standards than those provided in the various statutes of Canada? Will Syncrude, through provincial action, be in any way exempted from the standards and provisions of the Contaminants Act, the Fisheries Act and other statutes related to clean air and water?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been said at least a dozen times in this House that the provinces of Alberta has the authority required to set the standards. On the other hand, there has never been any talk of lowering the emission standards for sulphur dioxide; on the contrary, they should be more stringent; we have recommended lowering the standards from 270 to 280, that they now are, to 80 tons a day.

[Mr. Lang.]

Now, with the application of the new Contaminants Act, I will try to see what we can do to co-operate with the province of Alberta and lower the air pollution at Syncrude.

[*English*]

Mr. Wenman: Having regard to the statement made by the Department of the Environment that an emission rate of 287 long tons of sulphur dioxide was unacceptable and that the emission should be reduced to 40 long tons per day, may I ask whether the minister possesses the necessary legislative authority to ensure this objective? If not, will he seek such authority in the House of Commons?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I think that before looking for more legislative authority I should try to work with the Province of Alberta through my colleague to determine whether it is possible to lower the standard to an acceptable level. While 40 tons is what we find ideal, if we could reach some compromise for the meantime I would be very happy and this is what I am doing right now.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 3,588, 3,699, 4,031, 4,107 and 4,947.

[*Text*]

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY—TRAFFIC OFFENCES

Question No. 3,588—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. To the knowledge of the government, how much money is currently owed but apparently uncollectable by representatives of foreign governments in Canada ticketed for traffic offenses but safe from prosecution for their failure to pay any fines on the grounds that they enjoy diplomatic immunity?

2. (a) What are the ten countries whose representatives owe the most money (b) how much is currently owed in each case?

3. What attempts are being made by the government to collect such money?

4. What is the policy of the government concerning the claiming of diplomatic immunity by Canadian diplomats abroad who are assessed fines for traffic offenses?

5. Is the government aware of reports of the refusal by a number of foreign representatives attending the Stockholm conference on the environment, to pay hotel bills and other charges incurred by them while attending the conference and, if so, what measures are being taken to ensure that any debts owed by those attending the Habitat conference in Vancouver next year will be paid?

6. In the past twelve months, has the government been made aware of any instances including traffic offenses where foreign diplomats in Canada have invoked diplomatic immunity to avoid legal liabilities that would otherwise have applied to them and, if so (a) how many such cases is the government aware of (b) what was the nature of each

(c) were any diplomats doing so asked to leave the country as a result of their behaviour?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Persons in Canada having diplomatic status enjoy diplomatic immunity, and are therefore immune from the criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction of Canada. Consequently they cannot be said to owe money in respect of traffic offences.

2. (a) See answer to part 1. (b) See answer to part 1.

3. See answer to part 1.

4. The general policy of the government in this matter is twofold: it upholds the immunities conferred upon Canadian diplomats by international law in order to protect them from harassment, but at the same time it expects Canadian diplomats abroad to observe local laws and regulations.

5. The official Swedish report received by the government makes no reference to unpaid hotel bills and charges.

6. Yes. (a) 5,516 cases in the twelve months ending November 30, 1975. (b) 5,512 parking and traffic violations, one case of shoplifting, two cases of impaired driving and one case of theft under 200 dollars. (c) No.

EXPORT OF ARMS

Question No. 3,699—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. What safeguards does the government have to ensure effective control over the ultimate destination of arms being exported by Canada?

2. What percentage of the defence industry in Canada is foreign owned?

3. What is the amount of financial assistance under various government programmes for defence industries whether domestic or foreign owned?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of External Affairs and Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows: 1. Government policy in this regard is to ensure that shipments are consistent with Canada's general policy on the export of military equipment; to ensure that the orders are *bona fide;* reach the declared consignee and are not destined to countries to which U.N. resolutions forbid the export of such equipment. A Canadian exporter in applying for an export permit is required to specify the country of ultimate destination and the name and address of the purchaser. There are severe penalties for supplying false information. At the same time it is recognized that the equipment once exported to another country becomes subject to that country's export control regulations and beyond the jurisdiction of Canadian regulations. In these circumstances it is possible that Canadian equipment might be diverted to a third country to which Canada itself would not approve such shipment. However, should a situation of this type come to the attention of Canadian authorities, further shipments of such equipment, spare parts for that equipment or indeed shipments of other military and/or strategic materiel to the countries in question may be denied. Knowledge of this fact is normally sufficient to deter such diversion.

2. Defence products manufactured for export and to meet Canadian requirements emanate from a number of Canadian manufacturing industries, e.g. aircraft and aircraft parts, motor vehicles, communication equipment, metal fabricating, etc. National statistics do not identify defence manufacturing as a specific industry. In addition, nearly all Canadian companies who manufacture defence products also manufacture commercial items and the relative values of each vary considerably from year to year. Information is not available which would enable an accurate estimate to be made of the percentage of foreign ownership of that portion of Canadian industry engaged in the manufacture of defence products.

3. FY75/76 estimates provided for financial assistance of up to $42 million for shared programs between the Canadian Government, Candian firms and friendly foreign Governments for the development and production of defence and defence related products for export. In addition, $8 million is available for repayable loans for procurement of advanced production and test equipment.

SUBSIDIES TO SMALL BUSINESSES IN CHAMPLAIN CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 4,031—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Has the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce ever subsidized small businesses in the Constituency of Champlain and, if so, what was the total amount?

2. For each such subsidy, what was (a) its purpose (b) the amount (c) the year it was granted (d) the area concerned?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Nil.

2. Nil.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO CROP INSURANCE

Question No. 4,107—**Mr. Whittaker:**

1. Did the President of the Treasury Board announce in December 1975 a $10.1 million cut from the federal contribution to crop insurance and, if so, what is the present maximum for the federal contribution?

2. What was the previous estimate of the maximum for the federal contribution to crop insurance?

3. Is the government committed by statute to pay out a prescribed level or scale of contribution to the Crop Insurance Programme and, if so, does the government plan to stand by its commitment if the prescribed level exceeds the present maximum?

4. If the government stands by its commitment, where will it acquire the necessary extra funds?

5. If the concept of insurance is to afford protection against unforeseen loss, what is the government's rationale for encouraging the Crop Insurance Boards to sell less insurance?

6. Was the President of the Treasury Board aware of the fact that the government is required to pay out a prescribed level of contribution when he announced the cut in December 1975 and, if so, for what reason did he announce that the cut would be effective in 1976?

7. Is the government required to give five years notice on any change it proposes concerning the cost-sharing arrangement of the Crop Insurance Programme and, if so, has the government given notice of its intention to reduce its contribution?

8. Do such changes have to receive unanimous consent by the government and the provinces before they can be put into effect and, if so, has the government received such consent from the provinces?

9. If such consent has not been received, will the government act unilaterally to reduce its level of contribution?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. The importance of the restraint program led the government to allocate $51.9 million in 1976-77 funding for crop insurance contributions to provinces. This level of

funding is up from the expected $49 million in 1975-76, and is up 67 percent over two years, but is less than the $62 million in funding needs which was forecast prior to the Restraint Program of the Federal Government, and similar programs of provincial governments. The government is aware of its statutory commitment to a scale of contribution for eligible provincial crop insurance plans, and to the existing agreements with provinces which commit a specific level of federal assistance. The government will honour its commitments, and the Crop Insurance Act itself provides the statutory authority to make these payments.

5, 7, 8 and 9. The Minister of Agriculture and his provincial colleagues have agreed to review their respective Crop Insurance schemes in the coming months. The federal goal is to maintain a viable and expanding crop insurance program, yet one with better balance between participation levels and increasing expenditures. The legislation provides for mutually agreed changes in crop insurance cooperation between the federal and any provincial government without any notice period, and this is the spirit in which the federal and provincial governments are proceeding to review their crop insurance plans. The legislation also provides for a five-year notice period if one party seeks unilateral change in the terms of the federal-provincial agreements under this Act. No such notice has been given by the federal or any provincial government.

BLAINE BORDER CROSSING, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 4,947—**Mr. Reynolds:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 4,111 regarding the Blaine Border Crossing, British Columbia, could the Minister advise (a) for what reason were seven re-entry gates built if it is impossible to staff them (b) what steps have been taken to solve the problem of the average 45 minute to 1 hour wait on re-entering Canada during peak hours?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): (a) The number of entry gates at Douglas was increased to seven in line with anticipated increases in traffic volume, and especially to give greater flexibility during peak travel periods such as during summer and holiday weekends. The increase in the number of gates was made to handle the projected increase in traffic for the present and the foreseeable future. Due to the present policy of fiscal restraint, however, Customs is not in a position to hire the additional staff required to operate the facility at full capacity during peak periods. (b) Several steps have been taken in an effort to reduce the delays encountered at the Douglas and Pacific Highway offices; port facilities have been expanded, casual officers continue to be hired to assist with the increase in traffic volume during the summer months, and attempts are being made to anticipate traffic peaks during the rest of the year with staff and overtime being assigned accordingly. In addition, the clerical duties performed by our uniformed officers on the border have been reduced thereby allowing them to concentrate on their enforcement duties while facilitating the clearance of travellers.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 3,683 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

● (1500)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that question 3,683 shall be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

TOTAL COST OF BILINGUALISM

Question No. 3,683—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What is the total cost of bilingualism (a) language training (b) development and promotion (c) all other costs, including the cost to replace those absent from their position or job while on training courses?

2. In each case, what are the details and costs for (a) Canada (b) each province for each year 1971 to 1975?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. CAFIK—FAILURE OF REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSIONERS TO GIVE REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Speaker: On Friday the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) indicated that in respect of one of the orders of the day today he had a question of privilege.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege that I raise today flows from the ruling that you made on Friday. Without in any way questioning the validity of that ruling, Your Honour indicated that in respect of the points of order raised by myself, and primarily by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), the legality of the report submitted by the electoral boundaries commissioners for the province of Ontario was essentially a legal question and not a question that could be properly dealt with by the Chair in respect of the orders of this chamber. I respect that ruling, but I contend that the redistribution commissioners' failure to follow parliamentary directives constitutes a violation of the privileges of this House and of all its members. I will attempt to justify this contention through a number of arguments. Unfortunately, I will need a little time to go through all these arguments in order to present the case to you for consideration.

The essence of the redistribution commissioners report is its recommendations. These recommendations are absent, according to the definition in the act, and consequently they have failed to meet the criteria set down for the recommendations, primarily because no reasons are given to justify those recommendations. I contend firstly that members of parliament from the province of Ontario, having to address themselves in the debate to a redistribution report which essentially does not contain recommendations or reasons, are placed in a disadvantaged position, and consequently they have lost some of their rights and privileges as members of the House.

Secondly, the failure to comply with the law itself in a very obvious way, not through some subtle requirement of the law but an obvious requirement to provide reasons for the commission's recommendations, in my view creates a legal uncertainty as to the effect of any redistribution in Ontario, regardless of how it is disposed of by this House. A subsequent move by an individual before the courts to set aside redistribution prior to or after any election would affect the very foundations of this institution. It seems to me that this Act gives rise to the existence of parliament itself, and as a consequence if there is a legal flaw within the Act this institution is very much in jeopardy. If in fact the redistribution is set aside by the courts after a subsequent election that may be fought on the boundaries that would flow from this faulty report, this would also potentially jeopardize the seats of many, if not all, members of parliament in the future.

When Your Honour ruled on Friday that this was a legal, not procedural, question I agreed and I agree now. But the legal question is one for whom to resolve? The need for a resolution is obvious, but who has the jurisdiction really to solve the question? I believe that this question can be viewed in three ways. First, as an internal matter for parliament itself to resolve; secondly, as an external matter to be dealt with by the courts; and thirdly, as a question that might be dealt with directly by the Crown. In this latter instance I will make no comment, trusting only that it will take into account the points I am making. If in fact this is an internal matter, I would contend that there is a prima facie case here of a breach of the privileges of this House.

My case rests, in terms of its being an internal question, on section 51 of the British North America Act, which in part provides, in addressing itself to the subject matter of redistribution:

> —after on the completion of each decennial census be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time as the Parliament of Canada from time to time provides—

This clear directive from the British North America Act leaves to the parliament of Canada the authority to describe the manner in which redistribution will take place, subject, of course, to the caveats in the British North America Act itself. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, plus the historical precedents, I would contend that redistribution up until November 20, 1964, when the present act for redistribution came into force, had historically been an internal matter for parliament itself to decide. It appears to me abundantly clear, therefore, that parliament, through one means or another, through its committees or through the House itself, decided upon what was to be redistribution.

The redistribution Act of 1964 delegated this responsibility to an independent commission, for obvious and understandable reasons, such as getting rid of charges of gerrymandering and so on. But I do not think that the existence of this act changes the internal nature of the job to be performed; it was in fact a delegated responsibility by parliament to the commission.

The uniqueness of this commission rests on a number of things, not the least of which is the manner in which the commissioners are appointed. Two of them are appointed directly by Your Honour, one is appointed by the courts, and one, who is the representation commissioner, is appointed by parliament through a resolution of the House of Commons under a separate act, the Canada Elections Act. To my knowledge, there is no other Act of parliament that adopts this particular approach of an independent commission; it is unique in that respect.

It is unique in the same way as the Canada Elections Act is unique: they both give rise to this institution itself. The interpretation of the Canada Elections Act is quite clear. If one looks historically to the Supreme Court in Great Britain, or to the Supreme Court of Canada to determine how it treats the Canada Elections Act in deciding, whether a member has or has not been elected, the law is interpreted in a very special and unique way. The courts have concluded that the Canada Elections Act provisions can never be interpreted against the people themselves, that their will is paramount. I use that argument, Mr. Speaker, only to indicate that in that limited sense there is a uniqueness about the Canada Elections Act, and I conclude that there is also a uniqueness about the redistribution Act. Both those Acts give rise to the very foundation of parliament itself and the institution of democracy.

As I have pointed out, the statute is unique. In my view, the commission is an extension of parliament, based on section 51 of the British North America Act, which allows its functions to be performed directly by parliament. It does not say "performed through law". Your Honour will find in the British North America Act reference to statutes and laws. In this particular case there is no reference to a law or statute to give rise to redistribution at all, but in fact in the manner that has been prescribed by parliament, which is a slightly different thing, but important nonetheless.

● (1510)

In May's Parliamentary Practice, 18th Edition, Chapter VI at page 82 this question is dealt with in part as follows:

> Another collective right of the House is to settle its own code of procedure. This is such an obvious right—it has never been directly disputed—

Then, further it is stated:

This holds good even where the procedure of a House or the right of its members or officers to take part in its proceedings is dependent on statute.

The existence of the redistribution Act does not in any way abrogate the rights of the House to determine its own procedures and to settle its own problems, even though those rights may stem from an Act of parliament itself.

Further on page 65 of May's it is stated:

When any of these rights and immunities, both of the members, individually, and of the assembly in its collective capacity, which are known by the general name of privileges, are disregarded or attacked by any individual or authority, the offence is called a breach of privilege, and is punishable . . .

I go on further:

"The privileges of a legislative assembly would be entirely ineffectual to enable it to discharge its functions, if it had no power to punish offenders . . . or to enforce obedience to its commands."

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that parliament in fact gave a command through this House of Commons to the redistribution commissioners with which they have failed to comply, and under such circumstances, according to Beauchesne's 108(1), in my view there is a prima facie case of breach of privilege. It states:

Anything which may be considered a contempt of court by a tribunal, is a breach of privilege if perpetrated against Parliament . . .

Then it goes on, and I miss the words in between because it talks of offensive language, etc.:

. . . or by a mere failure to obey its Orders.

The orders of parliament were quite clear and quite specific in relation to its instructions to the redistribution commissioners. It is self-evident, too, that the commissioners failed to comply with the very essence of those instructions, which were to bring forward recommendations backed up by reasons therefor. I would contend on that ground that if this question is to be interpreted as an internal matter of parliament, then it raises a question of privilege for all members of this House as a result of the failure to comply with the provisions of that Act and the instructions that were sent to them.

If this question as to the legality of the reports submitted by the commissioners is to be resolved in an external way, then I contend I have a further question of privilege, as it would adversely affect all members of parliament. First of all, the intervening uncertainty in connection with the legal premise upon which our distribution rests adversely affects the privileges of all members of the House of Commons because no member would know for certain on what basis he or she may seek re-election, plan re-election or plan election in the first place. Secondly, if the uncertainty prevails until after the next election those who are elected will not know for certain if their election would be upheld by the courts, if in fact it is alleged before the court that redistribution itself is invalid, and, therefore, the effects of redistribution are invalid. That goes to the very root of parliament and the very existence of this institution. I would, therefore, contend that in order to protect the privileges of members of parliament today, and the existence of this institution in the future, this matter needs to be resolved in the interests of all members of parliament as quickly as possible.

I would, therefore, contend that if it is alleged that this is an external matter to be dealt with by the courts the Committee on Privileges and Elections should see that the courts deal with this matter in an expeditious way.

In light of the fundamental nature of this question of privilege which affects the very existence of parliament and the methods by which its membership is determined, if Your Honour concludes that I have a prima facie case of privilege, I am prepared to move a motion to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, referring this question to it with the recommendation that it consider the matter and advise this House on ways and means by which fundamental questions may be resolved.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I see there are a number of other members who wish to contribute. I will recognize the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras).

Mr. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) in registering concern, and with the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), whose intervention on a point of order the other day gave rise to the consideration in the House of Commons of this whole problem. I have deliberated with them in the ensuing days and I seriously believe we do have a fundamental problem that must be dealt with, and with dispatch. I do not want to take much time as I think the hon. member for Ontario has presented a very complete case, but there are two or three themes and links within his comments that in my view are of importance, and should be emphasized.

I note that in your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order of the hon. member for Thunder Bay you dealt with it on procedural grounds in light of the debate that was to be before us today. In dealing with it you did make the statement as recorded in *Hansard* at page 12391 of April 1:

—it does not seem to me that there is a great deal of difficulty about the facts leading up to the argument.

I take it that has relation to the view of the hon. member for Thunder Bay that indeed the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Commission did not fulfil its obligation to give its reasons to parliament when it submitted its report. Indeed, there is an indication that it failed to fulfil its obligation at another stage. I understand it was required by parliamentary direction to state its reasons publicly in advertisements to be embarked upon or commissioned before the public hearings, at which stage it was also supposed to have given the reasons for its decisions about the original boundaries which were subject, of course, to adjustment by virtue of views expressed at those public hearings. It seems to me the commission failed on two counts, and it seems to me you recognized this when you said there does not seem to be a great deal of difficulty about the facts. If that is the case, then I think it leads directly to the comment by the hon. member for Ontario about the question of privilege.

I will not again quote Beauchesne, but just refer to Citation No. 108(1) at page 98 which says that it is a breach of privilege when there is a failure to obey the orders. Indeed, in view of Your Honour's comments about the lack of doubt on the facts leading to the argument, and in light of that section of Beauchesne's, it seems to me there is a case of privilege.

It may be, Sir, that many reports that are incomplete or inaccurate, are tabled before parliament by government agencies, and that this a weakness in those reports. In most cases, of course, a government agency is involved, the ultimate responsibility is that of the government itself. The Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Commissions are not agencies of the government; they are creatures of parliament itself, and I believe it is only parliament, therefore, that can call them to order and correct such omissions

or failures. Indeed, I think it is our responsibility as parliamentarians to do so. I do not know of any other avenue by which that could be accomplished, except perhaps by a referral of the question of privilege to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I believe too, Sir, that in your subsequent comments about this, dealing with it on procedural grounds by virtue of the debate before us today—and I do not want to take licence with your comments—you indicated that there might be legal recourse by an hon. member as an individual or, indeed, by, and I believe you used the words, "any other citizens". That implies to me belief in what I feel is the real problem. The hon. member for Ontario referred to this. At some stage—and we do not know the timing on this—an individual citizen or indeed a member could take this report to the courts and cast at least in doubt the whole process proceeding to or flowing from the next federal election, particularly for the members from Ontario.

● (1520)

However, I suggest that if their situation were in doubt, this might indeed cast a reflection on the whole election because, although we are dealing with the commission for Ontario and its failure to give us a basis in law for the boundaries for the next election, I suggest that could have an effect on all the members from all across the country because of the relationship of the numbers involved to the precise constitutional requirements. Indeed, the new Readjustment Act sets the number of members for various provinces. So, I do not think it is just a matter for Ontario. I believe it is a serious matter which should be resolved. It all hinges on whether or not there was indeed an omission or a failure on the part of the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Commission to fulfil its obligation as indicated by an Act of Parliament which did instruct it to give reasons.

Also, there is a definition for the word "recommendation" which I believe establishes that there has been this failure in connection with this report and in the previous actions of the commission before public hearings. I do not believe we can leave this doubt around until the next election or until some private citizen or even individual member clears it up by referral to the court. Surely, since we are not dealing with an Act administered by the government but with one of those few commissions, agencies or organizations which report directly to Parliament and is appointed by Parliament, we cannot leave this report in the dubious state in which I certainly feel it now exists.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when you made your ruling on Friday on the point of order raised on Thursday by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) I thought that was the end of this issue. I thought of doing a bit of research but under the circumstances the research I had planned on doing did not get done. However, I have some rather strong views on the question raised today by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) supported by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras).

Before I get into what I want to say I must make the comment that some of the words being used today remind me of the debates we used to have in the old days when redistribution was done by a committee of Parliament. During the days when that method was so distasteful that the proposal was being made that we should have an independent commission, one of the arguments advanced against such a commission was that the seats in parliament were the concern of members of parliament and that this was an internal matter. That argument has been advanced today; that is, that the composition of parliament is an internal matter and that what is involved here affects the privileges of all members of this House.

What we are talking about is the next parliament, the thirty-first and thirty-second. These are parliaments that belong to the people of Canada. They do not belong to us. We do not have vested rights in the seats we now hold or in any changes which may be made in those seats. A previous parliament decided that this fact should be recognized by the referral of this matter to independent commissions. Some of us wanted those commissions to be completely independent of the idea that members should have their say in any way. We have this provision for the filing of objections and the discussions that are to take place today and tomorrow. It was a bit of a concession. However, I insist on the fundamental fact that parliamentary seats do not belong to those who happen to be here but to the people of Canada and that the seats which are to be determined for the next election and the election after that are not for us to decide. We have recognized that fact by appointing independent commissions.

Perhaps I should say at this point that I am a bit puzzled by the repeated reference to the fact that the Ontario Commission gave no reasons for its report that has been laid before parliament. It seems to me that is a matter of opinion or of definition. I find on pages 3 and 4 of the Ontario report under the heading "Schedule B" the subtitle "Reasons for the Original Proposed Boundaries". There then follow 2, 3, 4 or 5 paragraphs and some subparagraphs. Those reasons may not satisfy the members for Ontario. The members for Ontario may feel that the commissioners did not go into sufficient detail. However, I think the argument that the law is being ignored and that this House is being given a report without any reasons does not stand up. As I say there are reasons, limited though they may be, in the report as I have indicated on pages 3 and 4.

Sir, you made the point the other day that what is involved here, if anything is involved, is a point of law. When the day comes when we get Mr. Speaker to rule on points of law both he and this House will be in a great deal of trouble. I do not think members should try to get around that by saying that parliament has given orders to a commission, that there has been a parliamentary direction to the independent commission for Ontario. Sir, we sometimes set up committees or bodies to which we give instructions, but that is not what happened in this case. We passed the statute just as we have passed other statutes. Once we have passed a statute and it becomes the law of the land, it is not ours to judge whether that law is being fulfilled. If the law is not being fulfilled, that is a matter for the courts. I think the ruling you gave on Friday in that regard is perfectly correct. The hon. member for Ontario in his submission today, among other words, used the word "legality". If there is something here which is not in keeping with the legality of the situation, it is not for us to do something about it. The laws we pass frequently get

broken, but we do not deal with those who break the law even though we have passed the law in this House of Commons. That is to be dealt with by the courts.

I contend that this is not an internal matter. It is not one that comes under the heading the hon. member for Ontario has tried to refer to as our own procedures. That applies to how we debate things, but it does not give us the right to say that the commission for Ontario has broken the law in respect of the distribution of seats in the House of Commons. The internal procedures, or the debating procedures in this House of Commons in this Thirtieth Parliament which is clearly under our control, do not give us the right to meddle in what the people of Canada will have as the make-up of their seats for the Thirtieth Parliament. Although we have moved from a point of order on which you ruled Friday, to a question of privilege, I submit it is the same issue and that your ruling of Friday should apply to the question of privilege today.

I think the Minister for Manpower and Immigration is correct in one point he made. If it were to happen that the process were to go through and the commissions, all ten or eleven of them, were to finalize their reports, then someone went to court and found that one of them was wrong and then an election were called before the matter could be settled, then obviously the next election would be fought on the old boundaries. We could not have the next election fought on new boundaries for eight or nine provinces and on old boundaries for one or two provinces. That would upset the whole apple cart. Either the final act of the commissions would all be wrong or it would all be right. But I submit that even if there is a case for this matter to be taken to court, it is to be taken to a court outside of this place. We are not a court to rule whether or not a body which has been appointed by law has or has not kept the law which we laid down.

● (1530)

Let me go on to say one other thing more or less conjecturally. If Your Honour rules that we proceed with this debate, certainly the Ontario members who speak in this debate will have the right to protest that the reasons set out in the report are not adequate and today's and tomorrow's *Hansard* will get sent to the Ontario commission so they will know that there is dissatisfaction. What they will do about it is up to them, as is everything during this debate entirely up to them. On the other hand, if the Ontario members decide that this is so offensive that they do not want to debate Ontario at all, then the commission has full authority under the Act simply to finalize the boundaries that they have already put down in the report before us.

As I said earlier in my remarks, I think that we are getting a throwback to the old days when parliament felt that redistribution was its business. I contend that it is not. The redistribution, the number of seats that we will have for each province, and how the boundaries will be drawn is the concern of the people of Canada Parliament wisely, with all parties agreeing to it, decided that therefore we should not do it in committees of the House but we should set up independent commissions. They are human, they can make mistakes or they can look at the law which says they must give reasons and give reasons which are skimpy or not satisfactory. But I do not think we have the authority to set ourselves up as a court to decide that a body appointed under the law has not carried out the terms of that law. I make the point again that there are reasons although they may not be satsifactory. I have looked at the reasons in the Ontario report and compared them with the reasons in the Manitoba report. There are more words in the Ontario reasons than there are in the Manitoba reasons.

Again in the case of Manitoba, they did not go into every last detail. They gave their reasons for significant or precise changes which have been made and they gave their reasons for changing a couple of names in their final report. None of us from Manitoba made any objection to that final report.

It is a short set of reasons, if you want to call it that in the Ontario report, but at any rate it cannot he argued that they have broken the law by not giving any reason at all.

Pardon me for wandering around in circles, Mr. Speaker, Frankly, I support the position you took when you ruled on the point of order last Friday, and I believe you should rule the same way today.

Mr. Speaker: There are three other hon. members who want to speak on the question of privilege. I do not want to eliminate the discussion or to cut it down unduly. This matter has been discussed as a point of order and it is now raised as a question of privilege. I see the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) wishing to speak. There was a very strong intervention on Thursday and Friday. The House is moving on to debate these reports for two days. The matter has been discussed rather thoroughly as a point of order and now as a question of privilege. There are others who may wish to contribute. Perhaps I can give the House the benefit of my thinking on the matter.

The House having set aside two days to debate the question, it should go on to debate it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The questions which have been raised, whether one accepts or rejects the quality of the "reasons" that have been attached to these reports, is that there was a striking similarity between the reports of four of the provinces which are proposed to be debated today and tomorrow. If the Chair is to be put in the position of looking at the reports, examining certain paragraphs, and saying that these are reasons within the terms of the statute and these are not, clearly the Chair is being put in the position of being a legal judge. The Chair will simply not accept such a position.

In addition, the relationship between this debate and the actions of the commissioners or the legal position of the commissioners or the right of the whole process to effect actual changes is not very clear. The fact is that this debate was ordered by statute. It will continue today and tomorrow, and frankly there does not seem to me to be any relationship between this debate and the ultimate actions to be taken by the commissioners. They may take into account remarks made here if they wish, but they are not bound to do so because to bind them legally to do that would be to put them in an impossible position.

Therefore, clearly the intent of the statute is that this House should seek a combination between the independence of the commissioners and the opportunity of the House to pass judgment and make comment upon their recommendations. That is what has been provided. There was never any pretension that these debates or the comments that will be made in the next two days will have any legal or binding effect upon the commissioners. That being the case, I cannot understand what hon. members would consider the desirable effect to be of interrupting this process, since it has no legal effect. Therefore it would be my suggestion that we get on with the debate and maximize the time allowed. If hon. members wish to participate in the debate after those remarks, I will be happy to see them but I had hoped to shorten the process by making my intervention.

Some hon. Members: Amen.

Mr. Speaker: If there are no other hon. members who wish to participate in the discussion, we will go on to orders of the day.

* * *

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO REPORTS OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS—NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

The House proceeded to the consideration of objections to reports of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions for various provinces.

Mr. Speaker: The first objection is to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, when I and my colleagues sent a formal notice to Your Honour requesting that an objection be filed to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Northwest Territories, we used the traditional language of such a notice. In the formal language of that notice we said that the commission had failed to do one thing and overlooked or ignored something else. So, first of all, I should like to say that we did not file the objection because we doubted in any way the thoroughness of the commission's proceedings or the ability of any of the commissioners, but such is the language of tradition.

We filed the objection because the commission filed both a majority and a minority report. As I understand it, this does not happen very often. By filing our objection we hope to give the commission the opportunity to take a second look at the problems, a second look that would include the views of any member of the House who may wish to give them the benefit of his or her experience.

I presented a brief to the Electoral Boundaries Commission of the Northwest Territories last December in Yellowknife. In that brief I indicated that I favoured what is commonly called a north-south dividing line. I also told the commissioners that my own suggestion for names for our two new constituencies was western Arctic and eastern Arctic. One of the reports from the commission agreed with me about the boundaries, but neither of them agreed with my choice of names.

In the few months between now and the time that I gave that submission much has happened. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, or the Eskimo Brotherhood of Canada, presented its proposal for an Inuit land claim settlement in the Northwest Territories to the cabinet. When they were preparing this proposal, the ITC did a lot of work to make sure that the people in the communities were consulted. I have no doubt that their proposal represents a consensus on the matter of future political development in the Northwest Territories. Because of this I now feel that perhaps the boundary outlined in the majority report of the commission, commonly known as the tree line boundary, is the better choice, because the tree line boundary more accurately reflects the conditions which will exist if the ITC proposal is accepted by the cabinet, as I am sure it will be if the cabinet uses common sense.

● (1540)

Mr. Benjamin: Don't bet on it.

Mr. Firth: There are other factors which lead me to support the choice of boundaries of the majority report. The first is that the Indian people of Mackenzie valley—the Dene as we call ourselves—are in the process of defining their land claims. Although the proposal for a Dene claim has not yet been presented to the government, I have no doubt that the tree line boundary would be the best suited to the kind of claim these people will probably bring forward in about November of this year. The second point is that there are three northerners sitting on the commission. Of the three, two submitted the majority report.

However, there still remains the question of names for the two new constituencies. In my original submission to the commission I explained at some length some of the roles the member or parliament for Northwest Territories must play. I was speaking, of course, of any member of parliament for the Northwest Territories, no matter who it might be. I told the commission that in my view the person who does this job must, along with the other duties of a member of parliament, work to expand the knowledge of the people in the rest of the country about the particular problems we in the north face. Because I feel that this task is so important, we should name the new constituencies in such a manner that no one, no matter how little he or she knows about the north, would fail to recognize the part of the country to which reference was being made. This is the big job of the member of parliament for the north. He has to explain, as far as possible, the differences between that part of the world and down here.

Many constituencies have names which link them to their histories or to major landmarks. By using these names we are both able to preserve a little bit of that history and to instil pride in that heritage. In the case of the new riding which is to be formed in the eastern part of the Northwest Territories both the minority and the majority reports use the name Nunassiaq, an Inuit word which means something like beautiful land. There are very few Inuit words commonly used in the south, so there is little likelihood that this constituency name would cause any confusion for people in the rest of the country.

However, I do see a problem with the name of the other constituency. The majority report would call this riding Mackenzie River. The choice of the minority report is Mackenzie Arctic. Both these names are faithful to the history and tradition of the area. However, I still feel that they would be confusing because there is already a constituency in northern Saskatchewan known as Mackenzie. If these ridings were anywhere else in the country, I would not mind, but as I said, the general level of knowledge in the rest of the country about the north is very low, and anything which would tend to confuse northern issues even more should be avoided.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I should, therefore, like to ask the commission to reconsider its report with a view to retaining the tree line boundary and the names Nunassiaq and Western Arctic. This has the support of all my colleagues. It has the support of native groups in the Northwest Territories. It has the support of two of three of the northern members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and if my memory serves me correctly, this concept also had the support of hon. members to my right. As a matter of fact I hope that a former minister of Indian affairs and northern development who is now the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) will support this view.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, the trouble with some younger members is that they do not understand anything about Canadian history. They think everything began in 1963.

Mr. Blais: 1940.

Mr. Dinsdale: However, this is an historic occasion, and that is why I take part in this debate. What is happening today is the fulfillment of initiatives which began back in 1961 when a proposal went forward from the Norhtwest Territories Council for a division of the territories. The proposal arose out of a speech to the Territorial Council by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) on July 20, 1961. He was then prime minister. At that time he said:

> I was particularly interested in one view that you expressed: More and more the Council believes that to a greater extent than ever before, self-government should be made available to the people of the north, and I'll join with you in that. Already the field has greatly widened the responsibilities of the Council, and I can assure you of this fact: that having seen at first hand something of the achievements of the past, something of the things that have already been done, anything that you may suggest—and the members of the Council—to increasing the field of your responsibility, and also providing, to a measure not before known, of self-government, will receive my warmest approval and support . . .
>
> When you mentioned that you hoped that there would be, not too far away, a division of this vast northern area into two districts, I think that too is something that deserves the most sympathetic consideration on the part of the federal government . . .

Based on that speech, the council moved a resolution in January of 1962 in the following terms:

> Whereas the construction and improvement of transportation facilities and increasing activity in the exploration for and development of mineral and petroleum resources in the Northwest Territories are bringing about rapid growth and change, especially in the western portion of the District of Mackenzie;

It went on to indicate that it was suggesting the division of the territories.

For the benefit of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) there is where the plot thickens. There was legislation on the order paper back in 1963 to divide the territories. With the change of government in 1963 that legislation fell by the wayside, and it is not until some 13 years later that we see the great resurrection we are witnessing here this afternoon. In the meantime, many years have been lost. The target date of 1967, our centennial, which was to have seen greater autonomy and responsible government for the western Arctic district, has never been achieved. It was interesting that reporters of the stature of Don McGillivray stated on January 15, 1963 that this proposed division meant that the north was a step nearer independence. There were other things which went down the drain as well, such as accelerated exploration for Arctic oil which had been launched in 1961. Now we are moving forward once again, after this long delay, and I do want to support the proposal for the division of the territories into two districts.

I want to pay tribute to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), who has kept this issue alive over the years. It became necessary, because of the proposal, to give the native people in the territories the vote for the first time in 1962. Believe it or not, they did not even have the right to vote, a basic right of all people in a democratic country, until 1962. As a result of their close involvement they were consulted as to how the territories should be divided and how they should be named, so the exercise we are going through this afternoon is largely based on the activities of that period of some 13 years ago.

The native people themselves, the Inuits in particular, chose between four names for the eastern district: the first was Nunassiaq, meaning the beautiful land; the second choice was Nunamarik, meaning the homeland; the third choice was Nattilik, meaning the land of seals; and the fourth was Inuit Nunanga, meaning the land of the Eskimos. It was interesting that the majority viewpoint was in favour of Nunassiaq, the beautiful land.

It was on the basis of that recommendation that the boundaries were drawn. The boundaries are similar in some respects to the majority report, with the exception that it was strongly recommended that the districts covered by Victoria Island, Banks Island and the surrounding smaller islands should be included in the western Arctic region. I support the hon. member for Northwest Territories. "Western Arctic" is much more appropriate. We have always referred to that area as the western Arctic. The name "Mackenzie River" is a survival of the past, surviving from the designation "Mackenzie District". The original decision made back in 1962, chose "Nunatsiaq" as the right name for the eastern Arctic. The inclusion of Victoria Island and Banks Island in the eastern division was recommended because of the natural lines of communication, transportation and trade with the Mackenzie Delta. These considerations concerning the natural line communication still prevail, because of geography.

● (1550)

The centre of communications and influence for Nunatsiaq, or the eastern Arctic, will be Baffin Island, at Frobi-

sher Bay. If you look at the map of the vast district of the north of Canada above the sixtieth parallel, you will see that we are considering an expanse of land some 4,000 miles across the high Arctic barrens. I think a compromise will need to be worked out in this regard, if there is to be a division which makes sense in terms of lines of communication and trade. Certainly, Victoria Island and Banks Island should be included.

This afternoon I spoke largely in historical terms, because this question is of historical importance. The idea we are discussing has long been in abeyance, but has come to the fore because of the persistence of the northern peoples. They have evinced a desire for greater independence and responsible government. Although this move will not bring about two separate territories as was originally proposed in 1962, at least it is the beginning of a move in the right direction and, as such, all members of this House should support it warmly and heartily. I hope that in due course the division recommended by the Electoral Boundaries Commission will become two new territories. We look forward to the day when the great expectations of that area of Canada will come to pass, that the 3.5 million square miles of territory rich in resources, human and natural, will eventually come into its own. Perhaps it will need a change of government to achieve this. The people of the north will decide that in due course. This afternoon I wanted to draw the attention of all hon. members, and of the people of the north, to the historical precedents of this step that is being taken.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission of the Northwest Territories. I support the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth), who asks for the name of the riding in the western portion of the Territories to be changed. I agree that the part to which he refers should be known as the Western Arctic rather than the Mackenzie Arctic.

The report of the commission studying the Northwest Territories is unusual in that it made a majority and a minority report. The four commissioners split down the middle; the chairman cast the deciding vote. As a result we now have two maps, one based on the majority and one on the minority report.

Section 7(2) of the Northwest Territories Representation Act sets out the rules which the commissioners must follow in deciding the division of electoral boundaries in the Northwest Territories. Section 7(2) reads, in part:

(a) There shall be in the Northwest Territories two electoral districts each of which shall return one member; and

(b) in dividing the Northwest Territories into electoral districts and describing the boundaries thereof, the commission shall give special consideration to the following factors:

(i) ease of transportation and communication within the electoral districts;

(ii) geographical size and shape of the electoral districts relative to one another; and

(iii) any community or diversity of interests of the inhabitants of various regions of the Northwest Territories.

Those rules govern decisions for the drawing of electoral boundaries.

I now refer to the majority report, which reads in part:

... the commission in its proposal considers that the factors of geopraphical size and shape and community of interests of the inhabitants are more important and of a more lasting nature. The proposed division is the closest division that can be made so as to as much as possible give recognition to the traditional life and cultural patterns of the majority of the indigenous peoples while at the same time paying deference to the other factors.

In other words, the commission stated it made a decision according to geographic size and community of interest. If you examine the map accompanying the majority report, you will see that the eastern region is between four and five times the size of the western region. In other words, the majority decision was not based on geographic size. I suggest it was based on rule No. (iii), the community of interest rule. The minority report reads in part:

We are confirmed that after the public sittings and the subsequent meetings of this commission, the recommendations published in October 6, 1975, in the *Canada Gazette* and in various newspapers by the commission was, in our opinion, the product of the proper application of the rules set out in section 7(2) of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act ...

As the hon. member for Northwest Territories said, the Inuit Tapirisat association of Canada has presented land claims to the Government of Canada. I have examined the claims of the ITC, looked at the boundaries suggested by the majority report, and at the land claims of the Inuit people. There is a considerable difference between the boundary lines. If the government accepts the land claims of the Inuit, the boundary of the territory which the ITC wishes to call Nunavut will not coincide with the electoral district proposed by the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Commission. Therefore, some time in the future we shall need once again to reconsider the electoral boundaries.

When I began I mentioned that the commission was divided in its opinion and that the chairman cast the deciding vote. Bearing that fact in mind, and remembering the rules laid down in the Northwest Territories Representation Act, I urge the commission to review the report and make a decision based on rules (i), (ii) and (iii) of section 7(2), to which I referred. The decision should not be based on one rule alone.

● (1600)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Is there any further debate on the objection for the Northwest Territories?

The House having considered this objection, it will be my duty, pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to refer the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, together with a copy of the objection and also a copy of the debates of the House, back to the commission for reconsideration thereof.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now proceed to the consideration of the objections to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario which were grouped for the purpose of consideration.

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I will not take time to read the objection which was filed. It is in Votes and Proceedings. In order more properly to understand the reasons for my objection to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario as it relates to the boundaries of the Haldimand-Norfolk constituency, one must go back to the first Electoral Boundaries Commission of 1972-73 and look at the report which they presented in 1973. In preparation of its report, this commission held hearings in the city of Welland.

The elected representatives of the town of Dunnville and the adjacent townships of Canboro, Dunn, Moulton and Sherbrooke made representations at the Welland hearings asking that these areas be included in the then riding of Norfolk-Haldimand. When the commission reported in 1973, the map showed that the areas referred to above were indeed included in the proposed electoral district. Those citizens who had appeared in Welland therefore felt they had gained their point. What they did not realize was that by an act of parliament, the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario had been wiped out and the Norfolk-Haldimand riding had reverted back to its original boundaries. Further, these officials did not realize that a new commission had been established in 1974 to redraw the electoral districts for Ontario.

That brings us to the work of the present Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario and the report presently before the House, the report respecting which I have filed an objection. My objection, put simply, is that I want the present town of Dunnville, formerly Dunnville and the surrounding former townships of Canboro, Dunn, Moulton and Sherbrooke, to be included in the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. That was where they were placed by the commission which reported in 1973. That is the wish of the elected officials of the town.

Let us now examine the decision of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario as contained in the report tabled in this House on February 27, 1976, and perhaps, more important, try to understand the reasons behind this decision. At outset, I concur completely with the change in the name of the electoral district from Norfolk-Haldimand to Haldimand-Norfolk. A mere reversing of the two parts of its name may seem of little consequence. However, to the residents of the riding it means a great deal. It removes the confusion associated with the name because this name is now the same as that of the region which was established April 1, 1975, as well as the name of the provincial constituency. This change is generally welcomed throughout the riding.

As one means of gathering facts and obtaining public opinion, the commission conducted hearings across the province. One such hearing was, again, held in Welland. A record of these proceedings shows three persons gave evidence with respect to the Haldimand-Norfolk constituency, none of whom was an elected official from the town of Dunnville. They advocated placing Dunnville in the new electoral district of Erie. The persons most knowledgeable of the wishes of Dunnville, namely, the elected officials in the persons of the mayor, deputy mayor and councillors were not present. They were not present for two very good reasons. First, they had already presented evidence to a former commission and won their point. Second, the Welland hearing was not advertised in the local press and they were completely unaware of the proceedings. The result of this hearing and further deliberations by the commission was to remove the town of Dunnville from Haldimand-Norfolk and place it in Erie electoral district.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth in detail the reasons for my objection to this removal. First, and most important, is the fact that the mayor of Dunnville and his council are unequivocally opposed to their municipality being severed from the Haldimand-Norfolk constituency. Their reasons are well set forth in their brief to the first boundaries commission, and these reasons are even more valid in 1976 than they were in 1973 because the regional municipality of Haldimand-Norfolk is now a reality. The sincerity and reasonableness of the official position can best be shown by reading into the record the brief presented by the then warden of Haldimand county to the first boundaries commission. I quote from that brief as follows:

> Presentation to the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission, Welland, Ontario, Monday, February 26, 1973.
>
> MR. CHAIRMAN: My name is Mrs. Lorna Miller of 125 Kneider Avenue in Dunnville, Ontario. I am the warden of Haldimand county and the reeve of the town of Dunnville.
>
> I thank you for the opportunity of making this presentation which I so do on behalf of the council of the county of Haldimand, the town of Dunnville and the townships of Canboro, Dunn, Moulton and Sherbrooke. The reeve of Dunn, Mr. Keith Richardson, is also in attendance this morning.
>
> It is the strong feeling of the municipal councils which I represent here today that the municipalities of Dunnville, Canboro, Dunn, Moulton and Sherbrooke should be included in the Norfolk-Haldimand riding rather than the newly-created riding of Lincoln. I am certian, although no opinion poll has been taken, that the majority of the voters in these municipalities have the same feeling.
>
> As you know, for the past few years the Haldimand-Norfolk study group has made a great number of detailed surveys and conducted a very comprehensive study of the two counties for the purpose of establishing regional government in Haldimand and Norfolk. During this study, all briefs and submissions made by individuals, organizations and other boards and bodies have expressed desire to remain within the boundaries of their respective two countries. Although the report has not yet been released, we are given to understand that the boundaries will remain the same, with a possible minor alteration in the west end . . .
>
> I am not certain whether Dr. Railton, the present federal member for the riding of Welland, and Mr. William Knowles, the member for Norfolk-Haldimand, have made or will be making a submission at this time; however, I have discussed this matter with both the members and they concur with my representation here today.
>
> We do feel that we are more closely allied, both economically, socially and politically with Haldimand county than with the region of Niagara, having been in the Norfolk-Haldimand riding until the last redistribution of seats. I would also mention that the counties of Norfolk and Haldimand make up the provincial riding.
>
> I do not believe it necessary to go into greater detail, but do submit that it is our wish to become a part of the Norfolk-Haldimand riding, as it is for provincial elections, and ask that you give favourable consideration to the request of the elected officials and the citizens of the municipalities which I have the privilege to represent here today.
>
> All of which I respectfully submit,
>
> Lorna J. D. Miller.

As further evidence of the wishes of Dunnville council, I wish to put on record a resolution passed by that body on March 9, 1976, and also a letter from the clerk-treasurer of the town of Dunnville. I quote the resolution:

> Moved by L. J. D. Miller, seconded by Keith Richardson:

That whereas at a sitting for the hearing of representations held in the city of Welland on February 26, 1973, the warden of the county of Haldimand, Mrs. Lorna J. D. Miller, also being the reeve of the town of Dunnville, on behalf of her respective councils and with the support of the councils of the then townships of Canboro, Moulton and Sherbrooke, respectfully requested that such municipalities as constituted at that time (now all within the boundaries of the present town of Dunnville) remain within the Norfolk-Haldimand riding;

And whereas at the same sitting, the reeve of the then township of Dunn, Mr. Keith Richardson, made a similar representation on behalf of his council as did the county warden and reeve of the town of Dunnville;

And whereas the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario, 1976, excludes the town of Dunnville from the Haldimand-Norfolk riding but includes the said town in the new riding of Erie;

And whereas the inclusion of the town of Dunnville in the Haldimand-Norfolk riding would not increase the population of the riding to more than 25 per cent of the electoral quota nor decrease the population of the riding of Erie to less than 25 per cent of the said quota;

● (1610)

And whereas the council of the town of Dunnville since the inception of the region of Haldimand-Norfolk is now more adamant in its belief that the town of Dunnville is much greater allied with the Riding of Haldimand-Norfolk politically, economically and socially, being a part of the provincial riding of Haldimand-Norfolk and an area municipality with the region of Haldimand-Norfolk and has no such ties with the proposed riding of Erie;

Now therefore be it resolved that the council of the town of Dunnville strongly opposes the inclusion of the municipality within the boundaries of the proposed riding of Erie and urgently requests that this municipality be included in the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk for the valid argument set forth above and the reasons submitted to the commission in Welland on February 26, 1973.

This motion was carried unanimously. I also want to read to the House a letter written to me by the Clerk of the town of Dunnville, dated March 10, 1976:

Mr. William Knowles, M.P.

Haldimand-Norfolk,

Parliament Buildings,

Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Knowles:

Thank you very much for the copy of the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

The council of the town of Dunnville is opposed to the inclusion of the municipality in the proposed riding of Erie as evidenced by the attached resolution passed unanimously in regular session last evening.

It was our understanding the commission acceded to our wishes and included the town and townships within the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk.

As a result of this change, we did not make representation at a subsequent sitting again held in Welland on October 28, 1975, and I would add that there was no official objection from the town of Dunnville as a result of the change proposed by the commission nor was there an official request to be included in the new proposed riding of Erie.

Not until the report was issued were we aware of our inclusion in the riding of Erie. It is also our opinion that when the change was made, we should have been advised and then given an opportunity to resubmit our case.

We refer again to the resolution and respectfully request you do all in your power to include the town of Dunnville in the Riding of Haldimand-Norfolk.

He goes on to add a few more words, and signs himself "Frank Scholfield, clerk-treasurer." It should be obvious to even a casual observer that Dunnville and Haldimand country have been bound together geographically, historically, socially and politically. Let me expand on the importance of these four bonds of union. In a geographic sense, it should be noted that dating back to the creation of Haldimand county in the 1800s and prior, the county boundaries have always included the town of Dunnville. Dunnville has been an integral part of the county and made important economic contributions to the mutual benefit of all. This whole eastern area of Haldimand lies in the valley of the Lower Grand River. In early days, boats and barges of commerce moved up the river from its mouth in Lake Erie through Dunnville, Cayuga and Caledonia aided by a series of locks and dams. Today these same commercial and social relations are maintained and improved by a network of provincial and regional highways and railways. Today this region is part of the Grand River Conservation Authority.

Historically also, Dunnville belongs to Haldimand. At the close of the American revolution of 1774, the Six Nations Indians, under Chief Joseph Brant who had fought on the British side, were granted a large tract of land on the lower Grand River stretching from Lake Erie to Brantford. The town of Dunnville and Eastern Haldimand were within this tract. As portions of this tract were sold to white settlers, small towns and villages sprang up along the Grand at Port Maitland, Dunnville, Cayuga, York and Caledonia. Thus, it is evident that from the beginning Dunnville is part of the history of Haldimand.

Speaking from the view of social relationships, it should be pointed out that Dunnville had traditionally been the meeting place for social events for the county. Conversely, rural people of the present town of Dunnville use the Kohler agricultural centre near Cayuga as the focal point for meetings of all farm organizations, including Women's Institute meetings. Politically, Haldimand County has remained intact as a provincial constituency. The same applies for municipal politics and administration. It is important to note that the constituency organizations of the three major political parties feel that Dunnville should be in the federal riding. This is borne out by the opinions expressed in the following item appearing in the Simcoe *Reformer* of March 5, 1976. I should like to read a portion of that article. The heading is "Local party spokesmen want to retain Dunnville".

A study released recently by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, Ottawa, recommended that the town of Dunnville be included in a newly created riding of Erie. The commission also suggested that the name of the Norfolk-Haldimand riding be changed to Haldimand-Norfolk to correspond with the regional name.

Bill Knowles, member of parliament for Norfolk-Haldimand, announced his opposition to the exclusion of Dunnville from the riding after consulting with Dunnville officials.

Mr. Knowles said he would request a review of the boundary allocation and recommend that the riding boundaries coincide with regional boundaries.

Ken Green, president of regional Progressive Conservatives, said he agreed with efforts to retain the town of Dunnville in the federal riding.

New Democratic Party spokesman, Norm Walpole, said he felt it made a great deal of sense ot have the regional and electoral boundaries coincide. He said he did not know how the population-figures compared to other ridings, but felt the retention of Dunnville would result in less confusion in the minds of the people.

Don Daley, past president of the H-N federal Liberal association, thinks both the federal and provincial ridings should correspond with regional boundaries.

"The whole idea of regional government was to simplify things," he said. "This (proposal) just complicates matters."

Now we come to the basic principle which guided the members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and that is equitable distribution of population. The electoral quotient for Ontario is 81,085. The proposal to place Dunnville in Haldimand-Norfolk meets this criterion. The population of Haldimand-Norfolk is 75,292; and the population of Dunnville, which is 11,500, and we reach the total of 86,792, well below the 25 per cent plus variable which is permitted—101,356. The population of the adjoining Erie district is 79,834. Subtract the population of Dunnville, 11,500, and we are left with a total of 68,334, well above the 25 per cent minus variable permitted—60,814. These figures come from the 1976 report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario. It is therefore obvious that the proposed change does not adversely affect the neighbouring riding of Erie from which Dunnville would be removed. There is no domino effect.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Campbell-Grant. With few exceptions, it has met the approval of most members of this House. The commission has grappled with an exceedingly complex problem and produced an excellent report within their terms of reference.

I am satisfied that such a fair minded group of men will see the reasonableness of the case I have put before the House. The facts speak for themselves. Now, being in possession of all the facts, plus the documented opinions of the citizens of Dunville, I am sure they will accede to the wishes of these very concerned people.

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the report which has been tabled by the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario is, I contend, an extraordinarily deficient document. It is even questionable whether it properly constitutes a report as defined by the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. As I had an opportunity to say on another occasion, this document fails to provide reasons for justifying the recommendations made.

Earlier, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) talked about reasons and said it was a matter of opinion, or of definition, as to what constitutes a reason. In fact, the act is quite specific as to what a reason is: it is a reason justifying a recommendation. That takes it out of the realm of uncertainty and makes it very precise and definite. When a recommendation is made by an Electoral Boundaries Commission, it has to be supported and justified by a reason. Its report is incomplete, or may even be improper, if it fails to comply with this quite specific requirement of the act.

● (1620)

I further suggest that this glaring deficiency placed the citizens of Ontario at a serious disadvantage when they went about making their representations before the commission at the public hearings. In answer to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who suggested that somehow our concern is a selfish one on the part of members of this chamber, I would say "Not at all." We are here speaking for citizens, and the citizens whom we represent were at a disadvantage in expressing their views as to the recommendations of the commission because they had no reasons before them on which they could argue either for or against.

This lack of reasons also hampers members of parliament from Ontario in addressing themselves to the proposals of the commission in this debate. Hence, some of us have argued that this debate ought not really to have taken place at all. The failure of the Ontario commission to comply with the requirements of the statute has produced a reasonable measure of doubt about the validity of the redistribution process that has taken place to date in the province of Ontario. This is a serious situation. It is so serious that something really ought to be done to remove the uncertainty created by the raising of this issue.

I would think there are at least three things that could be done to remove this cloud of doubt that hangs over the validity of the report of the commission for Ontario. The first is that the commission for Ontario ought itself, in order to protect its own integrity, to recall its own report. It ought to do the job that parliament asked it to do.

Mr. Gillies: It did.

Mr. Penner: I did not. It did not supply reasons justifying its recommendations.

Mr. Gillies: It certainly did.

Mr. Penner: It should, therefore, take the report back, supply reasons and hold public hearings again so that the citizens of this province have something to which they may address themselves. Similarly, members of parliament may then deal with the report in terms of its justification, rather than simply a map and the description that accompanies it. A description is not a justification. A reiteration of what the act requires is not a justification. To say it has done certain things is not to provide reasons to justify its actions. This it has failed to do.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said there are five paragraphs under shedule B of the report. So there are, but if you take any one sentence in any of those five paragraphs, you are at a loss to find anything that, by any definition at all, constitutes a reason, much less a reason to justify, which is even stronger, more definite and specific. Secondly, if the commission itself will not recall its own report, perhaps the government ought to consider seeking a reference of this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is hoped that this committee would recommend appropriate corrective measures which would result in removal of the cloud of doubt which hangs over the validity of the Ontario report.

It would be an interesting and useful exercise for hon. members opposite, who are protesting that everything is according to the act, to go back and look at the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections when they were in the process of examining the amendment of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) requiring reasons. At that time, the electoral boundaries commissioner himself said this was a very good idea and that it ought to be done. Members of parliament would then be able to address themselves to the issue in debate in a much more useful and appropriate way, in a way that

would assist the commission. They would be on the same wavelength, if I may express it in that way.

The electoral boundaries commissioner then made a suggestion to the committee. He said, in effect, "Why not go a little further, and instead of requiring reasons just in the report that is tabled in parliament, also put the reasons in the newspaper along with the maps that are to be drawn, so that the citizens as well can study those reasons. Then, when they go to the public hearings they will be able to speak on the same wavelength that has brought the commission to the conclusion that it should draw the maps in a certain way?" Members of the committee thought that this was a good idea and the amendment was expanded to take it into account. Here was a recommendation by the commissioner himself, a man who sat on the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario. He encouraged this process, yet when, acting as an adviser, he brought forward the original proposals and then this report, there was no evidence of the reasons which he himself had suggested.

I have already mentioned the first course of action, the unilateral action of the commission, and the second, that the government should seek a reference from the House to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. The third course of action would be a private reference to a court of proper jurisdiction for judicial determination. Surely it is important to all of us in this House that the laws of parliament be upheld by the commissions we appoint, to exactly the same degree as we expect compliance with the laws by any private citizen.

I began by saying that this report now being debated is incomplete and improper. I wish now to go a step further and suggest that it is also insensitive. The report is insensitive on at least two counts. First, it is insensitive to what parliament intends with respect to the entire process of redistribution. As the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) pointed out earlier, what parliament intends with respect to an act such as the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act and the Canada Elections Act is of the utmost importance. The spirit behind the law is of equal importance to, or even more important than, just the letter of the law as may be the case with most other kinds of legislation where interpretation by the courts is required. I said that the report of the commission of Ontario is insensitive on two counts. In addition to being insensitive to what parliament intends, it is insentive to the overwhelming expression of opinion voiced by the people of northern Ontario.

It is perfectly clear that in everything parliament has done to date regarding the matter of redistribution, it wants the people of Canada to be as well represented as possible. It has taken a number of actions to ensure that this is so. First of all, by increasing the total number of members of the House of Commons, parliament sought to protect certain areas of Canada from losing seats. It has done so by providing floor provisions for certain provinces where the population is growing less rapidly than it is in other regions of Canada. That is an action that I can understand, one I applaud and accept. It is fundamental that this be done by parliament, and parliament has done it.

Secondly, parliament has departed from the strict principle of representation by population by adding a second seat in the Northwest Territories, again a decision that we all welcome. It is something that should be done in view of the vast area that has to be represented, even though there are comparatively few people who inhabit that great area of Canada. Thirdly, to protect representation in the less populated and less developed regions within a province, the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act provides for a 25 per cent tolerance below the quotient for any province. Of course, to offset that, it also allows for a 25 per cent tolerance above the quotient in the urban areas where representation takes on another kind of quality to that of the less populated areas of Canada.

● (1630)

Each of these steps taken by parliament declares unequivocally that in order to maintain the nature of Canadian confederation, exceptions must be made to the principle of representation by population. This brings me directly to the situation which the commission seeks to create in northern Ontario.

For the information of hon. members, let me point out that northern Ontario is that region of the province which lies north of the French River and constitutes four-fifths, or 80 per cent, of the land mass of the province of Ontario. That is what we are talking about here. At the present time, the people of northern Ontario are represented in this House by 12 members of parliament. In the parliament which follows this one, the province of Ontario as a whole is to be allocated an additional seven seats. All of these, quite understandably, will go to the more heavily populated southern part of the province. There is no argument about that at all. That area has been growing rapidly in population. Some of the members here represent a much greater number of citizens than others, and there has to be something done to alleviate that serious situation. The seven seats will all go to that more heavily populated area.

Some hon. members of this House expressed as much shock and as much dismay as have the citizens of northern Ontario when they learned that the commission was proposing a reduction of representation in the region of northern Ontario, comprises 80 per cent of the land mass of Ontario, from 12 seats to 11. They did not have to do this. I am led to believe that some members of the commission proposed, in the strongest terms possible, that this not be done. How could they have avoided taking such a serious and drastic step, denying the people of that region of the province of Ontario the representation they deserve? They could have done so by using more fully the 25 per cent tolerance factor which the redistribution act allows them to do. If they had done that, the present level of representation in northern Ontario could have been maintained. They did not even have to go to the full limit of that 25 per cent tolerance. The quotient for Ontario is 81,085 and the minimum permitted, using the full 25 per cent tolerance, would be 60,814. The average population of the 11 ridings now proposed by the commission in this report is 70,413, well above the minimum permitted. If 12 ridings were maintained, the average would be 62,046. You can see, sir, that this is well within the terms of the act.

I submit that it was the intent of parliament that the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act be used in this very way. I urge the commission once more to reconsider its decision and to deal justly with northern Ontario. After

all, northern Ontario is not asking for anything which it does not deserve; it only asks the commission to be fair.

To underscore my argument, Mr. Speaker, that the commission for Ontario has failed to fully realize the 25 per cent tolerance factor I would point out that in the province of Quebec the commission there proposed to let 51 per cent of the ridings be below quotient. The commission for Ontario has proposed only that 42 per cent be below quotient. I submit that there is quite a difference in approach.

Now, it may well be asked why the commission for Ontario should pay any particular attention to one region within the province rather than just deal with the province as an entity, allowing what may happen to happen. I have already suggested one reason, which is that it should do so because northern Ontario makes up most of the land mass of the province.

In addition, the commission, in its report, makes specific reference to northern Ontario. I wonder why it did that? Why would it feel obliged in any way to even mention northern Ontario? This leads one to suspect that the commissioners may have been somewhat troubled by what they did. The report says, in this reference, that all of the non-urban ridings in northern Ontario are below quotient. That is not even factually correct. I point to the proposed riding of Nickel Belt which is well above the quotient, at 89,392. That is a non-urban riding in northern Ontario. The commission makes special reference to northern Ontario in its report. The commissioners recognize the problem but, I submit, they have failed to respond to it. In this debate, that will go back to the commission for study, I call upon the commissioners, on behalf of the people of northern Ontario, to respond to the problem in a responsible way, in a way in which they should have responded in the first place, and not put us in this situation and through this kind of agony and uncertainty.

Earlier, I referred to the more populous southern part of the province. It is quite astounding to me, as I look at the recommendations, so-called, of the commission to note that in this relatively compact region, the remaining 20 per cent of the province, heavily populated, the commission has proposed that no less than 30 ridings be below quotient. That has to be astounding. In northern Ontario there are ridings above quotient, and that is in 80 per cent of the geography of the province, and in the southern part 30 of the seats are to be below quotient. Some of them are well below quotient, almost to the bottom of the tolerance level. That is an astounding situation.

Why should northern Ontario be given special consideration? I think the answer to that was very well provided by a representation to the commission submitted by the board of directors of the Lakehead social planning council. Let me quote what it said as follows:

> The vast hinterland ridings of northern Ontario deserve special consideration over both the urban and rural ridings to the south. Transportation and communication between communities in the north is far more difficult and indeed, in some cases, non-existent. The availability of social, medical, educational and other governmental services of all kinds falls well below that of the southern areas. Disparity in accessibility to information increases the further away from governmental centres one goes. These conditions create unusual demands on the elected representative who must often in a very direct and personal way act as the official or unofficial representative of such public services and institutions. In addition, there are the special problems of the north, development, resource management and ecology which demand constant and conscientious representation for the sake of all Canadians.
>
> For these reasons, the Lakehead Social planning council objects to the loss of parliamentary representation in this area. We appeal to you to reconsider the proposed boundaries and population figures and urge you to accede to the 25 per cent tolerance below the electoral quota in order to maintain the present level of representation.

When one seat is taken away, as the commission is proposing for northern Ontario, it means much more for the region than simply the loss of one voice in parliament, although that in itself is a serious deprivation. The member of parliament, however, is more than a solitary person. The office of a member is more like an agency providing assistance to people in a wide variety of ways. The member of parliament, the constituency office, the member's staff in Ottawa, together comprise a team to which citizens can turn for help, advice or information, as the case may be. We are not talking about a solitary person being removed; we are talking about taking away an agency or an action team serving the people of that area. It may be said that perhaps the people in a region such as northern Ontario rely more heavily on their elected representives than do those in the heavily populated centres. Because of the relatively small size of the communities—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I regret very much having to interrupt the hon. member, but I would remind the House of the special order made last week limiting speeches to 20 minutes. The hon. member may always ask for unanimous consent; then the Chair will see whether it exists.

● (1640)

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): There is not unanimous consent. The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence).

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, having been involved in the political life of this country and of the province of Ontario for longer than I would care to admit, and having been an elected representative at two levels of government for almost 20 years, I must say to you, sir, that I have seen many different forms of redistribution of political boundaries take place. I have seen abuses take place under the old system at the provincial and federal level to the point where obviously reforms had to be made.

The vehicle used by the provincial and federal administrations of this province and country, of course, involves the concept of a so-called independent commission. As I say, I have seen both bad and good redistribution. I have seen bad reports from independent commissions, and good reports. I must say to you, sir, that the current commission in the province of Ontario, to my mind certainly produced one of the worts reports I have ever seen in the form of the initial report that was brought down last year.

I must say that a complete change took place. I do not know whether it was because of representations made in respect of the crummy report of last year, but in any event in respect of southern Ontario the current commission has

brought down, generally speaking, a very excellent and very complex report which we are now debating. I think, generally speaking, in southern Ontario attention has been paid to community interests. I think the commissioners have paid attention to traditional boundaries in southern Ontario.

Also, I think they have paid great attention to the mobility of the population which is now taking place right through southern Ontario. They have been saddled with a great burden by this House. I believe they have discharged their responsibility in respect of southern Ontario in a remarkably efficient and good manner in respect of this report. However, one specific area comes to mind. Generally speaking, the commission has chopped off an extremely good Tory area to the northeast of the existing riding of Northumberland-Durham. Instead, it has been put into the new riding which they have called Cobourg-Newcastle. I will have a few words to say about that. They have included in the new riding a Cobourg-Newcastle real fighting ground in respect of the northwestern area of the new riding, the area around the old township of Reach, the town of Port Perry and the area now included in the riding of Ontario.

I would say that from a political point of view, if I had the ambition to run in the new riding of Cobourg-Newcastle, I would probably be here complaining about that as I have noticed the present member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) is complaining in an objection about which I am sure we will be hearing. Generally speaking, however, I think this is a good report. Certainly it is a common sense report. Even from a political point of view, I would have some objection to what they have done to the riding of Northumberland-Durham; but in fairness to the commission I think the addition of the old township of Reach and the old town of Port Perry in the new riding of Cobourg-Newcastle is a common sense approach because that area is now included with the rest of the area municipally which basically is a rural part of central and eastern Ontario.

I think the addition of this area completes the over-all picture of urban representation. Even though the member for Ontario may be sad to see it go, nevertheless, as a taxpayer, resident and citizen of that area I am glad to see it included because I think it adds to the over-all picture.

I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. I have two very minor—I stress the word "minor"—objections to the constituency marked No. 8 in the report which they have called Cobourg-Newcastle. I think the commission can do something about one objection. The second objection is one which I am not sure the commission can do anything about. Nevertheless, I want to comment on both minor objections in the House this afternoon. The name of riding No. 8 on the Ontario map is currently Cobourg-Newcastle. I object to that name only because of the number of objections I have received in the mail. Presumably, the commissioners chose that name because the new riding does include the new town of Newcastle and the town of Cobourg. That makes sense. However, there are many other communities in this riding. There is the town of Port Hope, for instance, and Port Perry. There are many rural municipalities in that riding.

It is not strange that I have received many objections from the citizens to the name of the riding. They object to being included in a riding which refers only to two municipalities within the constituency. If I were a member of the commission picking a new name for the riding, I think I would choose the name Durham-Northumberland, simply because the greater proportion of the new county of Northumberland is, and will be, included in the riding to the east which is currently ably represented in this House by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees). That riding, I quite agree, should be called Northumberland.

However, I point out to the commissioners that because the new riding also includes a good portion of the new county of Northumberland, "Northumberland" should be included in the new name. It is traditionally an historic name in the area and I believe it should be included in the new name of the riding. I should also point out that the new riding includes a very great portion of the regional municipality of Durham, especially the northern and eastern portion. Therefore, I think a name for the new riding that would represent the geographical area and which would calm the ruffled feathers of many people in the area who do not want necessarily to be tacked onto the town of Cobourg or the town of Newcastle, would be the reverse of the existing constituency name.

I suggest to you, sir, and to the commissioners, if they should read this debate, that the name of the new riding shown in the Ontario map as No. 8 should be Durham-Northumberland. I think that would meet the approval of all the communities and municipalities in the area.

● (1650)

My final point is simply that this is an objection to the existing report and it is one that I am not sure the commission can do anything about. It must be an objection that will recur in many areas of southern Ontario between now and when the writs are issued for a new election, and that is the problem of changing municipal boundaries between now and then.

Let me give an example. The new riding envisaged by this report has as its easterly boundary the existing town limits of the town of Cobourg. That is a good boundary to use because it fits in with the municipal boundary and people in that area know whether they are within the town boundary or outside it. I think it is a sensible approach made by the commission in respect of that eastern boundary. However, there is a move afoot to change many of the municipal boundaries in the existing county of Northumberland. One of the proposals that has been made—and I am sure that before long it will land in the lap of the Ontario municipal board—is a move by the town of Cobourg to expand the town boundaries to the north and to the east.

It is an annexation proposal because the area right now to the east of Cobourg is one that has been built up very rapidly over the last few years and is continuing to expand. Quite rightly, the municipal council of Cobourg wants to expand and take that area in to provide the needed municipal services and balanced assessment that the town needs.

My inquiry to you, sir, and my objection in respect of this matter so far as the commission is concerned is that if the town of Cobourg is going to expand, as I am sure it will, then why cannot we make the boundaries flexible so that if it happens between now and when the writs for the

election are announced, the federal riding boundary can move with the municipal boundary? I know this is pretty far fetched, and I know it raises all sorts of problems, but you can see the problem that will occur at the time of the next election, if we have one let us say around 1978, and the riding boundaries go to the existing eastern boundary of Cobourg while in the meantime Cobourg expands to the east. Then you would obviously have people within Cobourg and within the new riding who will reside and vote in the riding to the east.

My proposal is simply this. Where it is obvious there will be a change in boundaries so far as the municipality is concerned which forms part of the constituency or riding boundary, the commission should leave the matter flexible enough so that in a fairly easy way the boundaries can be changed when the municipal boundary changes. As I say, this requires some complicated manoeuvring perhaps, but in any event, as the new boundaries which we are discussing today will not become operable until writs for the new election are issued, presumably anything this parliament does can be changed before the effective date of the issuance of the writs.

I hasten to add that this is not a problem that is so earth-shaking that it will affect too much the electoral pattern in that part of the country, but I point out that in southern Ontario, especially with the great mobility of population that we now have, with the trend taking place of more and more people being resident in the urban or semi-urban area surrounding towns and cities, and with more and more of these annexations taking place whereby a municipality expands and gobbles up huge areas around it, it is a problem which I am sure will recur more and more often. I think there should be some way under our electoral laws of adjusting these matters fairly simply and quickly when the municipalities change their geographic shape.

Other than that, I think the report is a good one. As I said, I have been involved in one way or another in many of these redistributions. I must say that it is almost unbelievable to me that the same commissioners can come up with such a poor report as they did last year and a much better one this year. I do not know why they could not have come up with a good one last year; it would have saved a lot of heartache and effort. However, they must be congratulated for what they have done in southern Ontario.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Social Security—Suggested inquiry into public and private pension schemes; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Transport—Request flour and grain rail subsidies be removed only after Seaway tolls increased; the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser)—Airports—Runway extension at Vancouver—reason for minister's support of new runway within dyked portion of Sea Island.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It may not have been drawn to your attention, but I believe that at the request of the government my question which was posted for tonight has been postponed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

The House resumed consideration of objections to reports of Electoral Boundaries Commissions for various provinces.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) indicated that in his new riding of Cobourg-Newcastle he would be inheriting the area of Scugog, as it is now known, which consists of reach township, Scugog township and Port Perry. I must admit that he is a man of good judgment if he looks forward to inheriting that particular area. However, the people of that area have made very strong representations to me that they would prefer to stay in the area to which they presently belong, namely, Ontario riding.

I have indicated, not only today but previously in the presentations I made at public hearings and to the commissioners, that I should like to ensure that the Scugog area of my present riding remains part of the new riding which is presently called Durham West. I think it is important for that particular area that it remain associated with the new riding of Durham West because of its long-standing historic relationship with the Pickering area and with the old riding of Ontario.

The area of Reach and Scugog has been part of the Ontario riding for as long as I can remember, I think right back from the beginning of the riding. These people have a long-standing association with the area. The community of interest and the natural lines of communication are toward the south and to the west, as opposed to the east and southward. I believe that the commissioners really failed to adequately take into account the general disposition of the people in that area to remain associated more with the Pickering-Uxbridge area as opposed to the Cobourg-Newcastle area with which they have little, if any, association.

The second point I would like to make is in respect of the township of Georgina which is in the north end of the

riding of Ontario which has been added, under the proposals now before us, to the riding of Victoria-Haliburton. Georgina township is part of York county. It has a natural association of very long standing with the south and the west, as opposed to the north and the east. I think the commissioners have failed to give adequate consideration to the community of interest and to the natural lines of communication and association of the people of Georgina by adding it to the new, proposed riding of Victoria-Haliburton.

I made representations, along with others, in this connection when a public debate was held before the commissioners, to try to ensure that Georgina was either maintained in the existing riding of Ontario or, at the very worst, added to the south and to the west with the rest of York county.

● (1700)

The municipality, the people and the press in that area are very concerned about being associated with Victoria-Haliburton, where there is no community of interest and where in fact the riding will extend for an area of well over 200 miles. This is unacceptable to those people and I am disappointed that the commissioners did not give adequate consideration to the representations I and others made in connection with the location of Georgina township.

The third point I should like to make representations about is in respect of the name of the riding. At the time of the last election and the one prior to that, Ontario riding, as it is presently called, consisted of the township of Georgina, the municipalities of Uxbridge, Scugog, Pickering, Ajax, part of the town of Whitby, Whitby township, and part of the town of Oshawa, East Whitby township. In terms of keeping within the limits this riding could well remain exactly the same riding after redistribution as it was prior to it, and I strongly recommend that is the ideal course of action to be taken by the commissioners. However, if the commissioners deem that it should not remain toward the high element of the quotient, then Georgina should be put into the York region, not into Victoria-Haliburton, and Scugog township, consisting of the former townships of Scugog, Reach and the town of Port Perry, should be added back to the riding now termed Durham West.

Furthermore, I argue that under this redistribution the name Durham West makes no sense whatsoever. It is a very confusing name because there is a community called Durham now in riding 24 which is the new proposed riding of Grey-Bruce. I understand that the people up there resent the new region of Durham in my own area, being called by that name because of the confusion with their own community. This is further complicated by the fact that there is a provincial riding called Durham West which almost parallels the new, proposed federal riding of Durham West, and having two ridings with precisely the same name, even though in differing jurisdictions, will cause a great deal of confusion for the local electorate.

I therefore recommend that riding No. 14, presently considered to be named Durham West, should be renamed Ontario riding, or at the very least, if the representations of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham bear any fruit about the changing of the name of his riding to Durham-Northumberland, then it would make some sense simply to call the riding Durham. There is no Durham North, no Durham East, no Durham South, and no Durham at all under redistribution, and it seems a bit silly to call the one riding with the name Durham, Durham West. West of what, I do not know. I hope the commissioners will give consideration to making a change in that respect.

The next point I should like to make is with respect to the size of non-urban ridings. I think the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) illustrated the point quite well when he spoke of the importance of ridings in rural areas, particularly large rural areas, having a population toward the low end of the limit in terms of redistribution because when the geographical area is very large it is difficult for a member of parliament to provide service. People in rural areas expect better representation, or at least more direct representation, than smaller, more confined urban areas. I think the commissioners did not adequately take this factor into account in their deliberations. They should try to keep large areas down to the low end of the quotient, and urban areas should tend more to the higher end in terms of population distribution.

I agree with the hon. member for Thunder Bay that on the surface it does not make very much sense that the northern end of the province, which has large ridings, should end up losing one seat when the whole province has gained, I believe, eight or nine seats. In my opinion, that does not make any sense, and I think the point the hon. member made was well made although I have no direct interest in it. It is a point upon which I made representations before the commissioners in the public hearings to show them that the concern for the rural areas of northern Ontario and others is shared by many hon. members, even those from more urban areas in southern Ontario. I certainly hope the commissioners will give consideration to the need for some adjustment in that regard.

The last point I wish to make—and I will not belabour it—is in connection with the question of uncertainty in this act. I will be very brief indeed. Today I tried to express, in the clearest terms I knew, the central point that redistribution, in light of the allegation that the essence of the act was not complied with by the commissioners, may cause some uncertainty and possibly mean that the whole process will be set aside by the courts at some subsequent date. Some may believe that this is not a possibility. I cannot really conclude that. I personally think it is a very real possibility and I strongly suspect that the question will end up before the courts.

I simply want to express this concern to the commissioners. Although, I regret very much that they did not take time to give the reasons underlying their recommendations. I am not being critical of the commissioners per se, prior to the recommendations we see before us now, I made representations, as did almost all municipalities which I represent, and they bore a great deal of fruit. The new map we see before us reflects many of those concerns although not all of them.

Therefore, I think the commissioners have been very responsible. They have worked very hard on this job, and I think it is important that they bear in mind the difficulty we as parliamentarians and as citizens of this country may

face if this whole process is set aside by the courts. I suggested that it would be advisable to get this matter before the courts as soon as possible by way of a recommendation of a committee of the House, namely, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

It appears that this course will not be followed, at least on the basis of my question of privilege. But, hopefully, there may be some other mechanism by which a reference to the courts can be accomplished. It is unacceptable to me, and I believe to all members of this parliament who think about it carefully, and to all Canadians, to allow a redistribution of this magnitude, which provides the basis of parliament itself, to go forward without knowing that it has a solid base in law and is not subject to being set aside. I hope we can get rid of that uncertainty at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the objection which I filed set forth the areas which I respectfully suggest should be part of the proposed riding of Broadview-Greenwood. I also set forth recommendations for a revision. Therefore, I will follow the proposals and recommendations contained in the objection. In paragraph 2 I stated that the revision contained in the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario, 1973, gave a better and more accurate consideration of the geographical, historical, cultural and municipal aspects which constitute the riding. In other words, the boundaries were contained within the municipal boundaries of the city of Toronto with special attention to the northern boundary which existed from Broadview over to Woodbine Avenue, and they took into account the historical, social and community of interest aspects. That is why I did not object to the 1973 report. In fairness, the boundaries reminded me of a jig-saw puzzle. In 1976 an attempt was made to simplify the jig-saw. I said in paragraph (1) of my objection that in revising the boundaries of Broadview the commission did not give due consideration to the geographical, historical, cultural and municipal aspects which constitute the riding.

● (1710)

I hope my remarks will be considered as constructive criticism. I appreciate the difficulties the commission has encountered in attempting to determine boundary ridings in Ontario. It is difficult to keep in mind at all times community of interest, municipal boundaries and population. I made three specific proposals. I say in paragraph (3) of my objection:

> That part of the proposed Rosedale riding south of Queen Street and extending from Broadview Avenue east to Leslie Street forms an integral and composite part of the Broadview riding area immediately to the north of the above described area and extending from Queen Street to Gerrard Street and from Broadview to Greenwood Avenue. These combined geographical areas constitute a community of interests in geographical, cultural, social, religious and shopping interests.

Clearly, the area south of Queen Street, extending from Broadview Avenue over to Leslie Street, forms an integral and composite part of the area to the north, up to Gerrard Avenue and extending from Broadview over to Greenwood Avenue. The people of the area shop at a common shopping area within the confines of Queen Street, Gerrard, Broadview and Greenwood. They all use the same social and community centres; they all enjoy a similar community of interest; they all have access to the Jimmy Simpson, Woodgreen and Pape recreational centres. There are five or six churches in the area, Woodgreen United, St. Stephen's, Queen Street Presbyterian, St. Joseph's, St. Anne's and St. Clement's. The children of the area attend the same schools. That is why one can say that the people of the area enjoy a community of interest in their shopping, social lives and churchgoing.

The Don River provides the line dividing the people of Broadview from people to the west. People living to the west of Broadview and Queen tend to form part of the Rosedale riding. That is why I object to the part south of Queen, from Broadview to Leslie, being included in Rosedale. Historically and traditionally, the people of Rosedale have had no community of interest with the people encompassed in the area bounded by Broadview and Leslie south of Queen. Therefore, the people of the area should have available the type of representation available to those who live immediately north of Queen Street.

The commissioners may argue that the part south of Queen Street forms part of the provincial riding of St. David's. In arguing this way, the commission is thinking of the area between Broadview and Logan Avenue. Well, I have heard many people objecting to that idea. They do not feel part of the provincial riding. It has been my experience that people living south of Queen, between Broadview east, over as far as Leslie, come to me with constituency problems. They do not feel they belong to the provincial riding of St. David's or to the federal riding of Rosedale. I say in paragraph (4) of my objection:

> That a revision could be accomplished by making the proposed area of Rosedale described in paragraph (3) part of the riding of Broadview-Greenwood and by substituting the area commencing on the north side of Broadview and Mortimer Avenues and extending easterly on the north side of Mortimer Avenue to Pape Avenue and northerly on the west side of Pape Avenue to Millwood Road in the municipality of East York as part of the proposed riding of Rosedale.

This recommendation is almost the same as the commission's recommendation in their 1973 report and constitutes a geographical, cultural, municipal and community of interest area of the northeast part of the proposed riding of Rosedale. You can see what I have done. I have gone from the Don River to Pottery Road, gone up Pottery Road and used the Mortimer-Broadview site as the starting point for the revision. All the people of the proposed area enjoy a community of interest with the people in the Millwood-Southvale area. They shop at common shopping centres, frequent the same community centres, and so on. My next proposal concerns the Beaches area. I said in paragraph (5):

> That part of the proposed riding of Beaches commencing at Jones Avenue and Queen Street and running north on the east side of Jones Avenue to Gerrard Street and extending east on the south side of Gerrard Street to Greenwood and extending south on the west side of Greenwood to Queen Street constitutes an integral and community of interest area within the general area extending from Greenwood and Gerrard Street on the east, to Broadview Avenue and Gerrard Street on the west and south from Gerrard Street to Lakeshore Boulevard East.

The area mentioned constitutes the south end of the riding. In other words, the people living in the area bounded by Gerrard Street on the north, Lake Shore Boulevard on the south, Broadview Avenue on the west and Greenwood Avenue on the east enjoy a community of interest, attend the same churches, schools, social centres and shopping areas. I said in paragraph (6):

That a revision could be accomplished by making part of the proposed riding of Beaches described in paragraph (5) part of the riding of Broadview-Greenwood by substituting the area commencing at the south side of Mortimer and Greenwood Avenues and extending easterly on the south side of Mortimer Avenue to Woodbine Avenue to form part of the proposed riding of Beaches.

Mr. Otto, the former member, argued similarly in 1967 when seeking a revision of electoral boundaries. He knew that the area north of Danforth Avenue, especially north of Mortimer, should for the most part be considered as belonging to the township of East York. Therefore, the people of the area had a community of interest. I suggest that we should use a common northern boundary of Mortimer Avenue for the proposed ridings of Broadview-Greenwood and Beaches. It gets away from the awkward jig-saw that was attempting to be made in the 1973 report with regard to following the city limit line right from Broadview on the west to Woodbine on the east. The third suggestion is contained in paragraph (7). It reads:

● (1720)

That part of the proposed riding of Broadview-Greenwood north of the limits of the city of Toronto and extending to the Don River on the north and also extending to Greenwood on the east and Broadview on the west does not give due consideration to the municipal, geographical, historical, cultural and community of interests aspects of the area.

I have made the following suggestion in paragraph (8) by way of a revision:

In addition to the revision recommended in paragraph (4) above a further revision could be accomplished by making part of the proposed area of Broadview-Greenwood described in paragraph (7) commencing on the north side of Pape and Mortimer Avenues and extending easterly on the north side of Mortimer Avenue to Greenwood Avenue and thence northerly on the west side of Greenwood Avenue to Donlands and Pape Avenues and thence southerly on the east side of Pape Avenue to Mortimer Avenue to be part of the proposed riding of York East.

This recommendation is almost the same as the commission's recommendation in their 1973 report and constitutes a municipal, cultural, and community of interests area with part of the proposed riding of York East.

I sum up my proposals in paragraph (9) by saying:

That the three recommendations contained herein constitute a better geographical, municipal, cultural and community of interest integration of the general area, minimize the movement of people from the former ridings to the newly-proposed ridings and correspond to the electoral quota for the province of Ontario.

In other words, for the proposed riding of Broadview-Greenwood there would be a northern boundary from Broadview to Greenwood, a southern boundary of Lakeshore, an eastern boundary of Greenwood Avenue and Leslie Street and a western boundary of Broadview Avenue. With regard to the proposed Beaches riding, there would be a northern boundary of Mortimer Avenue, a southern boundary of Lakeshore, an eastern boundary of the city limits, and a western boundary of Greenwood. That would form a better riding geographically, historically and from the standpoint of community of interest.

What I have done is take into account the population quotient with regard to the three suggestions I have made. The proposed riding of Broadview-Greenwood now has a population of 89,900. With the Rosedale change, there would be a loss of 8,800 and a gain of 6,775, giving a net loss of 2,025. With regard to Beaches, there would be a gain of 5,650. With regard to York East, there would be a loss of 6,670. Therefore, the new total for the proposed Broadview-Greenwood riding would be approximately 87,000. However, there has to be added to that three new apartments which have been built since the census was taken in 1971. They are on the west side of Broadview just south of Mortimer Avenue. There is also a new apartment in the Cambridge area just east of Broadview and Danforth Avenue. Those four apartments would constitute at least 2,000 people, making a grand total for Broadview-Greenwood of 89,000.

With regard to the proposed riding of Beaches, there would be going to Beaches from East York 7,300, and going from Beaches to Broadview, 5,650, giving a net gain of 1,650 and a new total for the proposed Beaches riding of 92,300. With regard to Rosedale, there would be a gain of 8,800 and a loss of 6,775, giving a net gain of 2,025 and a new total for Rosedale of 89,800. Finally, with regard to East York there would be a gain of 6,770 and a loss of 7,300, giving a net loss of 530 and a new total for York East of 90,250.

If these suggestions were accepted it would help the proposed riding of Broadview-Greenwood. It would give parallel lines to the riding. It would help the riding of Beaches with regard to the community of interest aspect and give parallel lines to the riding. It would give a common boundary to the north of Mortimer Avenue for both the proposed Beaches and proposed Broadview-Greenwood ridings. It would give Rosedale the community of interest and the lines proposed in the 1973 report, with a slight modification. Those are the main aspects with regard to the proposals. With regard to the name, in paragraph (10) I state:

That the proposed riding name of Broadview-Greenwood be named Broadview to more accurately describe the constituency and to avoid confusion.

The area from Broadview on the west to Greenwood on the east is generally known as the Broadview area. It would create confusion by adding the word Greenwood because the present Greenwood riding is being replaced by the proposed riding of Beaches. The only part of Greenwood that is in the proposed new riding of Broadview-Greenwood is the west side of Greenwood. It really is not enough to suggest the change. Greenwood has a history of starting at Greenwood Avenue and going east. Usually it went over as far Victoria Park or to the city limits. The people of the present riding of Broadview and the present riding of Greenwood know these names. We would be adding confusion by merging the name Greenwood with Broadview in the new, proposed riding.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him by the special order made on Friday has expired.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to make a lengthy intervention at this point. I was a member of this House in 1964 when the legislation establishing the independent commissions to reapportion was created. I think it is something of a reflection on parliament that today, in 1976, we are debating redistribution based upon the results of the census of 1971, nearly five years ago. Indeed, another census will take place in June of

this year. It will again be some time before the results of that census can be reflected.

● (1730)

I can only say I hope the commission will do its job and not make any substantial changes from this point on. There is no question that boundaries, wherever drawn, will always create problems. There is some difference of opinion between myself, as the member for Ottawa West, and my colleague who represents the adjacent riding of Ottawa Centre. I believe my colleague has added his name to those who are making objection to redistribution. Unfortunately, he is not able to attend this afternoon.

Briefly, the objection concerned my easterly boundary and his westerly boundary. The proposal placed before the House not long ago by the commission would have created an easterly boundary for Ottawa West following Fisher Avenue, Carling, along Holland Avenue to the Queensway, and easterly along the Queensway a distance of one mile to the point of intersection with the Canadian Pacific Railway track. That, to my mind, was a good boundary. It reflected the social and cultural characteristics of the community. In the latest proposal, the commission has seen fit to make a modest change. They have extended the boundary along Holland Avenue northerly to Wellington Street and then easterly along Wellington Street to the point of intersection with the CP railway track. This change splits a well-known and historic parish in two—the Parish of St. Francis. It is situated on the south side of Wellington Street and covers a fairly substantial area.

It is my opinion there is no further logical boundary to be considered other than that contained in the most recent proposal. When we cross Wellington Street, the language changes; the district becomes generally French-speaking. The parish of Notre Dame des Anges, north of Scott Street, is more recent than the parish of St. Francis and serves a large part of that community. On balance, it is my hope that the commission will not make any further changes in this boundary. I do not believe they could come up with more logical or more consistent proposals.

There is a point at which we must face the fact that redistribution does not represent one of the more glorious efforts of parliament. It is, in a way, an embarrassment to all of us who are concerned. The act of redistribution has contributed the word gerrymandering to our vocabulary. It was not very long ago that boundaries assumed the outlines, as it were, of strange or fictitious animals. I hope the commission will get on with its job. Although the boundaries are not the ones I would have chosen, I, personally, find that on balance they make as much sense and are as logical and I hope they will not be changed further by the commission.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Blais: No, Mr. Speaker. I was wishing to take part in the debate and I was under the impression I was next on your list.

[Mr. Francis.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): My position is a difficult one when there is so much enthusiasm around. The Chair is doing its best to co-operate with the whips of the various parties. The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid).

Mr. John Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, the enthusiasm with which members participate in this debate is understandable. I wish to speak briefly about some of the problems we have in northern Ontario in connection with the decision of the commission to reduce the number of seats there from 12 to 11.

We thought in 1965, when the former commission came out with its recommendation to increase the number of seats from 11 to 12, that northwestern and northeastern Ontario had been recognized for the growing and developing areas they are. I might point out that considerable distortions were created as a result of the addition of that seat in the traditional pattern of representation which had existed until that time. I must admit there was some grumbling about this distortion. Nonetheless, it was accepted, and as things turned out the new seat proved to be a tremendous addition, giving representation to areas which had not been as well represented in the past because they had been tied in with people living in city ridings, and those living in the rural areas felt their interests had taken second place. So we were shocked to find that northern Ontario would lose one seat in the new redistribution proposals.

Consequently, the Liberal members from northern Ontario came together to work out a map, and that map was presented by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) to the commissioners when they held their meeting in Thunder Bay. To demonstrate that it was possible to do things in another way, the northern Ontario members drew up a second map. This time we showed it to members of other parties who came from northwestern Ontario and obtained their agreement that it did provide a way of getting a twelfth seat for northern Ontario, although they did not commit themselves to the particular boundaries which were drawn on that map. It was my pleasure to present that map to the commissioners at the meeting in Sudbury. I might say I also attended the meeting held at Thunder Bay and had spoken there, too, on the need for 12 seats in northern Ontario. So we showed the commission two ways in which it could accomplish our goal of keeping northern Ontario's representation at 12 seats.

We thought this was not unreasonable, because as a result of the changes which had taken place in the number of seats in parliament there would be an increase of seven seats in Ontario and it was not an unreasonable thought that this would provide sufficient flexibility to enable the commission to allocate the extra seat to us or continue the 12 seats. In addition, the House of Commons had passed a private member's bill which gave primacy to the need for keeping rural seats up to date by removing the necessity for the commission to take cognizance of growth patterns in the suburban areas of cities.

We thought the combination of those two factors would provide the opportunity for the 12 seats to be retained. We recognize that if there is to be a twelfth seat, there must be distortion, there must be changes in the normal pattern of redistribution. Nonetheless, the geographical dimensions

of the region, some 60 per cent of the land mass, indicates to me that there has to be a more reasonable division of the seats allocated. At present, two seats represent almost all that 60 per cent. Those seats are the constituency of Cochrane and the constiuency of Kenora-Rainy River. With such a vast area to be covered, there really ought to have been a third seat encompassing a substantial rural area.

At present, the two members concerned face an almost impossible task travelling around and trying to provide adequate representation for electors who live in all of northeastern and northwestern Ontario covered by those two seats. The latest proposals of the commission will mean a substantial dilution of the representation the electors affected had come to expect as a result of the decision of the previous commission to go from 11 seats to 12 seats.

Again I want to emphasise the desire on the part of all the members from northern Ontario, as well as those people who appeared at the commission's hearings, to accept the distortions which must occur if there are to be twelve seats in northern Ontario. We acknowledge the problem facing the commission. We understand the difficulty they face in carving out twelve seats when the population figure is barely above the number required to make 12 seats according to the act. Nevertheless, we urge the commission to take into account the arguments which have been put forward by the hon. member for Thunder Bay and the arguments I have put forward on this occasion.

● (1740)

I want also to touch on another aspect that was raised by the hon. members for Thunder Bay and Ontario. I refer to the question of giving reasons for the decisions arrived at. I think it is clear that nobody expected there to be detailed reasons for the drawing of every line in every constituency. What we did expect and what was anticipated was that where a major change was taking place, where there was significant alteration in the previous pattern of representation, the commission would have recognized what was being done and provided the rationale that would permit adequate debate to take place among those of the population who chose to appear before the commission at the public hearings. It was that intention that led the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) to present his motion, and I think it was that intention that led the House of Commons to accept it and pass it into law.

In the case of northern Ontario, where a substantial alteration is taking place in the representation available to those who live in that region, no reasons at all were given. It seems to me that the intent of the amendment passed by the House was violated because the commission did not choose to take it into account in giving reasons why it found it necessary to make the change. Who knows, perhaps had the commission put down its reasons and outlined the thoughts and desires they had in reducing the number of seats in northern Ontario from 12 to 11, it would not have been possible for us to argue against its reasons and excuses. As it turns out, because no reason was given, when we made our presentation to the commission in Thunder Bay and Sudbury we did not know what kind of case we had to make. It was for that reason that the House provided the legislation to ensure that there be proper debate. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, it may be that the reasons were so compelling and the commission's conclusions were so logical that we would have had no arguments to present against them in any case. In point of fact, since we had no reasons we have had great difficulty in formulating arguments to influence the commission in the way we wish.

In closing my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the argument that the pattern in previous commissions has been to provide us with the extra seat. This commission has reversed that decision and not given us reasons. Those of us who represent northwestern and northeastern Ontario, and those among the population who appeared before the commissions in Sudbury and Thunder Bay, all expressed a willingness to accept the inevitable distortions that must take place to keep the 12 seats. We respectfully appeal to the commission to re-examine the situation, to reverse the decision they made and to provide 12 seats in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of trepidation that I join in this particular debate, in view of the fact that I have my neighbour to the south chastising me for coming into this debate late. I will await with anticipation his golden remarks when he speaks in this debate, though how anyone with such a charming riding is interested in placing objections, I cannot imagine.

With reference to the riding of Nipissing, very early on I showed interest in the question of redistribution. Your Honour may recall that in January, 1973, which was my first session, we had been dealing with redistribution and I spoke in the debate at that time, primarily because, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) and the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), there was an attempt to reduce the number of seats in northern Ontario from 12 to 10.

At that time I felt the commissioners were being as fair as they could, being stuck with instruments that were not adequate to do the job. I had hoped that having redistribution frozen, as it was, a new redistribution could be brought in that would do justice to northern Ontario. I felt that northern Ontario, more than any other part of Canada, exemplified the problem posed by redistribution, namely, that as a rural area it suffered from a reduction in its representative efficiency as a result of redistribution.

At a later time I proposed a private member's bill whereby commissioners would be permitted to deviate downward from the provincial norm of 25 per cent to 35 per cent. It was my hope that with that amendment to the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act there would be the possibility that the commissioners would provide 12 seats in northern Ontario, notwithstanding the lesser proportionate increase in population in the area south of Lake Nipissing and the French River.

If I recall correctly, I was discouraged from proceeding with that bill by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, because it was believed that if there were a general increase in the total number of seats in the House of Commons, we in northern Ontario would be in the position where there would be no reduction in seats. So, effectively, the aberration that took place as a result of the first report,

namely, the 11 seats eventually granted by the commissioners, would in effect not need to take place.

It was, therefore, with a great deal of anticipation that I awaited the new commissioners' report after the amendments to the constitution which increased the total number of seats in the House. Thus, you can imagine my consternation and dismay when the commissioners again reduced the number of seats from 12 to 11, although the total number of seats in Ontario was increased from 88 to 95. In effect, southern Ontario was given another eight seats; northern Ontario, covering 80 per cent of the total land mass in Ontario, had its seats reduced in number from 12 to 11.

I was not alone in my disappointment, Mr. Speaker. Not only did the commission reduce the number of seats, but they did not provide for protection of community of interest. We were caught in the position where the commission, prior to the public hearing was saying, "We can only provide you, in northern Ontario, with 11 seats, not 12". We replied that the commission had to keep the 12 seats in northern Ontario, so they said to us, "What would you rather have, the community of interest protected so that the people who are represented by one MP are attached to their representation in terms of logistics, communications, community of interest, social development, and so on; or do you want 12 seats?" We said that we wanted both, Mr. Speaker, and they gave us neither. They did not give us community of interest nor the 12 seats, and we are caught between hell and high water.

It is very unfortunate that this happened because I think northern Ontario has not changed in its make-up. It is still a typical example of how the power of parliament and the power of representation is evolving toward urban areas, where urbanization is taking its toll of members of the House. Because northern Ontario has a huge land mass but a relatively small population increase, it is being relegated to the position of second importance. There is no doubt in my mind that the representations which were made to the commissioners ought to have been listened to by them. When the initial report tabled in August, 1975, came out, I insisted that my communities have an input in order to make known their representations.

● (1750)

When the commissioners came out with their report, they cut off the whole northwestern portion of my riding. Coming from highly-developed areas in eastern Canada where populations are present in every segment of the province, you are not aware of the size of northern Ontario or how disjointed the populations can be. There is a section of my riding, namely, River Valley-Field, the townships of Springer and Caldwell, which are traditionally part of my riding but are now being put in with the district of Timiskaming which stretches between Moosonee, that northwest passage so sought by Champlain in 1615, and Highway 17, some 900 miles to the south. I am looking at the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and I know the only way he is going to service that riding is by paddling a canoe up the Oricana River, down to Lake Timiskaming and down the Ottawa system. He is taking over a portion of my riding in the northeast, as well, that can only be serviced via Lake Timiskaming and the Ottawa River, or Highway 63 which goes through my riding.

An abortion of that nature is not deserved by the citizens or the electors of the district. I know the hon. member for Timiskaming is a very able representative, and I am not speaking of that at all. I am saying that this does not stand any scrutiny, having people within 40 miles north of the centre of my riding served by someone who is centred some 60 miles by water and a 120 miles by road. Nor does it stand to reason to have someone in River Valley, which is serviced by Highway 539, served by someone who is 120 miles away over really rough roads. If you have seen the neglect of the Ontario government vis-à-vis highways in northern Ontario, you have seen nothing until you travel between Highway 11 up River Valley to Glenafton and in that area. Not only did the commission cut off that particular area but it cut in half two townships in my riding. The southern halves are left with me and the northern halves are going up to Timiskaming.

I received a letter from the Corporation of Field Township which I should like to put on the record.

[*Translation*]

It is in fact a letter which describes specific problems faced by people who now belong to an area with which they have no link, no historical relationship whatsoever. I was sent this letter dated March 23, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

Dear Mr. Blais:

The municipal council of the township of Field has learned with bitterness and great consternation the decision made by the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission. We are strongly opposed to this decision to divide the western part of the Nipissing constituency. We expressed our views on this matter in a brief submitted to the commission last fall.

We are still insisting on cultural, economic and community relationships that link together the five municipalities of West Nipissing. The new proposed division would have disastrous effects on our region. The citizens' reactions to this decision are in support of our request for reconsideration of this adverse decision and we hope to come back to a status quo, in the best interests of the community of West Nipissing.

Sincerely yours,

Roger Lafond,
for Dr. N. Patenaude,
Municipal Prefect.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the fear felt by these people not to be incorporated in the are that can best serve them. No matter how able their member of parliament, these people are concerned by regional and geographical unity.

I also received a letter from the Association of West Nipissing Municipalities. This association groups all the small towns of the western part of my riding. They have acted together and succeeded in making changes that are quite remarkable by taking their decisions together.

I will therefore read two paragraphs of their letter dated March 15:

[*English*]

We have now received a final report of the commission, dated February 27, 1976, and to our surprise and bewilderment, the West Nipissing electoral district has been guillotined, half of West Nipissing will be taken over by the district of Temiskaming.

The members of our association are very displeased with this decision, and the implications are far reaching. In fact this proposed division not only divides the few municipalities in two distinct districts, but certain townships are divided in half. We are at odds to find any logic in this decision.

Because of common problems, we had banded together in order to solve our problems, and by working together, we have been having excellent results. But with this proposed new division, our efforts will be nullified.

In all humility, I left a small portion of that paragraph out as it was complimentary to me. I am sure the House will understand. When I look at those particular pieces of correspondence it becomes evident why the section relating to community of interest was placed in the statute, but unfortunately it was not abided by.

Let me reiterate my second point. All rural members for ridings in northern Ontario as well as in northern Canada are faced with a dire and crucial problem, namely, the erosion of our power within this House because our numbers are disproportionate vis-à-vis members representing urban ridings, so much so that urban members now accept their right to control the destiny not only of their urban or high-growth centres but of the whole of the nation.

I was amazed last week, on March 29, when the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) participated in a debate regarding constitutional reform. Let me quote what he said as recorded in *Hansard* for that date at page 12238:

The rate of urbanization is nothing short of a phenomenon. Before the end of this century, 94 per cent of Canadians will be urbanized and three-quarters will live in 12 major cities. Urbanization is caused by an interlocking set of developments spawned by exploding technology. Government efforts must be directed toward managing the process of urbanization. The special problems of urbanization—public assistance, transportation, environmental management, leisure, recreation and housing—interact on one another and demand more money which municipalities have no way of raising, thus exacerbating their dependence on provincial and federal government grants.

The quality of life in urban centres is diminishing, despite local efforts; the institutional framework of government was established long before the social impact of urbanization was ever dreamed of.

That was said during a constitutional debate. In what direction was that hon. member moving? He was seeking an amendment to the constitution which would give more power to the municipalities. What else would he be after, and who is there to resist that sort of pressure? After all, rural members are being eliminated as a result of this decennial redistribution, which to my mind is silly and premature.

We are rapidly approaching the time of the Conference on Human Settlements in Vancouver. I am looking at the notes for a speech to the Montreal Rotary Club by a Mr. Jim MacNeill, commissioner general, Canadian Habitat secretariat. What does he tell the Rotary Club? Does he say that Habitat has to look at various problems, including that of urbanization? No, he says that "we in Canada must confront our own exploding urbanization". He is saying we have to look at how we will deal with those problems. He continues:

● (1800)

Few Canadians realize it, but we—in common with other developed countries—will have to build as many new communities in the next three decades as we have in our entire history.

He recognizes urban explosion as an irreversible fact. He says that in respect of the human settlement at this conference we ought not to look at how we should reverse the trend toward urbanization. He says it is a known fact which must be accepted. He goes on:

This is unprecedented—in terms of scale and rate of growth. We, fortunately, have the skills to turn this into a great opportunity, providing we learn from the experience of other nations.

Habitat gives us that chance. At Habitat we can begin a process of exchange with other countries about managing urban growth, about transit systems, about housing designs, about all kinds of things. We must seize that chance.

What will the commissioners of Habitat for Canada talk about in Vancouver? According to the commissioner, they will talk about urban problems, not human settlements in rural Ontario, rural Quebec, rural Alberta, or northern development which is essential to this particular nation and its continued development. They will talk about urban explosion and urban development as though that were the primary concern of Canada. That sort of misconception about Canadian growth is directly attributable to the decrease in the importance of rural representation in this House and the increasing representation from southern portions of Canada and the urban centres of Alberta, and so on.

When I see this, I have a great deal of trepidation. I said that at the beginning of my speech. We are not dealing with figures and how to elect members; we are dealing with development because, surely, if we believe in democracy we also believe in the fundamental strength of representation from all areas of Canada. That strength is being dissipated when we see that by the turn of the century 94 per cent of Canadians will live in 12 urban areas. Unless we change the instruments available to the commissioners, 94 per cent of the representation in this House will be urban. Those areas which have made the wealth of this nation, through raw materials and the processing of those materials and through agricultural products which are the products of rural Canada, will be given second place.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the parliamentary secretary, but his time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does he have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Due to the fact that the House is sitting during the dinner hour, I might mention that I propose to call the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), in that order.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in making my comments this evening I perhaps will not have as much in the way of volume as my predecessor in speaking in this debate, but perhaps I can stick to the topic rather than to philosophy. I should like to draw to the attention of members of this House and, hopefully, the commissioners, the constituency marked No. 40 on the map called Lanark-Carleton. As the representative in that area, and as a person who spoke in making representations before the commission at one stage on behalf of certain municipalities in that area, I should like to urge the commissioners to consider the name Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton rather than Lanark-Carleton.

The reason is that there has been some community of interest between Lanark and Renfrew for many years and a community of interest between Carleton and Renfrew. In fact, Lanark, Renfrew and Carleton represent three historic counties in that area which came from the district of Bathurst. Within the boundary of the constituency marked 40 on the map there will be three townships, two towns and three villages of some size within that portion which is part of Renfrew county which will be included in constituency No. 40.

I ask the commission to consider the name Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton rather than Lanark-Carleton because I believe the poeple in that portion of Renfrew county are interested in being recognized. I know that subsequently the members may have private members' bills passed to change the names of constituencies with relative ease, but I think it would be better to try to finalize the names now in order to avoid the excess of printing involved in the changing of names on maps, and so on, at a later stage. In dealing with the riding marked 40, I have no further comments to make.

I have spoken to a number of people, especially those in eastern Ontario who, relatively speaking, are quite pleased with the redistribution. I know it is very difficult for a boundaries commission to give effect to redistribution within the guidelines, within the bounds of community of interest and within the parameters of population in respect of the divisions. It is interesting to note that in most areas throughout Ontario the commissioners have tried to respond to the criticisms and comments made at the commission hearings.

Having been chairman of the Conservative caucus for the province of Ontario, and having had to keep on eye on many of the areas in which people were interested, it would seem to me that the commission has given effect to the various concerns expressed by the municipalities and by the sitting member from whatever party, as much as it was possible to do so within the concept of community of interest within the population. Nothing is perfect in this world. There are a number of small technical errors. Some people would like to bring up some points.

I should like to mention the position I take in giving an over view on the province of Ontario. One thing that concerns me happens to deal with the constituency of Sault Ste. Marie. It has been drawn to my attention that there is a division of people within Sault Ste. Marie noted as No. 70 on the map, known as the constituency of Algoma. I have here a letter which I should like to read into the record. It is from the provincial member for Sault Ste. Marie who directs his attention to the fact that part of the city would be split in a set-off against the large rural riding of Algoma. Ward 1 on the map now before us of Sault Ste. Marie, which would be called Algoma ward 1, is the area of Sault Ste. Marie which has the highest density and greatest number of residential streets. This is the area in which 10,000 or 11,000 of the people of Sault Ste. Marie live. The letter reads:

Dear Mr. Dick:

As a member of parliament from Ontario, you no doubt are concerned about any matters that would have an adverse effect on the province and it is with this in mind that I bring the following to your attention.

[Mr. Dick.]

It is my understanding that the Electoral Boundaries Commission has recommended part of the City of Sault Ste. Marie be removed from the federal riding as it is now constituted and transferred to Algoma riding.

This in effect would remove 11,000 city residents from Sault Ste. Marie's federal election rolls, an action which I feel would be highly regrettable due to the urban nature of the riding.

I would point out that consideration was given to a similar proposal prior to the recent redistribution of provincial ridings but it was decided that it would be a serious error to tamper with the close urban ties this portion of the riding has with the rest of Sault Ste. Marie.

● (1810)

Even though this is a federal matter, I have received numerous complaints from people within this portion of the riding and this has prompted me to solicit your support when the matter comes up for debate in the House.

Your assistance in this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

John R. Rhodes

He is the MPP for the area. To give more effect to this, I would like to read into the record a copy of the resolution passed by the council of the corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie on March 22, 1976. It was moved by Alderman F. Manzo, seconded by Alderman R. Collins. It reads:

Whereas a report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission tabled in the House of Commons on Friday, February 27, 1976, would split and decrease the Sault riding by 11,000 voters; Therefore be it resolved that city council go on record as being opposed on the grounds that they are basically different ridings by nature, Algoma being rural and the Sault being predominantly industrial and that this resolution be forwarded to the relevant federal ministry as well as to Cyril Symes, MP, Dr. Maurice Foster, MP, John R. Rhodes, MPP, and Bud Wildman, MPP; and, further, that this city council go on record as opposing the elimination of the complete Cochrane riding.

I received a copy of this resolution and I read it for the record. I took it upon myself to talk to a number of people in Sault Ste. Marie about this problem because I wanted to make sure it came before the House. It appears that ward 1 is the area south of the Canadian Pacific railway, east of Churchill Boulevard and west of the city limits where it goes into the Garland River Indian reserve, with a small sliver being north of CP railway, the area goes right down to the Canada-U.S. border.

This is the area about which they were worried, and indeed it was suggested to me that this area is the heart and core of the major bedroom area of the city of Sault Ste. Marie, and if any decision had to be made that a portion of the city should not be included because of the population, that part of the city which would be west of Gooleigh Avenue would perhaps be excluded. I was informed that that is the area which has recently been annexed by the city. A large part of the area is still rural, many of the houses are scattered along the roads and are not tightly held together. It does not have the same community of interest as there is in ward 1, with the present redistribution going to the Algoma riding rather than staying with Sault Ste. Marie. So I want to emphasize that there was some concern. I will read a portion of another letter from a Mr. De Fazio of Sault Ste. Marie which states in part:

I am quite concerned that they are cutting off about one third of our city and putting it in the riding of Algoma East, which is predominantly a rural riding—This is very important to the future of Sault Ste. Marie riding.

Then he expresses a hope that this will not happen. There are another couple of points which I wanted to make

briefly. One is that there seems to be a great deal of concern about the fact that there is not enough population in northern Ontario and they are losing one seat in the area. Unfortunately, I cannot comment on the whole of northern Ontario. We in this party have not had representation in northern Ontario since 1935 and perhaps I am not in a position to speak of it knowingly, but I do know Renfrew county, and to some degree Nipissing and some of the more urban areas in northern Ontario. One way in which the population was decreased was that certain townships, three to be exact, named Mattawan, Papineau and Cameron, were taken from the district of Nipissing and added to Renfrew county and to the new riding No. 65 to be known as Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke. I note that there are almost 5,000 people involved in the town of Mattawa and these communities are part of the district of Nipissing. They are only 38 miles from the city of North Bay, whereas they are about 90 miles from Pembroke which is the heart and core of Renfrew county.

Indeed, the map is a very odd map in that this new constituency, No. 65 of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke would end up being about the largest constituency in southern Ontario, taking in half of Algonquin park, but in population the great bulk of it would be in the Deep River, Chalk River, Pembroke-Renfrew area, with a long highway line, Highway 17, which would then connect it to Mattawa some 90 miles away from the centre of the community.

I have had representations from people in the Mattawa area that their community is in Nipissing and North Bay; they do not come to Pembroke. I realize that the commission received representations from the council that they wanted to be with Pembroke. I can only indicate that four members of the council happened to be on the executive of the association of the present member for Renfrew North-Nipissing East (Mr. Hopkins) and that this is how it came about that the council passed the resolution. If northern Ontario will get those extra seats, they need all the population they can get. This does not enhance the Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke riding. It makes it the largest population in a rural riding in southern Ontario, with some 85,000 people, and it seems to be inconsistent with the number of representations I have received.

I want to bring it to the attention of the commission that the township of Cameron from 1867 to 1892, along with Papineau and Mattawan, were actually part of the riding of Algoma. From 1892 until 1924 all three of them were part of the federal constituency of Nipissing. From 1924 until the present, Cameron, the most easterly township, was part of Renfrew, but Papineau and Mattawan were never associated with Pembroke in a federal electoral district until 1966. So historically they have always belonged in the other area.

There is one other area to which I want to draw attention. That is constituency No. 78 which we are now discussing and which is known as Stormont-Dundas. For the first time, on this second map and in the present redistribution the township of Charlottenburgh was included in the constituency of Stormont-Dundas with the rest of the community. Historically, Charlottenburgh has been with the other four townships in the county of Glengarry, Kenyon, Lancaster and Lochiel. From 1867 until 1915 this was the federal riding of Glengarry. From 1915 until 1924 these four townships, added to Stormont, made up the federal riding of Glengarry-Stormont.

● (1820)

From 1924 to 1952 those four townships as a block were in the riding of Glengarry, from 1952 to 1966 they were in the federal riding of Glengarry-Prescott, and from 1966 to the present time those four townships, together as a block, have been in the federal riding of Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. It seems odd that they now take that one township, break it away from its historical base and lower the population in riding No. 23, Glengarry-Prescott, to 66,074—by just the few people who happen to live there—to increase the Stormont-Dundas riding to 84,578. If that township were left with the other three in the county of Glengarry, it would continue the historical tradition and it would balance out those ridings more equitably. I wanted to bring that to the attention of this House and subsequently to the attention of the commission.

A few comments have already been made dealing with the township of Dunnville which is included in the new constituency of Erie which is No. 17 on the map. The suggestion has been that it should go to No. 27 which is to be known as Haldimand-Norfolk on the map we are dealing with. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles) that the name change be completed here, but also that Dunnville has a historical relationship and that is the area in which the people from Dunnville would like to be with regard to representation at the federal level.

I can only concur in that to the extent that the same type of representations have come to my attention and I indicated that I would be glad to pass them on to the commission via this debate in the House of Commons. But there might be a problem with regard to how many people would be left in the constituency of Erie as a result of moving one township.

I hope the commission will be able to change the name of the constituency of Lanark-Carleton, No, 40 on the map, to Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton.

I think that is all the time I have to put my representations on the record. I believe the commission has had an extraordinarily difficult task to perform. In the main, I think it has tried to listen to the objections and to put recommendations into effect. In general, I think the commission has done an excellent job throughout Ontario with the material and the guidelines it has been given. It is a complement to the commission that it has been able to do so. Sometimes we politicians think we are put into a difficult position. I can say that I prefer to be a politician rather than a commissioner who cannot reply. It seems we are always kicking them because they have not kept in mind community of interest, size of population, size of riding or whatever. I think the commissioners have done an excellent job within the guidelines to which they were confined.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take long in the House today speaking about the redistribution of the riding of Essex-Windsor. I will try to outline my concerns. I am concerned because the townships of Colchester North, Colchester

South and the town of Harrow are being removed from the riding. The people of those towns feel that they were not consulted about the fact that they are going to be in the new riding or Essex-Kent. They have been a part of the riding I have represented since I came to the House of Commons in 1962 in the old riding of Essex South. Since redistribution has taken place before, and they stayed in the same riding, which is Essex-Windsor according to the first maps which were published, they were under the impression that they were going to remain in that riding, so they had no way of knowing that they were being considered for redistribution.

I will be losing some of the most intensive agricultural and productive parts of my riding if those areas go into the other riding. I gain no new area under redistribution; I only lose areas because of the size of my riding. Parts of the city of Windsor are being taken away. I maintain that more of Windsor should be taken, and more of the agricultural area left for me. The other ridings should be absorbing more of the city of Windsor.

Part of the riding which is being taken away is made up of Colchester North, Colchester South and the town of Harrow. They have always formed a part of a unit with the townships of Amherstburg, Anderdon and Malden. I will try to outline as briefly as possible how this can be shown. First, there is a large farmer co-operative in this area which has historically served the four townships of Anderdon, Malden, Colchester North and Colchester South, with its headquarters located in the town of Harrow. There is a branch office with a grain elevator in the village of McGregor, and another one located in the town of Amherstburg. This organization has kept the farming community in that area together and has made a form of community life for the people from the different communities which I think should be allowed to continue.

The little village of McGregor—rather, I should say, the rapidly expanding village of McGregor—is on the border between the townships of Colchester North and Anderdon. Under the proposed redistribution, this little village would be split right down the middle on a road we call Walker Road which is actually the townline road between these two townships. They have always been together. This will also mean that the parish of the church in the area will be split down the middle, because the church serves both a big part of the township of Anderdon and a big part of the township of Colchester North.

The reeves of these six municipalities have always worked together on joint projects. The six municipalities have never been separated either in a provincial or federal riding since they were created. The people of those municipalities feel strongly that they should remain as a unit. These municipalities have always worked together as unit, and I know because I was the reeve of Anderdon township when I entered this House in 1962. I was also warden of the county of Essex at the same time. I know how closely these municipalities have worked together and I know that the ties which bind them together are important.

I also recognize that the commission had a real problem trying to decide how redistribution should take place in a fair fashion. I am sure, though, we must remember that if these people had known they were going to be taken out of the riding, they would have objected strenuously, just as the people in Tilbury North and Tilbury West, at the far east end of the riding, objected before the hearing of the commissioners held in Windsor because they noticed that they were going to be put into another riding.

I just want to say that I hope the commission somehow or in some way will see fit to make sure that the people in Colchester North, Colchester South and the town of Harrow stay in the riding of Essex-Windsor, which they are desirous of doing.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I agree with those who have said that the commissioners had an impossible job in redistributing seats. There probably was not a more difficult place than northern Ontario, where we have not had the same growth rate as has been the case in other parts of the country. I was pleased to note that the commission heeded advice and listened to the representations of the provincial member for Algoma with regard to Sault Ste. Marie. The commission removed part of the population of Sault Ste. Marie from the city riding and added it to the neighbouring rural riding. There is no conflict with the Sudbury area. I suggest that the people of the Algoma region, particularly those living in Sault Ste. Marie, will consider this an advantage. Two members will represent the city and both will probably open constituency offices. The people will not find that a disadvantage.

● (1830)

I contend that we ought to adopt the Ontario government system of representation. The Ontario government has established ridings surrounding growth centres in accordance with the doughnut theory. As the population in the area surrounding the growth centre expands, new ridings are established to serve the larger population.

The commissioners considered the question of population and considered the growth of our urban centres in the next 15 or 20 years. In future, most of our population will be concentrated in 10 or 15 large centres. The rest will live in sparsely populated regions. We shall find that urban ridings will become more numerous than rural ridings in which the people engage mostly in farming, forestry and mining occupations. We ought to consider changing the 25 per cent limit. Boundaries should be designed to make adequate representation possible. At present it is impossible to provide adequate representation for some areas of northern Ontario.

I listened to the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) complain because some people living on the edge of North Bay are in the constituency of Timiskaming. He is perfectly right in saying that they do not want to be in the constituency of Timiskaming. They have no community of interest with Timiskaming which in the main is a rural riding with a forestry and mining base. The people of West Ferris, Sturgeon Falls, Verner, Field and River Valley are not connected by radio, television, newspaper, or road and rail links, with the riding of Timiskaming. Many of the people of North Bay have never gone farther north than the city. Most people prefer to travel south in Canada. I am sure that many people in these towns have not been up No. 11 highway into Timiskaming riding proper.

The commission took some of the population of the Mattawa-Nipissing area and included it in the Renfrew

North electoral area. In my opinion, it would have been better if the people had remained in Nipissing because all their interests centre on the city of North Bay. I agree that all the little communities on Highway 64 up to the Quebec border have a greater community of interest with Nipissing than with the riding of Timiskaming.

It is not that I do not want to represent the people of North Bay, Mr. Speaker. It is odd to travel 60 miles through an unpopulated region only to find that your constituency ends in the outer limits of North Bay. You can tell where North Bay begins by the road markers which tell you that you are now entering North Bay. Actually, some markers are 14 or 15 miles out of the city. I submit that people living in the suburbs of North Bay have absolutely no community of interest with the people of Kirkland Lake, Dryden and Moosonee.

In order to represent some of this area, I must learn again to paddle a canoe. That is the only way to reach some of the people of the area. Many are close to the Quebec border and do more of their business on the Quebec side than on the Ontario side. There is also the matter of connecting Timiskaming with the area to the north with the rail line which ultimately runs through Cochrane. We should consider how Temagami has been connected with Timiskaming.

I am not suggesting that members of parliament should redesign their own ridings. I congratulate the commissioners on the job they did. In the final analysis, it is not terribly important who represents West Ferris, River Valley, Temagami, Moosonee or Kirkland Lake. It is far more important to make sure that the people of the region are historically related and enjoy a community of interest. It is difficult for a member to represent both the suburbs of North Bay, and these remote regions as well, and do an adequate job. As most members know, people come to us with municipal, provincial and local problems which have little to do with our work as federal members of parliament. So the relationships of areas should be kept in mind and strengthened. In the case we are considering, that is not being done. There has been an attempt to mix rural and urban populations in one riding.

One encounters different problems in representing vertical as opposed to horizontal ridings. For the sake of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) who is in the House, let me explain that a vertical constituency, so to speak, is one consisting of high rise buildings and of people living in built up city areas. A horizontal constituency is spread out, as are constituencies in rural Canada.

Mr. Whelan: What about roads?

Mr. Peters: Roads are a common problem. Roads run through vertical and horizontal communities. There is a great difference between some rural communities although they are only a few miles apart. If you drive from New Liskeard to Cobalt—there is another small town in between—you will be amazed to note the difference between the two communities. They are proud of their differences. Neither community is large, and their problems are many. However, their community spirit is maintained because they are, and operate as, a community. They are related to other communities around them, sometimes favourably and sometimes not. However, what is the relationship to Verner which is on the other side of Sturgeon Falls? Sturgeon Falls will remain in Nipissing, but I will have to go through there and on to the next community. Even though it is closer to Sudbury and Nipissing, it will be part of Timiskaming.

● (1840)

What is their community relationship? I know a number of people in that area; I have been there many times. I know that they have a strong community sense of development. However, they have a larger community development which is in the Nipissing area. It is certainly not connected to Kirkland Lake, Moosonee or some of the other places I will represent.

It would be far better for us to sacrifice equal representation than to sacrifice the community interests of rural Canada. I can see this redistribution not only happening this time, but again in the early eighties after another census. Timiskaming will probably take in all the town of North Bay or all the town of Timmins, possibly both North Bay and Timmins, Sturgeon Falls and possibly even part of the area represented by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling). I can see the population not growing in areas such as northern Ontario, northern Manitoba, northern Saskatchewan or any other rural area, and we will end up representing provinces rather than communities. That will not be representation as we know it. I do not think the answer is to provide us with more staff and offices throughout the constituency. It would be much more satisfactory if we could drive around the constituency and have communication through newspapers, radio and other media. In that way we could service the areas we represent.

It is true that people in Sudbury, North Bay, Timmins and Rouyn-Noranda in Quebec have the opportunity of listening to one or two outlets. However, no one in any of those areas has the advantage of listening to all. Some are 300 or 400 miles apart. I suggest the relationship of those communities must be important with regard to our ability to represent.

Let me leave the commission with one thought. Over the years I have listened to and looked at members of parliament. Some I violently disagreed with, some I did not like at all, and some I did. In travelling across this nation I found that those who were terrible members and terrible people represented the same kind of people. The whole riding was very similar to the member. Other members were overly sweet and represented that kind of people.

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. member a question. Will he confirm that there are a whole bunch more in Timiskaming just like him? If so, I am not sure any of us will want to go there.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I have overemphasized the point. I am sure I am not one of the favourite sons of members of this House. If the hon. member came to my constituency, he would find that the people there are aggressive. They would welcome him. However, if he wishes to get into an argument, that is the place to visit. It is a mining and lumbering community, with some farming.

Most members are representative of the people in their constituency. I may have overemphasized this, but they are

truly representative of their people. If our ridings get too large, we will not be representing those who elect us because we will not be able to have that many faces. I strongly urge that the commission consider the problem which members from northern Ontario are outlining today. If not, the problem is going to magnify every time there is redistribution.

While we agree that the commission should be independent and should have certain guidelines, I would like to see that stretched as far as possible so that northern Ontario can retain 12 members. In that way we can continue to pay attention to the community of interest. In years to come you will be able to tell, from looking at a member, the kind of people he represents. You will know that he is representing those who elected him as well as their community of interest.

Mr. Peter Daudlin (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, your reference will note I had not intended, by way of filing an objection, to rise and speak on this particular matter. However, I was moved to speak as a result of the objection put on the record by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). I understand his objection and I believe it to be valid. It indirectly touches the riding of Kent-Essex as it now is, and Essex-Kent as it is proposed to be. I have no particular objection. Indeed, I would welcome the inclusion of the municipalities of Harrow and Colchester North and South to the new constituency of Essex-Kent. I would be quite happy to be representative of that area were I fortunate enough to be able to do so.

I must, however, agree with the minister in at least his third argument. Specifically, in making the changes from those proposed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, dated August 19, 1975, the commission failed to give the residents of the municipalities of Harrow, Colchester North and Colchester South an opportunity to express their views on the revised proposal. Most certainly it should be that the residents be afforded the same opportunity to express their concerns regarding the February 27, 1976, proposal as those who were affected by the draft proposals of August 19, 1975, were able to do at a hearing in Windsor in October of last year.

If one can make general comments and express general concern with regard to the method with which the commission has dealt with Ontario—and, I suspect, the rest of Canada—it is that there seems to have been some simple misunderstanding by the committee with respect to the manner in which individual people in these ridings should be dealt. One of the glaring absences in the method by which people were treated in the whole of this redistribution is that when a person is to be affected by the objection of another, the notice that one might expect to be given to those who would be affected was not in fact given. To bring it down to the specifics of Essex-Windsor and Kent-Essex, a proposal was made originally that two townships and some small municipalities be added to the riding of Essex-Kent to make up for the loss of the city of Chatham, some 36,000 voters.

● (1850)

I might point out that the constituents of the city of Chatham and the constituents of Tilbury North, Tilbury West and Rochester were made abundantly aware that something was happening which would have an intimate effect on their lives. Hearings were held in Windsor and people were invited to come and make objections if they saw fit to those boundary and riding changes. What the commission did, in response to whatever objections were made, was to make changes which would intimately affect other people who had no knowledge at all that those changes were made, what the changes would be or whether they would be affected at all by the changes which were made in Windsor.

If one can assume anything from the fact that those hearings were held in Windsor, it is that the majority of people in these ridings who had received knowledge or, at least, who should have received knowledge from advertisements which appeared in the newspapers, were to a large extent content with what was suggested. I suggest the commission has not given any weight at all to this contentment. I submit that at the end of the debate some changes ought to be made in the statute or in the regulations governing the way in which the commission is to conduct itself, to the end that if they are about to make changes which affect an area which has not been considered, notice should go out to the constituencies affected. In this instance, for example, notices should go out to Harrow, Colchester North and Colchester South before the boundaries of their areas are touched.

In the original proposal, the commission recommended, as I have indicated, that the riding of Essex-Kent include municipalities from Harwich westward to Gosfield North and South, and north to Lake St. Clair, including the municipalities of Rochester, Tilbury North and Tilbury West. I was entirely satisfied with the proposal. Indeed, I filed no objection to it at the meeting of the commission on October 19 in Windsor. I did not appear, nor did anyone on my behalf. In the revisions of February of this year, however, the commissioners, in their collective wisdom, removed the northern municipalities, namely, Rochester, Tilbury North and Tilbury West, and placed them in the proposed constituency of Essex-Windsor, while at the same time removing from the aforementioned riding the municipalities of Harrow, Colchester North and Colchester South, placing them in what will now be the constituency of Essex-Kent.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset of my intervention, I have no objection to the rearranging of the municipalities in terms of the proposal last summer or to the revisions presently under consideration. However, in the interest of fairness I would support any action which would elicit the views of the good people of Harrow, Colchester North and South before the citizens are affected.

The options open to the commission are, admittedly, few. First, there could be a reversion to the August, 19, 1975, proposal provided no serious objections were filed in connection with the municipalities of Rochester, Tillbury North and Tilbury West. This proposal would, I believe, be acceptable to all. As a second alternative, the commission could reaffirm the proposal laid before the House on February 27, 1976, after soliciting the opinions of the residents of Harrow, Colchester North and Colchester South. This, too, would be welcome and totally acceptable, at least to me.

The third option would involve a more complex juggling of various municipalities. For example, parts of Chatham could be included to make up for electors lost if Harrow, Colchester North and Colchester South were to revert to Essex-Windsor. Alternatively, the town of Essex could be exchanged for Colchester North and South. Both these proposals, however, contain serious flaws. Once again there would be a serious effect on people who would receive no notice that their interests were being dealt with. The absence of arrangements for public discussion would particularly affect the residents of Essex and Chatham. Further, any such proposals would add to Essex-Kent towns with a more distant historical relationship or slighter economic base than the municipalities of Harrow, Colchester North and South presently share with Essex-Kent. This would be a less satisfying solution to the concerns which all hon. members have expressed today.

The weakest option left to the commission would be to return Harrow, Colchester North and South to Essex-Windsor without adding to Essex-Kent the area to the north recommended in the August proposal. Not only would this make the proposed constituency of Essex-Windsor an extremely large and difficult area to serve, notwithstanding the fact that it is being served well at this point, but it would augment the existing disparity between the two constituencies with regard to the number of electors. We might bear in mind that the population of this area is growing substantially. If a census were to be taken today I am sure the figures would show a substantial increase over those used by the commission. This proposal would give Essex-Windsor a population of 90,000, while reducing the population of Essex-Kent to something under 70,000 electors. Clearly, it would be less acceptable than any of the other possible solutions.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, permit me to reaffirm my qualified satisfaction with the August and the February proposals of the commission. I suggest, once again, that there is substantial difficulty with the statute as it now exists with respect to sufficient notice being given to people who will be intimately affected by changes made after the original announcement goes out. Substantial thought should be given to the possibility of providing notice to areas which will be affected when changes take place which are not announced in the original published proposals.

I look forward to continuing my representation of the people of Essex-Kent and will welcome enthusiastically the municipalities which the commission, in its wisdom, saw fit to add to my riding.

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by remarking, as other members have done this afternoon, that the task of the commission is a difficult and thankless one. Faced with the need to decide among conflicting choices, they can never hope to satisfy all interested parties.

In the proposed redistribution of seats in Ontario, the commissioners have generally arrived at a population in rural ridings of about 70,000, and in urban ridings of about 90,000. It seems that the commissioners, while struggling with their admittedly difficult task, were very much aware of factors involved in geographical distance. However, the drastic changes made to downtown Toronto ridings lead one to conclude that the commissioners paid less attention to factors concerning social and cultural distance. It is to these that I wish to address my remarks.

The geographical spread of a rural riding imposes certain obvious and easily understood constraints on the service to a constituency by its member of parliament. However, a member who represents an urban riding with a high proportion of new Canadians must work within the framework of other constraints which are equally legitimate in the discussion of communication, service and representation. Service to constituents and representation of the views of a constituency require the maintenance of all possible channels of communication, and there is a special need to involve constituents in the political process in an area which cannot be described as a community in the way a suburban or rural riding with clearly defined geographical boundaries might be so described.

One of the responsibilities of a member of parliament is, of course, to represent adequately the views of his or her constituency and to report back to constituents on parliamentary action. Members also spend considerable time assisting constituents in their dealings with government. To the extent that a member represents a riding with a very high proportion of new Canadians who are not familiar with our governmental structures, the number of problems which are likely to arise will be increased. The number of languages spoken makes for further complication. While most constituents have some knowledge of one of the official languages, the extent to which more complicated issues can be understood and explained is limited where there is a limited command of English or French.

● (1900)

To members who represent ridings with a high proportion of new Canadians, a continuing concern is that of encouraging all citizens to develop a stronger and more effective sense of participating in the political process. Fuller and more broadly based participation in the political process yields many community and social benefits. It serves to reinforce the use of legitimate avenues toward, and mechanisms of, social change. It provides a training ground for future leaders. It exposes citizens to the political culture of our society and hence the broader values of our society. It is thus a force for constructive action. By providing a wider range of viewpoints and experiences, the participatory approach may well yield better decisions.

Canada is a multicultural nation within a bilingual framework. The realization of full and effective citizen participation in the political process in multicultural ridings such as Trinity presents special challenges. A major requirement for effective citizen participation is to preserve those circumstances that facilitate exposure to, and involvement in, political culture at the riding level. In ridings characterized by a large proportion of recent immigrants, such as Trinity, the process of exposure to, and involvement in, political culture is in large measure accomplished through informal group structures. These informal groups often grow up around community concerns and priorities. They represent a most important means for linking such concerns, priorities and needs with legitimate political mechanisms of change.

The residents of ridings characterized by a large proportion of recent immigrants have, by and large, established fewer traditional or formally organized means of transmitting political values or taking political action than is typically the case in more ethnically homogeneous ridings. Such formal arrangements take time to develop but they are, of course, the backbone of stable and healthy communities. On the one hand, broadly based citizen participation in the political process is vital to a healthy society. On the other hand, the structure of political culture in multicultural ridings is delicate and easily disrupted. I would therefore suggest, first, that wherever possible ridings such as Trinity not be subject to reorganization as this will inevitably disrupt the delicate balance of political participation that characterizes such ridings. Second, that when such reorganization is inevitable, it should be carried out with proper awareness of the social and cultural dynamics of multicultural ridings.

The concept of distance in rural ridings is well understood; the complex patterns of social and cultural distance and cohesion in urban ridings are less well understood. New Canadians generally have some difficulty in understanding the relative responsibilities of municipal, provincial and federal governments. In Ontario there has recently been a redistribution of provincial ridings. Now voters are being asked to adapt to yet another set of changes in federal ridings with a resultant breaking up of immigrant and minority groups who have worked together in a riding.

I am impressed with the arguments of sociologists who suggest that any move which increases the difficulty which members of ethnic groups have in voting or engaging in the normal political process decreases the group's feelings of participation in the life of their chosen country. Because of questions of communication and service and because of the arguments in favour of symbolic continuity, I would say that, ideally, ridings inhabited by a large number of new immigrants and a large variety of immigrant groups should be smaller than ridings with cultural homogeneity and a high proportion of native born Canadians.

But certainly there should be as much stability as possible in boundaries and in names of ridings which contain a large proportion of people who do not have a full command of one of the official languages. To change virtually all the boundaries in the ridings of greatest new immigrant density is to disrupt the symbolic organization of ridings and to increase the difficulties for new citizens of engaging in the political process. The higher the degree of continuity in boundaries and names, the greater will be the access to the normal political process of a large number of constituents in urban, immigrant-receiving ridings.

The need to service and represent the large proportion of new immigrant groups and the need for continuity to facilitate participation in the democratic process should receive priority consideration in redistribution. When we welcome as full members of Canadian society, with all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, the thousands of people who each year become Canadians by choice, we have some obligation to be cognizant of the factors that make it easy or difficult for them to exercise their democratic rights and become truly and satisfyingly involved in the political life of their chosen country. The riding is the vehicle, the medium by means of which information is carried and political activity—that is, constructive and socially useful activity—is made possible. If we are to expect a proper level of intelligent, political activity, we should alter boundaries and names as little as possible in immigrant-receiving ridings.

The views I have expressed this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, have already been expressed in one form or another at the public hearings which the commission held. It appears that, faced with the conflicting needs of rural ridings and very large suburban ridings, the commissioners have made their decision, which in the case of Toronto involves most change in the immigrant-receiving ridings. I do not really expect that at this stage the commissioners will redraw the boundaries for all of Toronto, but I do hope that, whatever further changes they do make, they will be cognizant of some of the particular difficulties of new citizens. I hope that some of the considerations that I have described may also be considered in future redistribution and balanced against geographical considerations and considerations of distance involved for rural ridings.

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for only a few moments, together with other members from the province of Ontario and other provinces, as we deliberate the report of the commissioners for redistribution. I want to deal with the question of redistribution over-all and then to share the natural affinity of members in talking about our own constituencies.

● (1910)

On the question of redistribution over-all, I think it is very easy for us in this House to see the report come out, look at it and find all the things wrong, and then be harshly critical of the commissioners. I want at the outset to recognize that they have had a tremendously difficult responsibility. They have met it, and I think have met it as best they can. Certainly in respect of representations I have put forward and that have been put forward by citizens of the constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth, the commission has been responsive and has responded quickly. We only wish the commission had responded more favourably.

I think part of the difficulty stems from the constraints within which the commission has had to operate when looking at redistribution. In looking at redistribution we should be looking not just at the reports, the new maps or what will result because of what the commission has had to do, but also at the regulations under which the commission has had to operate. I suggest the regulations are inefficient and in many ways out of date. If the maps which the commission must redraw and the constituencies which they must redesign are out of date, then the commissioners should be given the tools with which to accomplish their task. We should give them proper and modern methods for bringing about more equitable redistribution of the constituencies.

For example, I want to deal with a specific guideline taken by the commission, and I take this from page 3 of the report for the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario, 1976. It says that chapter 25 provides that the commission may depart from such equality—

equality being the electoral quotient of 81,085—for any of a number of reasons. First, it refers to special geographic considerations including sparseness or density of population, accessibility of regions and the size or shape of regions. Then it states:

N.B. Because of this amendment, relative rate of growth of population is no longer a factor to be considered.

I will deal specifically with the constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth, suggesting somewhat later that that is no longer a factor which should be left out of consideration. In fact, in a growing province and a growing country it is a factor that should be very much taken into consideration, but which obviously was not taken into consideration when the commission redrew the maps for the city of Hamilton, the county of Wentworth and the Niagara region.

There is the point, brought to my attention by a constituent, as well about the cost of the commission and its hearings. We recognize that this has been a difficult process. It must be an expensive process if it is to be done in the necessary detail. One thing I would question, and I think this should be reconsidered when we next ask the next commission to begin its work, is whether it is really necessary to buy up all that space in every daily newspaper in each province to reproduce the maps, and whether in fact it would not be more economical and more advisable to search out other means of advising interested parties what the constituencies in which they live are to be following redistribution.

There should be other means of informing them that the commission is considering redistribution along certain lines. We should seek out other means through the media which would not always require buying space, and if the media is responsible it would not ask the commission to buy all this advertising. We could make these maps available at the city or town halls or some place convenient without burdening the taxpayer with the extra and unnecessary expense of showing them in black and white in their daily newspapers just what the commission has done to the constituencies.

I want to turn to the particular case of the riding of Hamilton-Wentworth. I will not go through the usual tour of the constituency, talking about the greatness of every part of it. I did that a number of years ago when I first entered this House, in keeping with the custom and practice of a new member. However, I think I should describe what the constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth consists of today and what this commission wishes it to consist of in the future.

The constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth is a very historic one. I am sure no member will disagree with the suggestion that it is one of the finest constituencies in the country. It consists of an area that might roughly be described as a significant section of the city of Hamilton, the east end in which I grew up and, therefore, with which I have natural sentiments and ties. It takes in the new town of Stoney Creek. It takes in some of the rural portion of the old county of Wentworth and part of the township of Glanbrook. It then goes around to complete the horseshoe and takes in the town of Ancaster. This is a riding that has a community of interest. It has a riding that has historic ties in all of these areas, and it is a riding that makes sense.

One might also not take objection on these bases to the new constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth, because what the commission has done is to include part of the city of Hamilton on an extended basis. It then goes further into the old community of Wentworth, and includes the town of Dundas and the township of Flamborough, now being ably represented by my colleague, the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling). These are understandable changes and would be most welcome in the constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth by all the residents there because they have a community of interest and common ties. The city of Hamilton is experiencing tremendous growth, and many of these areas are historically a part of the old county of Wentworth. We take no objection to this fact.

Then we look at the areas of the proposed riding of Hamilton-Wentworth which the commission has lopped off in a way that can only be compared with an attempt by a medical student at surgery using other than the best of instruments. No doubt my colleague, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) is aware of more than one occasion when people have suffered as a result of this kind of thing and he has had to go in and correct others' errors of inexperience. To carry that analogy further, what all of us on both sides of this House are trying to do is get the commission, with the best intentions, to perform good surgery. They may consider the operation a success, but if the patient dies it really is to no advantage. We want to gently urge them, and we humbly ask them, to reconsider and to think about what they have done. We ask them to go back and reconsider: it is that simple.

They have taken a significant proportion of the city of Hamilton and also the town of Stoney Creek, now in the constituency of Hamilton-Wentworth, and put them into the new riding of Lincoln. If only Conservatives objected to this we might be accused of having partisan motives. The interesting thing to note is that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Andres), my present neighbour and an hon. member on the government side, has also put in a protest about this move. In addition, his predecessor, Mr. Ken Higson, who served with such distinction as the Progressive Conservative member for that riding, also put in an objection. The town of Grimsby and the riding of Lincoln objected to it as well.

I think it is most significant that a weekly newspaper in the town of Stoney Creek encouraged citizens and individual residents of Stoney Creek to indicate to the commissioners that they did not want to be part of the riding of Lincoln, but that in fact and in heart they were part of Hamilton-Wentworth and wished to remain that way. I think the hon. member for Lincoln in his notice of objection summarized the feelings that people of all parties and from both sides—from the Lincoln side and from the Hamilton-Wentworth side—have when he said:

The boundaries set forth by the Commission in its 1976 Report also digress from the provincial riding boundaries, municipal and regional lines. On page 4 of the report, the commission states the principle that:

"Keeping in mind density of population as well as community interests, the commission has drawn the boundaries of the major cities . . . so as to follow municipal boundaries wherever possible."

● (1920)

This principle was ignored in the case of Lincoln by bringing together sections of the regional municipality of

Niagara and Hamilton-Wentworth which in terms of historic social, service and general interest are diverse and represent and reflect very different community ties and concerns. That is what the hon. member for Lincoln said, and I agree with him fully. He was supported in that by the man who ran against him in the last election and who preceded him in this House. He was supported in that by the town of Grimsby which also supported my submission at the hearings in Welland. I might mention that at Welland the constituency of Hamilton Wentworth was represented by three people. It is interesting to note who they are. One is Iain Hendry, Q.C., of the town of Ancaster. He is a former chairman of the school board for Wentworth county. He lives at one end of the constituency, 45 miles away. He was supported in those representations by Mrs. Shirley McLeod of Stoney Creek, a housewife, and by David Stempin, a businessman from East Hamilton.

There you have what makes up the constituency of Hamilton Wentworth—those three people of diverse interests from different parts of the constituency saying one thing, that they belong in Hamilton-Wentworth, that they have no community of interest in Lincoln, that they are not wanted there, and that they are quite happy to remain in Hamilton-Wentworth. The commission not only has seen fit to ignore those representations but has not given us good and sufficient reasons for doing so.

At the hearings in Toronto, of his own volition Mr. Jim Ridge, another past chairman of the Wentworth county school board, a lifelong resident from the rural part of the constituency, went before the hearing and said that he, too, wanted to remain in Hamilton-Wentworth. These people were supported, as I said, not only by Liberals and Conservatives and not only by representatives of civic government and regional municipalities, but by literally hundreds of individual citizens who took the time and the trouble to make individual submissions by way of the Stoney Creek News. We have had no accurate reply or adequate response concerning why those feelings of individual citizens were suddenly thrust aside. I think of a couple of examples. One is the Winona men's club. On February 5 of this year they wrote to me as follows:

> Last night, at a meeting of the Winona men's club, we circulated the attached petition concerning the proposed change in federal electoral boundaries in Stoney Creek. All the members present at the meeting who live in the municipality of Stoney Creek signed the petition regardless of political party affiliations. It was unanimously felt that the municipality of Stoney Creek has traditionally been an integral part of the Hamilton-Wentworth region in all respects, and would be completely lost as a small section of the region of Niagara.

Then in a postscript they wrote:

> You will note a few ladies names on the first page. These names were obtained last Sunday at the morning service at the Fifty United Church.

I also received a letter from the Reverend and Mrs. R. Matejka on behalf of the Lutheran Church of the Messiah at Stoney Creek. Not only have we the Winona men's club but we have the ladies of the Fifty United Church and the Lutheran Church all together. This is ecumenical; this is the day of liberation! Everybody is of one accord. The commission just puts aside these things and says it has a map and will stick to it. We get stuck with those results. They do not have to live there. It is not their community of interest which has to be represented in parliament. The people who suffer have voiced their concerns and opinions, and they have the general feeling which I must express on their behalf that their sentiments were not taken into consideration.

I go back to the point I made earlier, that the commission decided not to take into consideration the growth of population as a factor in drawing up the boundaries. That may be convenient. It may be in their terms of reference. Perhaps they have no choice, but if so we must change that because it is an irresponsible way for a commission to draw boundaries when they draw them on the census taken in 1971. These boundaries will come into effect at the next general election which many of us expect will be in 1978. So I asked some of the communities involved to give us their population projections for 1978.

I should like to cite a couple of examples. This year there are 29,281 citizens in Stoney Creek-Saltfleet. By 1978 there will be 40,000 because we have a satellite city being built at this very time in that area. In that part of the city of Hamilton which is to be put into the new riding of Lincoln they are going on the 1971 census which runs roughly at 56,000 people, but the city clerk in Hamilton tells me that they have projected for 1978 a population of 88,884.

The commission in its report says that the riding quotient for Ontario shall be 81,085 people. In that portion of the city of Hamilton alone which they want to put into the riding of Lincoln there will be, in 1978, more than that: there will be 88,884 people. That to me is an abdication of responsibility. They have closed their eyes to the fact that this is one of the most dynamic and fastest growing areas in this province, indeed in this country. They just cannot close their eyes to the cold hard facts that those are not just statistics but that people are involved. That is the point on which I should like to end my remarks.

In making these remarks I want to reiterate that the commission has had a difficult job. I respect the efforts of the commissioners, but I must reject them. Their efforts are unacceptable. I ask them to go back to the drawing board. I ask them to take into consideration something of a general overview. Perhaps to paraphrase Robert Zend, an author and philosopher from the city of Toronto, which may be known to be one of the major suburbs of the city of Hamilton, he said there are too many people and too few human beings. I suggest they should stop worring and looking upon people as statistics to fit neatly into these things called constituencies.

We have 264 people here who talk about constituencies. The people of Canada do not talk about constituencies; they talk about communities. That is what the commission should be addressing itself to—what is a community? If people as statistics form constituencies that may be legal, it may be technical and it may be very convenient for a commission but it is not taking into account the fact that human beings who individually and collectively form communities are having their lives affected by the decisions taken.

This commission has done its best to date. Its best simply is unacceptable. I ask it to go back to the drawing board, bearing in mind it may have a responsibility to stick to the technical aspects of the act, to worry about statistics and worry about drawing maps and fitting statistics into those maps. But they have a higher responsibility, if the House

of Commons is to be representative, which is to stop worrying about constituencies and statistics and start worrying about communities in which human beings live.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, this is a brief intervention made in the hope that eight or nine years from now the remarks that are being made by hon. members in this debate might perhaps be read by the people who will be in charge of the next commissions responsible for the next set of boundaries according to the law ten years hence. I should like, as others have done, to express my appreciation for the way in which the commission has carried out what is undoubtedly a difficult job when taken as a whole. In the recollection of those of us who can go back to the map published in late 1972, there is considerable improvement in the quality of the boundaries proposed in the map that is before us today for discussion.

● (1930)

It seems to me, however, that the present map could be even better had the commission made full use of the Ontario quotient figure of 81,000 plus or minus the 25 per cent provided under the law. In the case of Ontario it means that the 81,000 people per riding envisaged under the law could have been increased to a maximum of approximately 101 per cent, or decreased to a minimum of approximately 60,000 people, by the application of this 25 per cent quotient.

If you look at the proposed maps and populations for the municipality of metropolitan Toronto you are likely to come to the conclusion that the commission made little use, or perhaps even shied away from the quotient envisaged under the law. Of the 25 proposed ridings in metropolitan Toronto the population of 20 ridings ranges between 88,000 and 93,000 people. This means that the majority of the ridings proposed in metropolitan Toronto fall within a very narrow band of 88,000 to 93,000 people, almost as if the commission had somehow come to the conclusion that it is a desirable quotient for a metropolitan area from which it did not wish or intend to deviate. If my interpretation is correct, I really do not know the reasons why it applied and maintained such a narrow band.

But what seems to me fairly clear is that had the commission used the quotient provided under the law more boldly and vigorously, we would have better boundaries, and by better boundaries I mean ones that respect and reflect better values such as community of interest in the sense used earlier this afternoon by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais), boundaries that would better reflect ethnic, cultural, and social factors and, frankly, ones that would better reflect the character of the existing neighbourhood and the role that neighbourhood organizations play in metropolitan centres across Canada. Had that quotient been used in metro Toronto as the law provides, the proposed boundaries before us here for debate would be less artificial.

I am ready to admit that ideal boundaries hardly exist in a metropolitan centre, but there are some boundaries that are less disruptive and artificial in an urban area than others, that are less disruptive to existing neighbourhoods and people than others.

For instance, a main artery, a major thoroughfare, or an expressway is a better boundary than a neighbourhood road or a neighbourhood street. A good boundary would be a major railroad, a park, or a cemetery, but it is very bad practice to use as boundaries, at least in the case of the municipality of metro Toronto, the so-called city limits. City limits probably had validity and meaning 40 or 50 years ago. Today city limits in metro Toronto only mean that on this side or on that side of the city limits there are heavily built up areas. The people living on streets on either side of the city limits hardly know that there is a boundary line dividing them.

I would also add to this category of poor boundary lines the streets that cut through the heart of an existing parish, or streets that are part of a tightly knit neighbourhood. As I said, our right of ways such as the CPR or the CNR are very good boundaries. So are cemeteries, parks, creeks and expressways. Major arteries are preferable as boundaries because, by their own existence, they seem to disrupt less the cohesion and character of an urban neighbourhood.

I hope that ten years from now some of the thoughts that have been put on record by hon. members will still have some validity at least in the drawing of boundaries of urban areas such as Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver. It seems to me that the success of a future boundary commission will depend, among other things, on the ability of the commissioners to take into greater consideration than has been the case so far the social factors that have been described so well earlier by the hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson). As we all know, ridings and their boundaries are there to serve people, and the present law, it seems to me, is well designed. There is flexibility built into the present law, in the 25 per cent plus or minus formula that has been made available to achieve exactly some of the objectives I have tried to describe in this brief intervention.

The future commission would really do a service to people living in urban communities by making greater and bolder use of this 25 per cent formula so as to serve better the social, cultural, and economic features of the people living in the ridings affected.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this particular occasion is the third time I have spoken on electoral boundary redistribution since the act came into effect back in 1965-66 when I was very critical of the work of some of the boundary redistribution commissions.

In 1974-75 I was able to satisfy members on the government side of the wisdom of an amendment I had been advancing ever since the original act was passed, that was that original proposals and definite plans for redistribution and final reports must carry the full reasons of the commissioners as to why they made changes. I suppose it was a little ironic to see the difficulties into which some commissions have entered vis-à-vis members in their provinces by refusing to enter reasons. That is not the way it is to be done and I am satisfied, after three experiences, that this House has made two fundamental mistakes.

The first mistake is to think that independent commissions could carry out the redistribution of electoral boundaries better than a parliamentary committee composed of members who will see if there is any attempt at gerry-

mandering, as so many people tried to suggest, but which is the figment of rather fertile imaginations.

They are people who think that citizens are mere statistical ciphers and that you can take a number of people in an area, put them together like so many head of cattle in a corral, and say that will be a constituency, regardless of the community of interests, the composition of that community or other factors. Yet all too often this is what we have had. In 1973, the last time the commission did such a universally poor job, this House put a stop, by law, to the operation of its reports.

● (1940)

Then I think it committed a second mistake, and that was to try to get out of that difficulty by agreeing to some sort of fanciful formula where by every ten years the number of members in this House and the number of ridings in this country would automatically be increased. Why to save face for someone, or so that a province would not diminish in numbers relative to others which have more rapid growth? We do the very same thing within provinces. We recognize that certain areas may have to have a seat suppressed or combined with another one, but it is all wrong in so far as a province is concerned.

I am not going to enter into the litany of complications which this will give rise to in this House after the next general election when eighteen more seats will have to be found in the Chamber. I think we will need baskets hanging from the ceiling, or we will have to appropriate some of the balconies in order to give appropriate room to all the members. Then ten years hence it is expected, at the same growth rate, that we might approach 300 in number. People will say that this House has too many speakers and that there are too many speeches made. This is only compounding the problem, but that is not what I am trying to get at in this debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The members will all have to be my size.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Even though the hon. member represents two sheets of paper in size, looked at sideways—contrary to myself—he still occupies a desk the same size as mine, and his chair is the same size, and that is so for all the other hon. members. However, what I am concerned about is what I think has always been a fundamental mistake by both of the commissions.

Unfortunately the House committed a third mistake during the winter of 1974-75 when, persuaded by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), there was removed from the list of factors which were to be considered by redistribution commissions the one known as growth potential, and this was adopted by hon. members on both sides of the House. I remember during private members' hour seeing that bill come up from the bottom of the list and then being passed. I moved a quick amendment, and I remember in my speech that I said the House did not realize the noose into which it was shoving its neck for general redistribution when that particular factor was being removed.

This came home to me during the hearings last September and October. I will be the first to say that the redistribution commissioner, Mr. Castonguay, said to me in public court that I was the only one who saw the trouble at the time, and that this was a factor which was causing all sorts of difficulties, particularly in urban and suburban ridings. I just heard the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan) say that the commission ignored certain growth factors in parts of the city of Hamilton and its suburbs. Of course it did because the House, in its lack of wisdom or in a moment of mental aberration, removed the growth potential as a factor.

Now I should like to turn to the representations which were sent to me by the former member for St. Paul's, Mr. Ronald Atkey. He makes the same points which have been made by many members. First, with regard to the present boundaries of St. Paul's, the boundaries proposed by the commission are likely to cause confusion among the electorate in that there is no conformity with existing provincial and municipal boundaries.

How many times have we seen voters totally confused because of helter skelter boundaries? Gracious only knows, the clerk of the provincial house is usually a member of these commissions, and there is no way they seem to be able to bring the boundaries together. It passes the wit of man to see why they cannot do this. But no, if when one commission divides constituencies on, shall we say, a vertical pitch, north and south, you can bet your bottom dollar that the next commission will divide them on a lateral basis, east and west, merely to introduce total and utter confusion in all corners.

The federal riding of St. Paul's will overlap five provincial constituencies: St. Andrews', St. Patrick's, St. George's, Eglington, Bellwoods and Oakwoods; and five municipal wards, three wards in the city of Toronto and two wards in the Borough of York.

There is another factor. Federal members and provincial members must work in close liaison. It does not matter what party they represent; the paramount consideration is looking after the interests of citizens. I do not care a fig for the norm of some 76,000 which some people slavishly adhere to, trying as much as possible to keep to that norm—one man, one vote. That is a lot of tripe.

What is required is the best possible service from members of parliament and members of provincial legislatures to the people concerned. That is why we exist, and we know from the changing role of members of parliament, both provincial MLA's or MPP's, that the federal member today has a role he did not have 10 or 15 years ago, a much greater role of constituency ombudsman in which he has to give service, and people have to come to recognize this as the point. But gracious me, when you get a mish-mash of boundaries which make Clapham Junction just outside London look like a simple matter, I just wonder why commissioners cannot see that.

Third, there is a natural community of interest which exists in various parts and in various cities. There are community interests in my city of Edmonton and in the city of Toronto, and in mid town Toronto there are natural flows of community interest. In St. Paul's, for instance, by making the riding more of a lateral than a vertical shape the proposal seems to ignore the natural north-south community of interest which centres around the Yonge Street subway. People who work in downtown Toronto and take the subway to work—principally those east of Bathurst

Street—do tend to share more of a community of interests than those who live west of Bathurst Street who may go into other parts of Toronto to go to work.

Here is another one—boundaries. One will find them in rural constituencies running down the middle of the main street of a small town. In the case of St. Paul's, Lytton Boulevard cuts right through a closely-knit community. It is a quitet residential street with little traffic and has no rational basis as a natural dividing line. Lawrence Avenue, a major artery several blocks to the north, is the more obvious choice.

● (1950)

Strangely, in its preliminary work the commission made conscious attempts to conform to both provincial and municipal boundaries. Yet with regard to the report for the province of Ontario, the commission departed entirely from that conformity and did not give reasons. I am told there are no reasons in the Ontario report. Why not? They must be there. It is not the task of members of parliament to punch at pillows. The commissioners do not have the God-given or legal right to hand down a ukase from on high and challenge others to prove them wrong. Their changes must be made on the basis of law. They must give reasons. If those reasons are invalid, they must expect to be attacked. Hopefully, as a result of criticism, they will change their conclusions. I submit that nothing should prevent the commissioners from making the changes required.

I have almost used up my time, Mr. Speaker. The former member, Mr. Atkey, made alternate proposals to the commission. He presented proposal A and proposal B. He considered some of the advantages of proposal A, and some of the disadvantages. Strangely enough, the commission disregarded both proposals A and B and brought forward a solution which runs counter to many of the principles I have tried to enunciate, and which members on both sides have repeated time and time again. I must confess that it is frustrating to find that people—and I do not say this patronizingly—who are certainly as intelligent as members of parliament should assess a situation in a vacuum, treat people as mere ciphers, ignore demographic factors and community of interest and arrive at the sort of results we now see.

I intend to speak with regard to the Alberta objections tomorrow, and will go into detail about my own city. I shall speak about some of the problems which have resulted from proposals made by commissioners who have, shall we say, considered facts which exist in a vacuum, which are a figment of somebody's imgination, and which do not exist in reality. They have used such facts in coming to a conclusion. I hope that hon. members are not arguing in a vacuum. I know that there are many submission concerning Ontario and many concerning the other provinces.

I hope the commissioners realize the disruption which a wrong decision can cause. I hope that the commissioners will consider the census figures, allow a tolerance of 25 per cent on either side, and remember that the best job of redistribution is the one which changes boundaries the least. As it is, the people in the constituencies have a tough enough time knowing who their federal and provincial members are. They know that their problems will eventually receive attention. As it is, our people have some difficulty in recognizing which member represents which constituency. It gives us no satisfaction when people come to our constituency offices with a problem and we have to tell them, "Well, no, this is the wrong place. You will have to go down there, to Mr. So and So, the provincial member."

Not all our constituents are perfect linguists in English or French. It does not behoove us to make their life that much more complicated. As it is, John Q. citizen has a tough enough time, and the commissioners should take another look at this matter and uncomplicate some of the tangled webs they have placed before the House in the form of redistribution plans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Andras: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am the member for Port Arthur. Some ten years ago, shortly after being first elected to this House, I made reference to an article I had written for some publication, the name of which escapes me, in which I advocated government support for studies of the feasibility of creating a new eleventh province. I think it was to be called Aurora.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not Aurora Borealis?

Mr. Andras: No, but in the end it could have been called that. It was to comprise northern Ontario and parts of northeastern Quebec. I was astounded at the response to this whimsical idea of mine. There was a response from residents of northern Ontario, all the way over to the Quebec boundary, and in Quebec itself. People from Mattawa to Kenora, from Parry Sound to Nipigon, sent letters into my office supporting this suggestion. The letters poured in.

I raise the matter in this context for this reason: by doing this, residents of northern Ontario vented their individual feelings of frustration and isolation, and made known their discontent with the manner in which they had been treated by governments generally, federal and provincial.

I hasten to say, Mr. Speaker, that whatever separatist leanings I had in those days I soon abandoned, particularly after my own somewhat cursory study of the constitutional issues involved indicated that only the most drastic action, revolution, could bring it about. I did not, however, reject the legitimate aspirations, and very legitimate feelings of my fellow northerners. As a member of parliament and member of the government for many years I have been advocating and supporting legislation the aim of which is to relieve regional disparities and improve the social and economic well-being of Canadians everywhere. If the quality of life in northern Ontario has improved in the ten years since I made those comments, the reason is partly the

vigour of the representation made in parliament on behalf of the 12 federal ridings about which we are talking.

As the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) said, few rights are as fundamental as the right of the people to have a voice in government. Canadian citizens demand representation which reflects their diverse and distinctive interests. That is the spirit in which the Parliament of Canada enacted the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. So, the suggestion that northern Ontario residents look upon the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission as disappointing would be an understatement. It would be a masterpiece of understatement. It is far more accurate to describe their feelings as those of anger, frustration, and resentment. Indeed, I must associate myself with those adjectives in expressing their feelings or describing them.

● (2000)

My colleagues from northern Ontario, particularly northwestern Ontario, have filed objections to the report. Most certainly we emphatically reject the reduction in the number of constituencies in northern Ontario from its present status of 12 to 11 particularly when we note that the province of Ontario is gaining seven seats. I do not need to dwell on the difficulties encountered by each of us in these more sparsely populated areas in attempting to carry out adequately our duties as members of parliament. The hon. member for Edmonton West has waxed eloquently on that. I agree with the comments I heard as I came into the House.

Northern Ontario is a vast, rugged region. Our communities are relatively small and they are very scattered throughout that whole incredible geographic area. Transportation routes by southern standards are not always convenient, and communications are frequently extremely difficult. The makeup of the population of northern Ontario also warrants mention. It contains citizens of English and French origin, as well as a significant percentage of those who speak neither English nor French, and indeed, and more particularly, one must recognize that northern Ontario contains a large population of our native people.

It is also important in conveying our views to the Electoral Boundaries Commission, which I hope is the point of this debate, to remember that in northern Ontario there are two time zones. At least three of our present constituencies in geographic area are larger than France. It is in fact further to drive from Toronto in Ontario to Kenora in Ontario than to drive from Toronto to Halifax in Nova Scotia. That gives some indication of the vastness of the area that we members from that part of the country have to try to represent adequately.

As the hon. member for Edmonton West pointed out, and I applaud him for speaking in a debate which appears to affect only Ontario, and as I said earlier, it really affects far more than the province of Ontario. It bears repeating that people in areas such as ours rely a great deal more heavily, and identify more closely because of their needs with their elected representatives, than those in heavily populated centres.

Because of the relatively small size of our communities and their distance from Ottawa, there is no question in my

[Mr. Andras.]

mind, even in the year 1976, that there is still a tremendous feeling and sense of isolation from the centres of power.

My own experience is that because government services very often do not extend into these remote areas and because access to the capital city, in this case Ottawa but it also applies to Queen's Park in Toronto, is difficult and expensive, there is a greater need for effective representation. It has been said, and it is very true, that a member of parliament in effect becomes an ombudsman. His role becomes far heavier because he is expected to supply to his constituents much of what is available by a phone call in Don Mills or a ten minute bus ride to an office in Windsor. That is not possible in our part of the country.

When the number of constituencies in northern Ontario was increased from 11 to 12 in 1968, that was applauded. It was looked upon as a great step forward. To reduce this number now by eliminating the riding of Thunder Bay would be, and is being considered as, a message to the people of this area that they will no longer be able to enjoy the excellent and exclusive representation that they presently expect, and justifiably so.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, have the problems which led to the creation of an additional constituency in 1968, just eight years ago, been resolved? Are the people of northern Ontario less deserving of adequate representation in 1976 than they were in 1968? I want to say for the record that the population of this area has not declined. What has occurred is that the rate of increase has not been as rapid as that in the southern part of the province.

It is little wonder that residents of the north have responded so quickly and so firmly to the electoral boundaries that they see thrust upon them. Throughout our region, municipal councils, chambers of commerce, labour unions, newspaper editorials and many individuals have objected strenuously to the proposal to reduce northern Ontario representation. I recall few issues which have upset our constituents as much as this. Residents are most concerned in northwestern Ontario, the area most affected. The municipal council of the city of Thunder Bay has unanimously passed a resolution protesting the change.

The communities of Geraldton, Schreiber, Longlac, Terrace Bay, Manitouwadge, Beardmore, Nakina, and Hornepayne felt so strongly about this issue that they jointly hired legal counsel to argue their case, so far to no avail.

There are precedents and ample evidence to maintain twelve seats in northern Ontario. First, in increasing the total number of members of the House of Commons, parliament sought to protect areas such as the maritimes, the Northwest Territories, and Northern Ontario, from losing seats. Second, parliament has departed from the strict principle of representation by population in adding a second seat in the Northwest Territories, an area not unlike our own in many respects. Third, the Ontario provincial commission recently went through the same process as we are in, and maintained the existing 15 provincial ridings. Surely residents should be given the same consideration by the federal commission. Fourth, the floor which is guaranteed smaller provinces is not only a safeguard of provincial rights, but also is a recognition of the difficulties of representing non-urban regions.

Finally, the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act provides that the commission may depart up to 25 per cent from the electoral quota for the province because of, and I quote:

. . . special geographic considerations, sparsity or density of population, accessibility of regions, size or shape of regions, or for special community or diversity of interests of the inhabitants of the various regions.

The electoral quota for Ontario is 81,000, and the minimum permitted as a 25 per cent departure is 60,814. The average population of the 11 ridings proposed is over 70,000, well above the minimum permitted. If 12 ridings are maintained, the average would be more than 64,000, which is within the terms of the act.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was clearly the intent of parliament when it enacted the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act that every allowance be made for geographical consideration, and I urge the commission to make every use of this section of the act to ensure that northern Ontario retains 12 seats.

The constituencies proposed by the commission are huge geographical monstrosities which sprawl across the region unmindful of traditional historical ties. They ignore transportation and communication patterns, and neglect linguistic affinities.

● (2010)

Consider for a moment a single constituency which would include both Windsor and Ottawa. The riding which the commission calls Cochrane North is larger and more diverse than such a constituency would be. But it certainly lacks the sophisticated communications network of a constituency in Southern Ontario. While reference has been made to urban and to rural ridings, much of Northern Ontario is neither urban nor rural; a great deal of it is best described as wilderness. But it is a wilderness which contains people, and these people need to be represented.

We have assigned to the commission a difficult and important responsibility. But while the task is difficult, it is not impossible. It is possible, as I have pointed out, to maintain 12 seats in Northern Ontario under the act. My fellow Liberal members of parliament from Northwestern Ontario and I appeared and addressed the commission during the public hearings. We submitted our own map to the commission showing how 12 constituencies could be maintained within the guidelines and quotas laid down by the act. I believe the act was drafted with areas such as ours in mind. That is why the 25 per cent tolerance, plus or minus, was provided.

I urge most strenuously, in this last stage of revulsion at the decision, the last opportunity we shall likely have, that the quality of representation enjoyed by our part of Canada should not be sacrificed by reducing the number of representatives to a level below that which our residents deserve and demand.

I have said nothing so far about the question of privilege raised earlier today. I respect the decision of Mr. Speaker—his feeling that he could not be the legal judge. But added to our concern with regard to the boundaries defined by the commission is concern over the very basis upon which the decision has been reached—that it has jeopardized and weakened the legal foundation for redistribution. Mr. Speaker, I trust you will convey to the Electoral Boundaries Commission of Ontario our strong feeling and our vigorous representation that a second look be taken at this situation, and that the Commission will, if I may say so, come to its senses and restore the representation we believe we are entitled to in my part of the country.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments as a member of parliament from Ontario. Let me assure my colleagues that I am not finding fault as far as my own riding is concerned. I represent a rural riding, the constituency of Parry Sound-Muskoka. It is a sparsely populated constituency, one with no large municipalities, but small ones scattered all through it. The commission added about 22 townships to my riding, which certainly represents a sizeable amount of land, but I doubt whether there would be more than 150 votes in the whole of those 22 townships unless the 8,000 or 10,000 wolves that eat the deer up there are allowed to vote, in which case it would be a different story.

I have listened with interest to my colleagues across the House speaking with regard to Northern Ontario, and as a Progressive Conservative representing a great party which has not had a member from Northern Ontario since 1935 I suppose I could sit back laughing about the proposal to reduce northern representation and say, "That's just wonderful". But with all due respect I do feel that the people of Northern Ontario are entitled to 12 members instead of 11, even though it would probably make no difference to us as a party in 1978.

I wish to make a few comments on that aspect and support the many fine members of parliament who feel that the decision of the commission was a retrograde step. I have the greatest sympathy for the Electoral Boundaries Commission which is pretty well hemmed in by the guidelines which have been set for it by way of minimum population figures and so on. However, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) who preceded me pointed out that the population of the region would warrant 12 seats, and I certainly hope the commission will consider his submissions on that basis.

In my own riding I am not far above the minimum of 60,000. The population of Parry Sound-Muskoka is around 62,900. The hon. member for Port Arthur mentioned talk of secession in Northern Ontario. I know there are certain people in Northern Ontario who feel that Northern Ontario should be an entirely different province. That feeling is brought about by the idea that they have been forgotten by higher levels of government to the south. I am hoping the commissioners will bear this in mind when considering the matter again.

I was interested to hear the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) speak today about the new boundaries to his riding. Looking at the map, it is certainly quite small in comparison to my riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka. He was complaining about difficulties of one kind and another, and in my view he has cause for complaint because certain comunities in that area were selected to go to the new and enlarged constituency of Timiskaming.

The hon. member stated that the new riding of Timiskaming would be 900 miles in extent. I think he must have been talking about kilometres. I think he was stretching it

a bit. I doubt whether even in the new and enlarged riding of Timiskaming it would be much over 550 miles from the southern end to Moosonee and James Bay. He did not mention that he was being given a very choice part of the territorial district of Nipissing, the part that was in Renfrew North. That is the part which is very close to my own riding and which is actually oriented to the riding of Parry Sound, the township of Chisolm, which is now to be part of the new riding of Timiskaming.

● (2020)

The idea of moving down from 12 to 11 seats does not sit too well with us, Mr. Speaker. I consider myself a northerner. Half my riding is a territorial district. Territorial districts are for the most part in northern Ontario, with the exception of Parry Sound. The southern portion of my riding is the regional municipality of Muskoka. Representing a territorial district I have every sympathy with northern Ontario members and I hope the boundaries commission will see fit to let northern Ontario retain its 12 seats. As matters stand, Ontario will end up with seven extra seats. This great Toronto horseshoe will be getting eight seats and the rest of Ontario is getting no increase. One particular area, northern Ontario, is losing a seat.

As the hon. member for Nipissing so rightly pointed out, there is a great trend toward urbanization. He stated that by the year 2000 94 per cent of the people of Canada will be residing in 12 congested urban areas. Let us hope something will be done to keep more people in rural areas where they will be happier, healthier, and live a lot longer. Although they will probably not make so much salary, they will live a better rounded life.

I see the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) getting ready in anticipation of speaking. Having checked the boundaries of his riding I see the commissioners have done a slicing job and removed part of the city of Sault Ste. Marie and placed it in the riding of Algoma. I am sure the hon. member is not too elated with that. The city of Sault Ste. Marie is, I was going to say an island unto itself, but it is at least an entity. It is a community. The ten or eleven thousand people who are being cut away from the city so far as the federal riding is concerned are very unhappy about it, and I am sure he will be speaking most eloquently on behalf of his riding. As I mentioned to him, he has not been the only one to speak in support; the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) spoke on the matter and read into the record a letter from the Ontario minister of housing.

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief. The purpose of this intervention, which has already been outlined to the Electoral Boundaries Commission on maps, is not to take issue with the proposed revisions of population distribution between the ridings of London East and London West. Rather it is to propose a simpler and less disruptive boundary between these two ridings while maintaining the same population distribution as proposed by the federal boundaries commission. It seems to me that one of the criteria which common sense would dictate should play a part in the considerations of the commissioners is that of minimizing the disruption of existing ridings.

[Mr. Darling.]

After the election of 1968, the first in the newly created ridings of London East and London West which resulted from redistribution, considerable confusion existed in the minds of residents as to which riding they lived in, and this was evidenced by the substantial amount of misdirected mail and telephone calls which both members received. This has now diminished to the point where, eight years later, it is safe to say that 95 per cent of the constituents know in which constituency they live. While accepting that some disruption is necessary with redistribution, it is suggested that new boundaries should keep disruption to the absolute minimum.

The proposal I am advancing has absolutely no bearing on any boundary of these ridings except the joint boundary, the common north-south boundary, between London East and London West. In the commissioners' proposal, in the northern section of the riding they carved out a much larger chunk of London West than was necessary. Then in order to compensate for this excessive carving in the northern portion of the riding, they had to carve an equally large chunk out of London East in the Southern section.

I believe that the boundary which would be achieved by a much smaller adjustment in the northern section of the riding would be considerably fairer and more reasonable from the point of view of the residents of both these ridings. It is a simpler boundary since it follows well-known thoroughfares, makes use of well-known streets, and will be much clearer for the residents to understand than will watercourses, less well-known streets, or relatively unknown railroad tracks.

Now I make a political comment, Mr. Speaker. Both ridings were won by the same party in the last election by substantial margins, and I think the fact that both sitting members support the proposed revision that I am advancing is a clear indication that it is felt that there is virtually no political advantage to be gained from either set of redistributed boundaries.

We believe, and I propose to the House, that one of the criteria that should be urged upon the commissioners is the minimizing of disruption for existing constituents. It seems to me that the disruption should be minimized to the greatest extent possible, consistent with the achieving of a proper distribution balance between the existing ridings.

I would therefore urge upon the commissioners of the federal boundaries commission that they re-examine their proposed boundary between the ridings of London East and London West and alter it so as to minimize the disruption they are imposing upon the residents of both ridings, and achieve their desired population distribution by substantially moving back the boundary in the northerly section of the riding, keeping the existing boundary between the two ridings in the southerly portion of the riding.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Loiselle (Chambly): I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Loiselle) is rising on a point of order.

● (2030)

Mr. Loiselle (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, since I shall be unable to attend the sitting of the House tomorrow and I

must submit a brief on redistribution of electoral boundaries in Quebec, particularly on the south shore of Montreal, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to interrupt the debate on the Ontario ridings for only 5 or 6 minutes so I may make my own comments. Will the House grant me unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my understanding that the hon. member for Chambly will talk about a riding in the province of Quebec and then we will immediately revert to the province of Ontario. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank my colleagues for allowing me to interrupt the debate on the redistribution of the ridings in the fair province of Ontario, to hear a few comments on the province of Quebec and to give hon. members the opportunity to find out that it is not easy to change the electoral map; in particular the commissioners should have known more about the various communities when they carved out the Quebec territory.

Mr. Speaker, my comments are aimed at requesting that the Electoral Boundaries Commission review its decision concerning my riding of Chambly to which part of the present riding of Saint-Hyacinthe has been added, after which it has been split into two. What I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, is that the towns of Saint-Bruno, Montarville and Saint-Basile be taken out of the Chambly riding and added to the future riding of Verchères. The reasons are obvious and very simple. First, my intervention arises from explicit requests from the authorities of these two municipalities, public agencies such as chambers of commerce, school boards and all public and quasi-public bodies of that area.

At this time, if the commission did not change its figures, the new riding of Chambly would count 81,000 inhabitants and that of Verchères 71,000. However, we are aware that the riding of Verchères, as it is now and shall have to continue to grow, is a predominantly rural riding and therefore its growth rate will be relatively low, while Chambly, with towns like Saint-Hubert and Chambly, is mostly an industrial riding with a high rate of residential development. So the growth rate of the population is among the highest. If we made forecasts for 1981, it is obvious that the town of Saint-Hubert should constitute a riding by itself.

And we will have to separate the town of Chambly. But if we take the territory of Verchères to which we would add the municipalities of Saint-Bruno and Saint-Basile in 1981, it could still remain a riding. Anyway, according to 1971 figures, the population of Verchères, which is known to remain stable, would now be about 90,000 and Chambly's with its high rate of population growth would amount to about 62,000 or 63,000 constituents.

The reasons not to dissociate Saint-Bruno and Saint-Basile from municipalities such as Boucherville, Belœil and Sainte-Julie are quite simple. Under an agreement on tourism, our own government will grant $13 million for developing green spaces and agricultural area in this territory. Consequently, we will achieve once and for all what has been called the Bois de Verchères project. This implies the cooperation of all municipal boards because this project expands over all these municipalities. Therefore we need cooperation.

Clearly the commissioners could not know that policy. But the document will be signed soon and the municipalities must remain within the same constituency.

As far as environment is concerned, I wish to indicate there is not only a territorial distribution agreement, but also a land-use agreement.

As for rural zoning and municipal infrastructures, such as sewer and water systems, although we are evidently surrounded by rivers, we have nonetheless water supply problems, and the municipalities, whether Boucherville, Sainte-Julie, Saint-Bruno or Saint-Basile must be supplied from one source, from the same purification plants, and the bulk of the expenses are financed in the normal way. There is of course the Department of Municipal Affairs in Quebec, but it gets money from Ottawa.

I wonder why in areas of intensive development, in areas such as the south shore where we find headquarters of the CMHC which for the last two years made direct loans of about $60 million, I wonder why more consideration is not given to local factors and the role of the member of Parliament. In such areas, his role is not strictly that of a law-maker coming to Ottawa five days a week to ensure better quality of life to all. His basic duty is in the nature of an administration role, which is hard to perform when there is a multiplicity of problems.

Let us take the City of Saint-Hubert for instance. It is experiencing very active development. It is also a city where urban renewal must retain attention. Taking the municipality of Chambly, with the Department of Northern Development and Indian Affairs and the industrial park project, we have another type of problem although linking easily with those in Saint-Hubert. But with the airport between Saint-Hubert and Saint-Bruno, when the present member for Chambly leaves Saint-Bruno to go to Saint-Hubert, he feels he is getting into a different constituency. This is something I must live with. And if I do represent the eventual Chambly constituency, I have no wish to keep on shifting personalities, as I now have to, because of absolutely different sets of problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, I ask the commission to review its work. This is not only the wish of the hon. member for Chambly, it is also that of the various town councils affected in this case, those of Saint-Basile and Saint-Bruno, which want to be part of the Verchères Riding, as well as those of Boucherville and Belœil, which would like to work and be in the same riding as these two towns which they will eventually lose if the commission does not modify its decision. Mr. Speaker, this is also the most sincere wish of the present member for Chambly, who still does not know which riding he will represent. But the wish I express as member for Chambly arises not from electoral concern, so to speak, but much more from

my own experience of the evolution and expansion of that community. This experience I have acquired since 1970, first when I was an assistant to a provincial minister and representative for a riding from this area and, since 1974, as a federal member of Parliament closely linked to the development and expansion of this region.

So I urge the commission, which has refused to consider the report submitted by an ad hoc committee from Saint-Bruno and Saint-Basile and which has refused to change its first version, I urge it, following my speech tonight, to accept to review its decision. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you very much, once again, dear colleagues.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The House will now revert to the consideration of the objections to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission of the province of Ontario.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I have listened this afternoon with interest to the arguments presented on both sides of the House describing how hon. members and their constituents feel the constituencies should be divided. Some were very fair in their criticisms while others were a little selfish.

I want to begin by congratulating the commission before which I had the privilege, along with many representatives of my riding, of appearing. I congratulate the commission on its willingness and on its openmindedness in reconsidering its proposal of last August, and in its consideration of a number of objections.

Objections in the province of Ontario numbered 203 and were presented at hearings in Toronto, Thunder Bay, London, Windsor, Belleville, Ottawa, Welland, and Sudbury. As a result of these objections there were 67 changes made. This indicates that the commissioners were thinking of the people and taking into consideration the traditional and historic links as well as the cultural activities of communities.

The county council of the county of Haliburton appeared before the commission in Belleville. Haliburton county was severed from its traditional and historical ties with the County of Victoria and put into the great riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka. We heard from the able hon. member representing that riding a few minutes ago.

It is my suggestion that there are actually next to no historical links between the County of Haliburton and the riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka. They are not linked by watersheds, land borders or anything else. In making a direct representation, the Haliburton County Council along with many other people drew this to the attention of the Commission. The commissioners listened to the view of the people. They made this change and brought it back to the County of Victoria. This made much sense because in the county the administration, the businesses, the way of life of the people, the hospitals, the medical services, the chambers of commerce, the county council, what used to be the War Measures Association, and the local municipalities have much in common. I must congratulate the commission for taking this into consideration. They listened to the people and their wishes. I will have more to say about community of interest a little later.

● (2040)

The task of the commission is a most difficult one. It is impossible for a commission to come up with a solution that will be 100 per cent satisfactory to all concerned. However, when reason and common sense are injected into a problem of this nature the results often are very desirable.

Again, as I say, I think in the section of the province I have the honour and privilege to represent the commission was very favourable to the wishes of the people as far as possible. We must remember that we gave them a task to do. We gave them a formula and guidelines. They were confined to the guidelines set down by the House of Commons. They did not come up with what was altogether a solution in the first proposal. But they held hearings and made 67 changes; so they were listening. However, here we have some members criticizing them in respect of the difficult decisions they have had to reach. I must, in this regard, express my congratulations to the commissioners.

All sections of this province are different. I lost six townships through redistribution, townships which I greatly respect, and townships in which I have learned to work with the people. I knew their problems and had an understanding of the nature of life in those communities, including the expectations of the people and what would help them to live in some of the remote areas.

I must speak of the townships in North Hastings which I lost and regained in the redistribution in 1968. We had to go through the process of initiating the people into being a part of Victoria Haliburton. They were a little hesitant to come. We were new people to them. We probably operated in a different manner in respect of many of the services. But now they are a part of the community. They are very good people. However, they are now being placed in the riding of Hastings Frontenac. I am sure they will have very good representation there, but they really wonder why the change is being made. They say they have become accustomed to being in Victoria-Haliburton and wonder if they are being used as pawns. These people resent this. They do not know where they are going. I think we should pay a little more attention to the wishes of these people wherever possible. I realized it is difficult to please all people.

Another two townships involved are Rama and Mara. They were in the riding of Victoria-Haliburton when I first was elected in 1965. Now they are being placed in the riding of Simcoe. They are adjacent to the riding of Simcoe, and as much as I hate to lose them because the people there are fine people—and again they understand me and I hope I understand them—their proximity to the other riding probably means that we cannot argue too much about the change.

There is the problem of the lack of general knowledge concerning redistribution and what it is all about. I do not think the people are well enough informed about redistribution. I realize that there is the advertising in the newpapers and through other media, but possibly people do not take the time to think about the situation until it is too late

to put in an objection. I believe that in future publications concerning redistribution we will have to put forward a better effort to enlighten our people and make them fully aware that it is in their interests to speak up at public hearings and express their wishes with regard to redistribution. This probably is more true in the rural ridings of Ontario than it is in the urban ridings. There is a different way of life. The representation is different.

I believe that the rural people are closer to their member of parliament. They expect him to attend as many functions as possible. As a rural member I enjoy these functions, but there are more than I really can attend. However, this is part of the role of a rural member of parliament. This is good for all concerned. It gives the member an exposure to his constituents. They feel freer to come to him with their problems when they can meet him at a hockey match, a fall fair, or other functions in which they participate with the member.

On such occasions the people will talk to their member with a much lighter heart and more freely than if they met him at some more formal function. I think this factor must be taken into consideration in respect of the rural parts of Canada. We must consider the rural way of life in Canada and the close relationship that members have with their constituents.

I know that many metropolitan areas are ably represented. But if I were free to do so I could tell the story as explained to me by an hon. member when he described some of the urban ridings in Ontario. I believe my language would be restrained. However, this is a story for another place.

The news media also come into this. A large riding may have up to 20 or more newspapers. In additon there are many radio and television stations which cover the area. In an urban area there may be two television stations and two radio stations. In the rural areas one has to cater to a smaller media. This also must be taken into account. It is difficult to get the message across to one's constituents in a large, spead-out rural riding.

The population growth picture probably is something else to which we do not give enough attention in respect of the formula concerning the electoral boundaries commissions. Many parts of rural Ontario, the smaller cities and larger towns, receive an influx of retired people who want the better way of life. We cannot blame them for that, but we must consider that. There will be many thousands more people in the ridings by the time this is enacted. This is why at this time the population growth potential should be considered.

Now I should like to return to the matter of community of interest on which I touched briefly a few moments ago. In the rural parts of Ontario because of the methods of transportation and communication the people mingle back and forth. They have different community activities. Senior citizens in senior citizens' homes are now being bussed to other senior citizens' homes, and up to Ottawa by special buses with wheelchairs in them and everything else. This is part of life in a rural riding which is not as common as it is in urban ridings, not that it does not exist in urban ridings but it is on a different scale. They suffer from a lack of closeness to their elected representative at either the provincial or municipal level.

● (2050)

Taking all this into consideration I think that the commission has done a reasonably good job. I know that approximately 75 per cent of the suggestions that were put before the commission by different organizations and groups within my riding were well received. This is a very good average. I know that probably we would all like to have 100 per cent of our requests accepted, but 75 per cent is a good average. It is a good average for a job that is hard to do if you wish to please everybody, and it is a good average for a job with a formula which was probably outdated before it was started. That is why I cannot be too critical and say that the commission should have done this or should have done things over again.

As I said a few moments ago, with regard to central Ontario, the heart of greater Ontario, the commission has done a conscientious and sincere job. Some of the criticisms that hon. members are making of the decisions of the commission as regards the boundaries of their ridings perhaps should not be directed at the commission but rather at the people who established a formula to be used by the commission. I hope that when electoral boundaries are reviewed again they will look back at some of the suggestions put forward here this afternoon and this evening—and I do not mean just my suggestions but other very constructive suggestions that I have heard here—and they will take them into consideration when the next guidelines are set down for the electoral boundaries commission.

I have often wondered who speaks for you, Mr. Speaker, in a debate such as this. I suppose that is a privilege which one who occupies your most respected position must give up, but I want to thank you again for paying attention to my recommendations. I am sure that we will hear much from members of the other provinces. I believe that the Ontario representation has been reasonably well put forth. As I said, I was a little disappointed at some of the criticism regarding boundary ridings proposed by the commission, which was hampered by the guidelines. However, I hope it has all been constructive.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Ethier (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief because I know several of my colleagues also want to participate in this debate that affects their riding. First of all, I should like to thank the commission for having included paragraph "d" in the designation of my riding, paragraph which in part says that the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton is included in the riding of Cumberland.

In paragraph "d", the commission took into consideration the cultural identity of the electors of that municipality, which used to be part of the federal riding of Russell and which it will be an honour for me to serve. Moreover, I shall make it a point to meet my new electors as soon as possible. Looking over the illustrious names in that municipality such as the MacDonalds, the Boudrias, the McTeers and the Lamothe, I can assure them that I will make it a point of honour to represent them well.

Mr. Speaker, while I am pleased that this municipality has been added I nevertheless deplore the fact that the commission has deemed it advisable to leave out Russell in the name of my constituency. I can hardly understand such

a recommendation, because on page 16 of the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario, we find in schedule "d" section 23, the definition and the make-up of my constituency named Glengarry-Prescott-Russell. However, they wanted to change that name for that of Glengarry-Prescott.

Section "a" concerning the make-up of the constituency mentions the county of Prescott, section "b" the county of Russell, section "c" the county of Glengarry, except the township of Charlottenburg and the village of Lancaster and the above mentioned section "d" the township of Cumberland. Section "b" refers to the county of Russell and not part of it. I therefore suggest that the commission did not take in consideration the fact that the population wished to keep their identity as citizens of Russell. On their behalf, I ask the commission to recommend that the name be changed.

[*English*]

Under section C the Township of Charlottenburg and the village of Lancaster are excluded from the county of Glengarry. My objection would have been only to the changing of the name of my riding had the commission omitted the last part of section C which states "but excluding the village of Lancaster and the township of Charlottenburg".

This part of my riding was referred to as Glengarry not only since the last redistribution, the one before or others in the past, but since well before Confederation. I should like to mention for the record that the hon. member who represented Glengarry before Confederation was none other than the Hon. Donald Alexander MacDonald. I should also like to mention for the record that he was born in St. Raphael in the township of Charlottenburg, which the commission wants to withdraw from Glengarry. The hon. gentleman was elected to the legislative assembly of the province of Canada in 1857 to represent the riding of Glengarry.

Because the riding existed before Confederation and because the hon. gentleman from Charlottenburg represented it when it became part of Confederation I have received many complaints from constituents who wish to remain Glengarrians, those in Charlottenburg and those from the village of Lancaster.

As one who has shared the first 50 years of his life with fellow Glengarrians, I also object to the recommendations of this commission. How would we explain to a young piper from Lancaster that he can still belong to the Glengarry Pipe Band but he is no longer a Glengarrian, or worse still, how would we explain to a veteran of the Glengarry Highlanders who lives in Charlottenburg and served his country as a Glengarry Highlander that he will no longer be a Glengarrian?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the area I represent is made of three former counties and all three have their own page of history. So I suggest that this recommendation of the commission be reconsidered and that these three historical counties be left unchanged.

[*English*]

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, by any political standards there is no reason for my objecting to the boundaries of the newly created riding of Prince Edward in Ontario. As outlined in paragraph 64 on page 27 of the Boundaries Commission Report for Ontario, it is made up of the whole of Prince Edward County and that portion of Hastings County comprising the towns of Thurlow and Tyendinaga, the village of Deseronto, and the city of Belleville where I live.

I have lived in this area all of my adult life and I have seen boundaries change, and change back again. As the sitting member for a major portion of the population of the new area since 1972 I do not, however, consider that I have any proprietary right to the new seat. Having said that, I wish to point out that my life has been spent in public service in the area, and I feel I am aware of its problems to a greater degree than some. Each time the boundaries have been changed, there has been a disruption of traditional communities of interest. Now we are faced again with a severance which will put aside these regional interests. This time there seems to be an opportunity, at least partially, to correct the situation without unduly disturbing any other boundaries.

● (2100)

So that there will be no misunderstanding, I should point out that I am going to speak in part about the proposed riding of Northumberland, most of which is now served by the most capable member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees).

Changes will also be suggested in the proposed riding of Hastings-Frontenac, but these will be of a nature which will not materially or drastically affect that area. Historically, commercially, from the point of view of municipal government, communications, and so many other factors, the area south of No. 7 highway in Hastings county has always related to the larger urban areas of Trenton and Belleville. Even the boundaries of this area set prior to 1968 when it was known as Hastings South took into consideration the natural bonds of the area south of No. 7 highway.

Let me now outline briefly the changes I propose, which are supported by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings. I suggest that the township of Rawden, with a population of 2,115; and the village of Stirling, with a population of 1,500, should be rejoined to the riding of Northumberland, making a new population for that constituency of 67,901. Let the two townships of Huntingdon, with a population of 1,635, and Hungerford with a population of 2,292, and the village of Tweed with a population of 1,738, be rejoined to the area to the south to be called Prince Edward, which will increase that constituency to 72,394.

On checking the arithmetic this will leave the proposed riding of Hastings-Frontenac with a population of 65,636. Very quickly we will see that this leaves a population in the area spread much more evenly than would be the case under the proposal now put forward by the commission.

Ending my very brief intervention may I say that by and large I am not unhappy with the decision of the commission. Over the next few hours there will be a number of suggestions for minor variations, such as mine, all of which I am sure will bear close scrutiny. Only the commission itself will have the final opportunity to make changes.

Under the system we are bound by, there will be no further appeal, and I can only ask as strongly as possible that our representations be taken seriously.

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make a few comments on the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario. I sympathize with the commissioners on their task to redesign the electoral boundaries of the province for the next federal election in 1978.

The commissioners have had the dilemma of trying to reconcile the criterion of representation by population with that of taking into account the geographical size of areas and community of interest, and I, along with many of my colleagues from northern Ontario, was quite upset about the first revision which showed that northern Ontario would lose two seats and that its representation would be reduced from 12 to 10. We argued against that reduction in the number of voices speaking for northern Ontario, which has peculiar interests and needs, and thought we had made some points with the commission. Lo, when it came out with this latest and final draft, this final revision, we were shocked to see that the representation had been reduced by one, but in so doing the boundaries of many ridings had been redesigned to the point where they did not seem to make sense, and one seat, the riding of Thunder Bay, was done away with entirely.

We in the north have strong feelings about the need for keeping up representation in our area of the province. Northern Ontario is a part of a province of vast size. There are great distances between a few major urban centres, and many small towns and villages. The point to be remembered is the great distance and a lack of accessibility, not only between communities but between these communities and the centres of governmental power, whether it be in Toronto or in Ottawa. Therefore, as other hon. members have said, it is important that the citizens of northern Ontario have as strong a voice as possible and as many voices as they can have to speak for their interests. Hence we need as many members of parliament from the north as can be justified on the grounds of population, geography, and community of interest.

We think it is important that our representation be kept at 12 seats because the people of northern Ontario see their members of parliament as ombudsmen, people who deal with many problems of government bureaucracy which the people themselves would be unable to deal with because of their remoteness from the centres of governmental power, the great distances between communites, and their inaccessibility to civil servants. Hence members of parliament provide a very important service on a one to one basis with their constituents.

Members of parliament always play important roles in making representations on behalf of municipalities to government officials, both at the provincial and federal levels. Therefore it is important that members of parliament have a real familiarity with the peculiar needs of the various communities within their constituencies. If we keep reducing the number of members of parliament in northern Ontario, that will mean that the size of the ridings will geographically increase, and one member will have that many more communities to take care of, to familiarize himself with, and to meet their needs equally as he tries to meet the needs of many other groups and interests within his constituency.

For my colleagues in northern Ontario who represent rural ridings or farflung ridings I have the greatest admiration and sympathy. It is a very onerous task and a tremendous one for them to represent communities which often are hundreds and hundreds of miles apart.

I represent an urban riding, the city of Sault Ste. Marie. It has been my privilege to represent that riding since 1972, and I find that, like my counterparts in the north, I have a very important role to play as an ombudsman and in making representations to the government. So it was with a great deal of surprise that I saw the final map as drawn up by the commissioners because, out of the blue, I found that part of the city of Sault Ste. Marie was lopped off and put into the rural riding of Algoma. In effect there are two sections of my former riding which now go into the riding of Algoma: the Prince Township area, including the village of Gros Cap, and a large section of ward 1, amounting to a total population of about 11,000 which now would be moved into the federal riding of Algoma.

● (2110)

I cannot fathom the rationale of the commissioners in doing what they did. I can understand their argument. They had to keep a minimum population in northern Ontario ridings, especially Algoma, a rural, sparsely populated riding. They had to keep a minimum of 60,814 voters in the riding. To do this they had to take away part of the population of the city of Sault Ste. Marie, and add it to the rural riding. That makes no sense, especially if one examines the criteria according to which the commissioners are supposed to work.

The province of Ontario, in its redistribution plans, at one time thought of dividing the city, but then thought better. It heard representations from the people of Sault Ste. Marie, heard arguments concerning community of interest, after which the provincial government decided to keep the provincial constituency intact.

The municipal council of Sault Ste. Marie has objected to the proposed plan to put part of the city into the new riding of Algoma, and the majority of residents affected have also objected. They have called and written to me, saying that they cannot see the logic of this proposal, and have nothing in common with the rural riding of Algoma, which is far-flung and contains many small communities. The people in the city who will be included in the new riding of Algoma are upset at the commissioners' decision. I share their concern.

If one compares the urban riding of Sault Ste. Marie with the rural riding of Algoma, one can see that there is little in common between both ridings. Algoma consists of a number of small communities, mainly one-industry towns; many of the industries are foundering. There is great unemployment in the region and the people live economically precarious lives. Hence such communities struggle to survive. They find it difficult to attract new industry. The municipalities are crushed by existing debts, and taxes are increasing. The people of the community are not in the same boat as the people of Sault Ste. Marie. The city is flourishing. It contains a major industry, Algoma Steel, and many subsidiary industries.

In addition the people of Sault Ste. Marie have no community of interest with the people of Blind River, Bruce Mines or Elliot Lake in Algoma riding. Nor can the citizens of the city find much in common with the dairy farmers of Algoma or other cash crop farmers of that riding. There does not seem to be much community of interest between those two parts of the province. The two ridings have little in common economically. Nor is there a cultural community of interest involving the larger urban centre, Sault Ste. Marie, and smaller communities throughout Algoma riding.

I cannot fathom the rationale for breaking up an urban riding, like Sault Ste. Marie, and adding 11,000 of its residents to the riding of Algoma. The hon. member representing Algoma will have to service the extra constituents. He will need to consider their problems and, at the same time, try to please the constituents of the other small municipalities and interest groups in his far-flung riding.

Once the commissioners made the philosophic decision to reduce the number of seats in northern Ontario, they manipulated boundary lines and arrived at a compromise solution. They took portions of large urban ridings in northern Ontario and added them to less populous rural ridings in which the populations were below the minimum magic figure. I understand that this has been done in the case of Sudbury and of Thunder Bay as well.

What the commission has done will not deal with the root of the problem, maintaining 12 seats. I would have preferred it if the commissioners had decided to keep 12 seats, and recognized, as we have argued for many years in the north, that you cannot always abide by a rigid formula of representation by population. You have to take into account the size of ridings in the north. By their nature they are sparsely populated. Therefore one must create ridings which are manageable, which can be serviced. We should not have ridings stretching hundreds of miles from end to end. You can get round this difficulty only by making at least 12 ridings in northern Ontario. Once you go below the 12 riding limit you run into all kinds of difficulties, as is evident in this latest redistribution attempt.

The commissioners tried to soften the blow by reducing the number of northern Ontario seats to 11, but in so doing negated a fundamental principle, the need to keep intact community of interest. The result is an illogical cutting up of urban ridings. One part of the city riding has been added to a rural riding, and both rural and city people are all at ease in the new riding. They find no common ground. Their focus is different, their needs are different, and the result is the sort of discontent we witness at present in northern Ontario.

I cannot propose a solution to the problem of the riding in Sault Ste. Marie alone. I only wish that some people had looked at the map before deciding. If you returned to Sault Ste. Marie those people the commissioners took from the city and added to Algoma, Algoma would still have to find 10,000 population somewhere else. If you tried to amend the Algoma boundary, you would bite into another riding and take population from it. There is a domino effect in this. Once you start tampering with boundaries, no matter in which direction, the population of one riding may go up, but the population of the next riding will go down. That riding may need to recapture some extra population. I do not think the solution necessarily is to leave Sault Ste. Marie alone and to let Algoma find the population it needs somewhere else. I say this because the domino effect comes into play and, in the end, you will be back to square one.

I submit that the commissioners should again examine northern Ontario, realize it is unique, recognize its problems and the difficulties members of parliament face who represent such a vast area, and go back to the drawing board. We say that the 12 seats of the area have worked well. The commission should say, "We shall take into account the geography of northern Ontario and relax the representation by population formula, to make sure that community of interest and geography take precedence."

I repeat, the people of my riding are upset that part of the city will no longer be in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, but part of the new riding of Algoma. The population of the city opposes any part of the city being put in another riding. The Soo is an urban centre. It has worked well as a community in the past. The people have community of interest and want to see it maintained. I suggest that the commissioners should go back to the drawing board and begin with the basic proposition that we must maintain 12 seats in northern Ontario, and draw the map accordingly. I sympathize with the commissioners; their job is tough. However, we must consider the concerns of the people of northern Ontario. They have legitimate complaints. They have every right to send at least 12 representatives to the Parliament of Canada.

The commission's latest effort, although well-intentioned, has led to discontent and dissatisfaction. The people of the community object to the cutting up of the urban riding. I again say that I hope the commissioners will go back to that basic premise of 12 seats and not cut up urban ridings.

• (2120)

Mr. Ed Lumley (Stormont-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate. My intervention will be very short because primarily I am satisfied with the recommendations put forward by the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

I appreciate the comments of the hon. member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Ethier) who was sorry to see the recommendation that Charlottenburgh Township and the village of Lancaster will be lost, although I am happy that the Electoral Boundaries Commission paid heed to the motion put forward by the township of Charlottenburgh, both in 1975 and 1973, requesting that they become part of the riding of Stormont-Dundas. Approximately one half of the population works in the city of Cornwall in the constituency of Stormont-Dundas. Therefore it will be a much more homogenous riding with Charlottenburgh included.

I am also happy to take the latter half of Dundas County. I know I will have big shoes to fill, following the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) who was born in that area. Although I will not be able to eat as much chicken on the banquet circuit as the hon. member, I hope I can accomplish what he has—accomplished in past years.

One of my concerns with respect to the recommendations is that my riding will now be 50 per cent rural and 50 per cent urban, with a population increase of approximate-

ly 18,000 people. If you look at the electoral quotient of 81,000 and at the new ridings, you can see that the average population for a rural and partially urban area is between 66,000 and 70,000. Therefore I am a little concerned that I will not be able to maintain close relationship with the constituents in my riding with this substantial increase to 85,000.

It is important to note that in a lot of federal ridings, and this goes for all members but particularly in Ontario, we cover almost two provincial ridings. In my case I have approximately 30,000 people more than each of my provincial counterparts. It is important to note in the provinces where they are reducing areas to maintain a closer relationship with constituents, that federally with respect to rural areas the responsibility is getting greater. The Electoral Boundaries Commission must take this into consideration when making its final decision.

Primarily, I am very happy with the decisions taken by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to make this short intervention.

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas (Mr. Lumley). He expressed happiness with the decision of the commissioners with regard to the two great townships and one incorporated village in the county of Dundas, Mountain, Matilda, and the village of Iroquois which I now have the honour to represent in this parliament. His happiness was expressed in terms of those areas coming to him. I say to him that we will be watching very carefully to ensure that the good people in that area are properly represented. I would not want the amity of this situation to be changed in any way.

I want the hon. member to know they are fine people. They have problems in terms of representation here, in terms of agriculture, the drainage problems of the South Nation River and many other things requiring a great amount of attention and, more important co-operation between the three levels of government. I do not happily look forward to relinquishing representation in that area. I will be closely looking at the representation they receive in the furure, whether from the present incumbent for Stormont-Dundas or someone else.

As the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas said, these redistributions are not completely happy. Certain areas may be included in a constituency for a long period of time and, as a result of progress, they change. I have a double wrench in terms of this redistribution. One was mentioned by my friend for Stormont-Dundas, the fact that that part of Dundas County that I represent will go elsewhere. More than that, I am losing the Village of Cardinal. My home town is the Village of Cardinal. I know no one in this House would hold it against me if I were to admit that I am from the great village of Cardinal which has contributed in so many ways to the well-being of eastern Ontario.

In this mobile age in which we live I suppose I am among a minority, perhaps a sizeable minority, of members of parliament who represent the place where they grew up and where their parents lived, at least one of my parents still lives there and I can still call it home. The only problem with representing your home town is that many people in the town remember when you ran around in shorts and were perhaps more annoying than constructive to many of the neighbours, their gardens and chicken-houses. They sometimes cannot quite understand that there may be some hope in the progress of young people of their own town and that they can finally represent them in the parliament of Canada.

I do not think there is a greater honour that can come to any person than to represent the people among whom he grew up, and who were his friends as a youth as well as the friends and acquaintances of his family. Therefore this is quite a wrench for me in another way. However, I suppose we are all in one way or another the victim of change.

While there has not been a noticeable population growth in the southern part of Grenville County and the part of Dundas County which forms part of Grenville-Carleton, there has occurred in the northern part of that riding, that part of the township of Gloucester on Long Island, the new township of Rideau, the township of Nepean, the township of Osgoode, and the new township of Goulburn, a tremendous growth. This is as a result of the growth of public servants in this country and the attraction to the area of those employed in industry and business who, in one way or another, are dependent upon or related to the public service of this country. As a result, these changes have taken place.

I tried mightily to find some way within the criteria established by the statute to resist the change in boundaries, but regretfully that was not possible. Whether one represents an area for a long or a short time, he becomes used to balancing the various problems that exist. In the circumstances the report of the commissioners, which is the subject of this debate tonight and which was finally tabled as a result of the submissions that were made to the commission after it had originally reported, was the best possible job that could be done, not only with regard to my constituency but all constituencies on the Ontario side of the national capital.

Regretting as we must the change that occurs, I think it is the best possible balance and I commend the commissioners for doing an extremely difficult job so well. I know they lingered over the job a long time. I know they were concerned about it. However, what they did in terms of the national capital area, an area I can speak of with some authority, was a good job.

● (2130)

There was some feeling among members of parliament, and I heard it expressed on all sides of the House and in all the parties represented here, that there was not much point in making a submission to the commission, that their minds were made up and that they would not listen anyway. But I must say that this was not the case with respect to the ridings of which I speak and which were the subject of a lengthy submission dated October 29, 1975, prepared under the leadership of my friend, the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick). As I say, it was a lengthy submission and it argued the case for a change from the first findings of the commission with respect to its original distribution to those which were ultimately found in the ridings which were covered by it.

There was a conscious canvas of opinion by all the members in the area of the municipal councils, the school

boards, the historical atlases, the maps, the instruments of social communication and social intercourse within the area that was under discussion. That submission was prepared and submitted to the commission by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton and others and it was accepted, not because of its length, but because it was a rational explanation of the way in which the commission had gone wrong, in our respectful submission, and how the criteria of the act, in terms of numbers, could be answered and the other criteria not be ignored, and the important community of interest preserved.

As a result, with the regrets I have expressed personally as to that redistribution, as any person who represents an area must, I believe the best possible job was done by the commission in terms of the ridings that make up the national capital area on the Ontario side of the river and slightly beyond. I know there may be differences of opinion with respect to that, but I hope my colleagues in the House will understand the basis upon which it is made and I would be very happy to show my colleagues, when this debate is completed, the submission to which I referred, which was complete and covered every detail and to which each of us was able to make what I hope was considered to be a constructive comment upon the original proposals for the area.

The northern part around the city has its roots in the old part of Carleton County, and its centre of gravity toward the county seat, now the regional government seat and the seat of the board of education in the area, and all of these things reflect a community of interest which is buttressed by employment factors and locations of places of employment in the area.

All in all, Sir, I believe the best that could be done was done. The wishes of the people, at least as expressed by their representatives in the local area, were answered. Those matters which contribute to that broad field of community of interests were honoured. So this redistribution is a sound one.

There is always a problem with names. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton would, I am sure, like to have his constituency remain with the name Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton. When one looks at the map and the location of the municipalities which are included in his constituency, one sees that the name "Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton" is still applicable because contained within the boundaries of that constituency is still the Township of March—an historic part of the County of Carleton and one which has produced many fine public men in the municipal field, some of whom became wardens of the county over the years.

It was important in my judgment, and formed part of my submission, that the name "Carleton" be maintained because of its historic significance to the Townships of Goulbourn, a newly constituted Rideau, a newly constituted Osgoode, and Nepean and the portion of Gloucester, all of which formed part of old Carleton County. I think it is self-evident that if Ottawa were to form the base of the names for constituencies within the area of the City of Ottawa, that certainly there was justice and propriety in maintaining the name Nepean, the Township of Nepean, as part of the area which focuses upon, in a geographical sense, the Township of Nepean. This was done.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

There has been a return, regretful from my point of view certainly, at least in my personal feelings, of the County of Grenville, to the historic area known at the municipal level as the united counties of Leeds and Grenville—there has been a return in that way and the area of Dundas has gone in with its historic association with the balance of Dundas into the area now called Stormont-Dundas. I think that is regrettable but there is not much one can do about it on the basis of statistics, strive as I did to try to find an argument to thwart that particular idea. The area known as Carleton, Nepean, Goulbourn, Rideau, Osgoode and part of Gloucester and Long Island now forms a constituency which, in terms of representation, is sound.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that quite often commissioners are criticized for joining rural and urban areas together. It is contended there is not a community of interest. I do not think that is so. I think there is a potential for this to happen but I do not think it necessarily follows. A lot depends on the attitude of those who occupy the political institutions on the municipal level within the areas we are discussing.

If there is a desire for alienation between the rural and the urban area, then I think alienation will take place. But if there is no such desire, but rather a desire the other way, to find a community of interest and to realize that fate and circumstances and redistribution and population growth and a lot of other things throw people together into relationships they would not otherwise have found, then a community of interest can be found. I have found that, Sir. I have found this to be true in terms of Grenville-Carleton, which in terms of north and south is as different as night from day. We managed to develop a community of interest over the course of the years,—my predecessor in this House and I worked hard to do that.

● (2140)

My predecessor has now gone to a reward that I think is just and fitting, but we did manage to develop a community of interest between the ends of the riding which, prior to that time, had been alien to each other, so it is not necessarily the case that the difference between rural and urban is irreconcilable. I am pleased to have the opportunity to take part in the debate and to follow the hon. member for Stormont-Dundas. I trust that these submissions will go forward in the usual way to the commissioners.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour is aware there is still a considerable number of Ontario members who are seeking the floor in this debate. I have learned that it will be very difficult for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) to be here tomorrow to take part in the debate when it centres upon the electoral boundaries commission for Quebec. I would therefore ask if the House would give unanimous consent to allow the minister to make a short intervention at this point, and then revert to the discussion on the Ontario boundaries.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, just to make sure I understand this before we deal with the matter, is the hon. member saying that in the event there are Ontario members wishing to speak who have not yet

spoken they will carry on tomorrow, or at least the way would be open for them to carry on?

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): At the least the way would be open for them to carry on, yes. Ontario members will continue tonight until the ten o'clock deadline once the minister has made his remarks.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we did it earlier tonight for a backbencher. I don't see why we shouldn't do it for a front bencher.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the House allow the hon. member for Westmount (Mr. Drury) to speak on the Quebec report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) rising on a point of order.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): No, I simply wish to point out that I am pleased to give my consent, on behalf of my party, to allow a bright minister like the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) to speak. I consider he has interesting things to say and he will not be able to say them tomorrow if he is not here. I thus give my consent.

[*English*]

OBJECTION TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, before I make a very brief intervention let me first express my gratitude to the House for doing me the courtesy of allowing me to intervene tonight rather than tomorrow.

It is not often that a member of parliament has presented to him an opportunity to welcome back into his particular sphere of interest, into his fold, a significant number of his former constituents from whom he has been separated for some years by the plans and preoccupations of redistribution.

As some hon. members will recall, I was first elected to this House in 1962 representing the constituency of St. Antoine-Westmount. However, in 1966, following redistribution, the southern portion of St. Antoine-Westmount, which included the portion of the municipal area known locally as St. Henri bounded by the CNR track and St. Jacques West, was included in the constituency now known as St. Henri. The eastern portion of the present constituency includes the western portion of the old St. Lawrence-St. George constituency; that is, the area in Montreal between Atwater and Park Avenue. I therefore welcome heartily the commissioners' decision to include in the enlarged Westmount constituency the former portion of St. Henri which I was honoured to represent and also to have expanded this area southwards and westwards.

The area bounded on the east by Peel Street, on the south by Sherbrooke Street, and on the west by Guy Street and Cote Des Neiges, contains many people who have long had a community of interest with those living in the central part of the riding. It is hoped, and in my view it is entirely appropriate, that this relationship can and should be maintained.

With a view to achieving this I would propose that the inter constituency boundary begin and would fall naturally if a line were drawn beginning at the Camelien Houde Parkway over the mountain, down Peel Street to Sherbrooke Street West, westward along Sherbrooke Street West to Guy Street, south on Guy Street to St. Catherine Street, west on St. Catherine Street to Atwater Street. St. Henri would then include Concordia University, McGill University, Montreal High School, the Royal Victoria Hospital, as well as many historic buildings. At the same time it will leave the residents west of Peel able to continue their association with the constituency of Westmount. This line also generally separates the commercial district from the residential district.

I would like to say that it would appear that the commissioners have sought to develop and promote a social, economic, and linguistic balance which is truly representative of downtown Montreal. It was felt, therefore, following discussions with hon. members for St. Henri (Mr. Loiselle) and St. Jacques (Mr. Guilbault), that a compromise in the establishment of the boundaries in this downtown area would be most acceptable to the constituents and, therefore, hopefully to the commissioners. The other boundaries of Westmount which have been proposed by the commissioners are more than acceptable. I should like to say that these suggestions, which have a consensual basis, have been made in the spirit of co-operation to serve better the constituents of Westmount, St. Henri, and St. Jacques.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ONTARIO

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North-Nipissing East): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to express a point of privilege rather than make a specific comment on redistribution. Earlier this evening the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick)—I am sorry he is not in his seat to hear my remarks—was quoted as having said that he did not know very much about northern Ontario but wanted to make a few remarks about it. He then went on to talk about the northern part of my constituency and said he understood that Mattawa had a population of 5,000. The actual fact is that it has a population of 2,800 people.

He then on to another point that I personally feel he should be requested to withdraw, and that was to state that the Mattawa town council passed a resolution requesting that it come back into my constituency because four members of that council are on my association. Not one of the members of the Mattawa town council has been or is on my association. The hon. member should be requested to withdraw that remark.

To back up what I have said, the hon. member talked about the size of my riding and the fact that it had a large part of eastern Algonquin Park. I do not mind that because right now I have 30 out of 34 townships in Algonquin Park. Obviously he did not look at the present map.

These are the groups form the Mattawa area that supported returning the the new riding under redistribution; I have a list here: Mattawa Town Council, the Golden Age Club, (Senior Citizens), the Community Centre Board, the Chamber of Commerce, the Curling Club, St. Anne's

Roman Catholic Church, which is one of the largest parishes between Pembroke and North Bay, Mattawan Township, Calvin Township, Bonfield Township, the latter two are on the north-west side of the town of Mattawa, St. Alban the Martyr Anglican Church, St. Andrew's United Church and the Catholic Women's League, plus a petition Who is left?

● (2150)

An hon. Member: Len Hopkins.

Mr. Hopkins: He is left, and I hope he will be. All these communities are tied together by highway 17. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton said he had received representations from people in Mattawa. Who are these people who are misinforming him? I phoned Mattawa tonight and talked with some people, and they are livid about an MP who lives in Kanata talking about their town which is 190 miles away, and about which he knows very little. They also told me to inform him that he is all wet, and the best thing for him to do is mind his own business because they are quite capable of handling their own affairs and when they express their views they at least check their facts first.

These people said they identified themselves by going on record before the commission and they feel that those people who are passing on this misinformation to the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton should also identify themselves instead of helping that hon. member drag this kind of red herring across the floor of the House. I am sure the Electoral Boundaries Commission will look at this simply in the light in which it was presented. They will recognize it as a pure and simple—very simple—partisan, political play.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Never heard of in this House!

Mr. Hopkins: I want to congratulate the Electoral Boundaries Commission as I think it had sympathy, understanding and a feeling for what it was doing. In the case of the village of Madawaska, which is a community of approximately 300 in my riding which is situated on the highway between Whitney and Barry's Bay, this little community was placed in the constituency of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), which would mean he would have to drive through a large section of my constituency to get to that centre, while at the same time I would be driving through his riding in order to get to communities just a few miles beyond. Three delegations came down from that small community presenting the case, and the recommendations were accepted by the commission.

Three delegations came down from that small community presenting the case, and the recommendations were accepted by the commission.

Then we have Lake Traverse and Brent which are two small communities in Algonquin Park. Access roads to both those communities are off highway 17 along the Ottawa River. These two small places were also placed in the riding of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I had a discussion with him about this matter. Representations were made and the commission for that as well.

A very important thing the commission did was, to a very large degree, unite the county of Renfrew once again. There are three townships plus the town of Arnprior not in the constituency, and county council and the various municipalities across the county are very pleased that they are united in that way instead of being split up into three different ridings.

Another point the Electoral Boundaries Commission accepted was the new name for the riding which we suggested of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke; Renfrew to include the town of Renfrew and the county of Renfrew, and Nipissing to include those townships in Algonquin Park and the Mattawa area. Then we have the city of Pembroke which is the only city in that part of the valley. They also returned Mattawa, Papineau, Mattawan and Cameron to the constituency at the request of those resident people. There is a very strong desire on the part of Calvin and Bonfield Townships on the northwest side of Mattawa to remain in the constituency. They were not left in but each has written a letter to me requesting that the Electoral Boundaries Commission take another look at their situation. They feel much more at home with a large number of small municipalities and smaller places than in a riding with a large urban centre such as North Bay. That is really the basis of their argument.

In addition the Township of Calvin is on the border of Papineau Township and the town of Mattawa. That is really their small centre and they want to retain their relationship with it.

Some of my present riding will be going into northern Ontario. This will be adding to the population of northern Ontario, but I can sympathize with those people there who would like to retain their 12 ridings. I have spent some time working in the north and I have a feeling for it. I know how people feel up there and how important it is to have members who travel great distances maintaining liaison.

I am not concerned about the size of my new riding. Quite to the contrary, as I said at the beginning, I am very pleased with it. In the past years I have looked after many problems in the northern part of the riding of Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton as well as problems in the northern part of the riding of Frontenac-Lennox and Addington simply because the members for those two constituencies live some distance away. The two constituencies come within 10 or 12 miles of my home. As a result the people come to me because I am closer. These people will be coming into the new constituency of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I get letters from Renfrew, too.

Mr. Hopkins: Yes, and I hope you look after them as well as we try to do up there. I am sure you do.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Better.

Mr. Hopkins: You are noted as a very conscientious member of parliament, and I am sure you will allow me to conclude my remarks. May I call it 10 o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I could ask the hon. member if he has many remarks left. Perhaps the

House could allow him two or three minutes if he can complete his remarks in that time.

Mr. Hopkins: I think I can finish in a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we do not see the clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hopkins: As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Electoral Boundaries Commission was sympathetic, understanding, and logical. I say this because I know some of the people who appeared before it. Some were elderly and had never appeared before a commission, so naturally they were nervous. The commission gave them a very sympathetic hearing and was very understanding in its approach. That is a factor which I think must be mentioned.

I am basically very pleased with the work of the commission and I want to make it very plain that the size and the population of the new riding of Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke do not bother me in the least. I know the area and many of the people. The people in that area are pleased to be tied together as they are by highway 17 and other key roads connecting the communities. This makes it a much easier job than having a large constituency where it is difficult to get to various communities. This is not now the case, but I hope the commissioners will take a second look at the representations of the townships of Bonfield and Calvin. Other than that I am totally satisfied with their work.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRANSPORT—REQUEST FLOUR AND GRAIN RAIL SUBSIDIES BE REMOVED ONLY AFTER SEAWAY TOLLS INCREASED

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I think this is the fourth occasion at this particular time of night on which I have raised the question of the future of Section 272 of the Railway Act.

Under Bill C-87, the government's restraint program, section 272 of the Railway Act would be knocked out and along with it the rail flour and grain subsidies which affect Montreal, Saint John, Halifax, and probably other east coast ports. This is a serious matter for the ports of Halifax, Saint John, Montreal, and for every flour mill in Canada as well as for the grain growers of western Canada, so I think that in time one could muster up a pretty fair debate in this Chamber on the repeal of section 272.

Unfortunately the repeal of Section 272 would take effect only when the clause of Bill C-87 is passed to this effect. This means we could be here quite a while. As I have indicated, many Conservative members of parliament are concerned about this matter. I dare say we could entice such members as the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Landers) into some public discussion of this matter, as well as any number of Liberal M.P.s from the city of Montreal because that port is affected.

The purpose of this hearing tonight is the question I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway and whether he intended to put up the tolls on the Seaway. As people are well aware, the deficit on the Seaway is expected to be $12 million this year, which is almost the same as the subsidy that would be removed under Bill C-87. The Seaway has a debt of some $700 million to $800 million already behind it. The minister indicated last year that the increase in the Seaway tolls would not take place this year although he hinted that it would take place next year. My suggestion is that in justice both programs should accompany one another.

If there is to be a removal of the rail flour and grain subsidy on shipments through east coast ports there should also be something to make the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls higher, and both should happen at the same time. The doing away with the subsidy without an increase in the rate of the tolls would give Montreal an extra advantage over the ports of Halifax and Saint John. Having regard to competition among those three east coast ports I do not think one should do something which would help one to the disadvantage of the other. I suggest that the minister hold off the repeal of Section 272, at least this year, until he has put together his new transportation policy to replace the policy which his predecessor aptly described as a mess.

I will suggest something else which I have discussed with my colleagues. I think I can suggest this on behalf of the official opposition. If the minister will withdraw the clause—I think it is clause 15—of the restraint bill, C-87, then I think we could promise on the part of the official opposition that there would be perhaps only one speaker on the other parts of the restraint program in the House of Commons, and then reference to the committee, so that at least the restraint program could pass with a minimum of difficulty.

I think we could also present to the minister some suggestions for savings that would total much more than the subsidies which we suggest be kept on at least for this year and until a new transportation policy is developed. I say this most seriously. I realize, since this is probably a fresh idea, that the minister would like to talk about it with the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien). Perhaps the President of the Treasury Board would like to spell out some of the multimillion dollar savings that we actually have on the list at this point. That is a suggestion. Otherwise, as I told the President of the Treasury Board, if we are going to debate Bill C-87 and they try to remove the grain subsidy, that debate could keep us here until Christmas.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the hon. member's offer. As I understand it, if that section were deleted there would

only be one opposition speaker on the rest of the bill. I do not know whether that would in fact—

Some hon. Members: Louder!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I believe the minister's microphone is not active.

Mr. McCleave: Mine is. Perhaps the minister could come over to answer from my place.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The minister could move over. Perhaps he should change his portfolio.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the House agree to allow the minister to speak from another place than his own?

An hon. Member: Let him speak from the place of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I was delighted with the offer of the hon. member assuring us that there would be only one speaker if we deleted this particular section. It is intriguing indeed to think we might actually get that kind of agreement, because the time of the House is very precious and we often fritter it away in long drawn out debates in which people simply repeat themselves.

I was also pleased to have the recognition by the hon. member that subsidies like this one contained in section 272 are not in themselves necessarily good. They in fact lead to a very large expenditure by the government, with probably little benefit. They probably hurt the ports of Saint John and Halifax, for instance, in not allowing experiments with unit trains direct from the west, a variety of things which could in fact compete quite effectively with the actual cost situation but cannot compete when artificial subsidies are in place.

The hon. member tied his suggestion about the future of these rates to the future of Seaway tolls. He has indicated that I said that they would not be raised this year. I have indicated that I believe they have to be raised to reflect real costs, and I will say that again quite clearly because there too it is important in our whole approach to transportation costs that we try to understand what those costs are. We should ensure that these costs are reflected in the prices, and that we make the right decisions about the expansion of the rail system or Seaway system according to that kind of understanding of costs.

I could say to the hon. member, however, that in moving against the section 272 subsidy we are not in any way disadvantaging the ports on the Atlantic costs because it is my intention to have a further indication of the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls by January 1, to be in effect by January 1, which is a really crucial time in comparing the two seasons. It means that prior to the winter season the change will take place, and therefore the unit train operation can be planned at this stage.

● (2210)

While I want the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) to consider the very kind offer made by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) on behalf of the opposition, I hope the hon. member will consider the possibility of going with us in quick order on the bill, and we will accept his view on how to cut expenditures and try to make progress in that way.

[Mr. Lang.]

AIRPORTS—RUNWAY EXTENSION AT VANCOUVER—REASON FOR MINISTER'S SUPPORT OF NEW RUNWAY WITHIN DYKED PORTION OF SEA ISLAND

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my remarks tonight concern the proposed expansion of the Vancouver international airport.

As the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) knows, back in 1973 a decision was made by the then minister of transport to go ahead with airport expansion, and after a series of exchanges in the House of Commons over a number of weeks the government finally agreed that in fact there were no environmental studies done, that in fact there ought to be some consultative process set up to decide whether and under what conditions airport expansion should take place. As a consequence the airport planning committee was established, and for the last three years it has been considering the matter of airport expansion at the Vancouver airport, and especially a new or parallel runway to the main runway which is there.

In addition environmental studies have been done, and those studies, both the airport planning studies and the environmental studies, have now been completed, but on March 12 the minister put out a press release in which he said that he viewed as a better solution a new proposal which came out during the summer of 1975 from the Ministry of Transport, for a shorter within dyke runway. The curious thing about this is that now the minister is asking the citizens of Vancouver and other interested groups to give him their views on this particular runway despite the fact that the short runway proposal has not been subjected to the airport planning process.

If the minister has any doubts about that, he can refer to the airport planning committee report of March, 1976, where it is specifically stated that the proposal which the minister mentioned in his press release is not the subject of their considerations. Furthermore, the environmental study which has just come out and which did not include a study of the proposal the minister is now advocating, said on page VI of the report that any new concepts proposed for expansion in this context, that is, in the context of short runways within the dykes at Sea Island, must conform to the federal environmental assessment and review process.

It is very curious that on March 14, 1974, the then minister of the environment, the Hon. Jack Davis, put out a press release in which he announced the federal government's new environmental impact statement procedure. The press release said things like this: "In announcing Ottawa's new environmental assessment and review process, environment minister Jack Davis said that all federal departments, agencies and firms under federal jurisdiction would have to prepare 'suitable environmental impact statements'." Then he went on to describe the process which he at that time said would be mandatory so far as the regulatory aspect of environmental considerations of the federal government were concerned, and that would

have to include expansion at the Vancouver airport. I refer the minister to that press release of Thursday, March 14, 1974.

Concerned about this last summer, on July 9, 1975, I had occasion to ask the former minister of transport, who is now the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), if this matter would be put in front of the standing committee, and on page 7392 of *Hansard* the following appears:

"Mr. Speaker, I am ready to table all the reports and have them referred to the Standing Committee on Transportation of this House for full discussion."

I asked the Minister of Transport on Friday if that commitment would be kept. I asked the Minister of the Environment today whether the commitment made by him as minister of transport would now be kept by the new Minister of Transport, and if my memory serves me correctly the Minister of the Environment said he would consult with his colleague who, I wish to point out, is in the House tonight. I am very appreciative of that, but there are three questions which arise: first, will the commitment of the former minister that these matters will be put in front of the House transport committee be kept, and second, will there be a public hearing, which is called for under the environmental process? I have no patience with the minister because in his press release of March 12 he said that there have been 200 mini hearings. That is such a flagrant disregard of the truth it might be almost deliberate. Those were not mini hearings; they were meetings of the people who were putting together the material. I think the minister should take note of that and give his press release writer a lecture on speaking truth.

The third question is, will the new short runway about which the minister has been talking, be subjected to the environmental impact assessment procedure which the government laid down and repeatedly assured us will be followed?

There was a commitment to put this matter before the standing committee of the House. As there has not been a follow-through on the matter one is prompted to ask, when is a commitment not a commitment? I would hate to say that the unsatisfactory but brutally accurate answer is this: it is not a commitment when the promise is made by a Liberal minister.

I invite the minister this evening to make sure that the commitment is kept. It cannot do any harm but may do a great deal of good. If it is not kept it will be a demonstration of cynicism at its worst, truth abused and a wretchedly irresponsible destruction of confidence in the solemn word of a minister of the Crown. The undertaking was not elicited in the confusing hurly-burly of informal talk on a press release, but was made in answer to a specific, plain question asked in the House of Commons.

With respect, I ask the minister to meet those three specific requests. I ask the minister to please keep the commitment made by the former minister of transport last July 9.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I am now operational, so to speak, on my side of the House, and will stay on this side.

When the hon. member asked his question I said that I would try to give him time to make up his mind and say whether or not he thinks there should be a runway in the particular location referred to in Vancouver. There is this difficulty in building airports: people want to fly, but they do not want an airport built anywhere near them. Eventually a problem is created, a problem which the opposition loves to bring to the fore. Hon. members opposite like to say that people will be inconvenienced by new airports and hope, no doubt, that people will blame the government for the inconvenience.

I wish the hon. member would make up his mind on where he stands. The hearings dealt with a broad range of facts to do with airport expansion in Vancouver and available alternatives. I do not think it is wrong to refer to mini-hearings—that is not a bad expression. Many interested people came before the committee. It was like a sort of parliament in which the views of the people of the Vancouver area were heard. In that sense we held mini-hearing after mini-hearing. Hundreds of these mini-hearings were held in the course of the Vancouver airport hearings.

I do not say to the hon. member that we will put this matter before the committee of the House. That decision will need to be taken at a time—I do not know when it will be—when I know exactly what we must look at, what the different considerations involved are, and what decisions will need to be made. I do not believe in crossing bridges ahead of time. I think this is a personal matter for the minister. It is up to him how he will discuss this matter in parliament and with the people concerned.

I believe my record is clear. I believe in consultation, but I often believe in going directly to the people involved. I do not believe in becoming involved in a petty political process in which members are unwilling to state their own views and to say if they favour an airport for their own city. Apparently some hon. members want hearings to go on and on. In the end people who want to fly will not have the use of airports from which they may fly.

Shortly after I assumed responsibility for my present portfolio I learned of the proposal for a shorter runway. There were certain concrete advantages favouring the shorter runway as against the longer runway. As the shorter runway avoided difficulties concerning the movement of earth beyond the dyke—difficulties to which the hon. member and his mysterious friends alluded—it seemed an attractive proposition.

As between the shorter runway and the longer runway, there may be differences with regard to noise. Somebody must determine if those differences are real or imaginary, and then decide how much more study needs to be done. Yet, sooner or later in the interest of saving money, we must put an end to study after study, an end to opposition to simple steps leading to progress in Vancouver. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the end Vancouver will not thank the hon. member if he opposes additional airport capacity for Vancouver, capacity which we see may be needed in several years. But I do wish he would make up his mind and tell me clearly what his position is on that question.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 6, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF REASON FOR PROTEST DEMONSTRATION AT PRINCE ALBERT INSTITUTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the sit-in at the Prince Albert penitentiary and its expansion to other areas within the Solicitor General's department in protest over the inadequate medical facilities and the rash of suicides over the last several years, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu):

That this House instruct the Solicitor General to establish immediately an independent investigation into the circumstances surrounding the sit-in and protest, and in particular to investigate the alleged lack of medical facilities at Prince Albert and all other institutions within the penitentiary system.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

SUGGESTED DISCLOSURE OF OWNERSHIP AND WAGE RATES BY CONTRACTORS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Since the Department of Public Works has admitted it does not require companies bidding on contracts to disclose the names of owners or the wage rates for contract work, and since this would appear to make it difficult, if not impossible, to enforce government conflict guidelines and federal minimum wage rules, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instructs the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) to require full disclosure of ownership and wage rates from all contractors dealing with his department.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

DR. WILDER GRAVES PENFIELD

EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE FOR HIS LIFE AND WORKS AND OF SYMPATHY TO HIS FAMILY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion of importance to all members of the House and to all Canadians. Yesterday afternoon in Montreal my old friend and neighbour, Dr. Wilder Graves Penfield, O.M., passed away. On the banks of Mount Royal Mountain, the Montreal Neurological Institute will serve as an everlasting reminder of his greatness. Leading surgeon, teacher, researcher, organizer and author, he was above all a great humanitarian. His life, among other things, underlines the importance of medical research in Canada and the importance of learning a second language at a young age.

[*Translation*]

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I went to elementary school with Dr. Penfield's children in Montreal. He always talked to me about the importance of learning a second language at a young age.

[*English*]

I count it a privilege to have had as a friend this outstanding man, this great Christian gentleman. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That his House expresses the gratitude of the Canadian people for the life and work of Wilder Graves Penfield, O.M., and expresses its sincere sympathy to Mrs. Penfield and the family.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A motion presented pursuant to Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

● (1410)

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER AND INTRODUCTION OF SECOND PART OF COMPETITION POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact this House no longer has a Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that the lack of such a minister may very well be used by this government to procrastinate in introducing the second part of its competition policy dealing with combines legislation, and in view of the fact that the former minister had promised this legislation this year, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

The government immediately appoint another Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and that this minister's first priority be to bring before this House the second part of the government's competition policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there unanimous consent pursuant to Standing Order 43?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

EXPRESSION OF DISPLEASURE AT COVERAGE OF DEATH OF DR. WILDER PENFIELD—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I too, rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 concerning the news coverage of the unfortunate and untimely death of Dr. Wilder Penfield. I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House expresses its profound displeasure with the CBC for giving considerably more coverage on its National News to the death of a United States multimillionaire than to that of the distinguished Canadian, Dr. Wilder Graves Penfield.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House before presenting the said motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

An hon. Member: What is the motion?

Mr. Lawrence: Would you repeat the motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House having given its unanimous consent as required, pursuant to Standing Order 43, it is moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

[Mr. Speaker.]

This House expresses its profound displeasure with the CBC for giving considerably more attention to the CBC's coverage of the death of a United States multimillionaire than to that of the distinguished Canadian, Dr. Wilder Penfield.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—COMPANY'S PROPOSALS FOR INTERIM FINANCING—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LETTER DATED JUNE 5, 1975, FROM PROJECT OFFICE

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. The minister has said that Lockheed led the government to believe it could provide interim financing and he cited Mr. Heppe's letter as proof of this, but that seems to be a complete reversal of what Mr. Heppe actually wrote. What he did write is that Lockheed could probably finance the shortfall sum of $27 million subject to the approval of the emergency loan guarantee board, and subject also to full repayment by Canada in April of this year. In other words, Lockheed believed it could probably finance $27 million, but only for eight months. Does the minister have any proof whatsoever to show that Lockheed did indicate it could borrow a much larger sum of money over a two or three year period?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the time of tabling that letter, it referred to the financing in the summer, long before the final negotiations in December. I made that very clear. However, in conversations which were held by my officials with officials of Lockheed, it was also our understanding that the Lockheed Company could finance the short-term or production phase payments.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the same minister. Did the proposal that Lockheed should provide interim financing come from Lockheed itself or from the LRPA project office? Mr. Heppe's letter appears to suggest that the proposal actually originated on the Canadian side in item (c) of the project office letter 6000-07-1(L) dated 5 June, 1975. Will the minister table this letter?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member referring to the letter asking for information, the letter which brought the response which I tabled? If that is so, I have no difficulty in tabling it because it relates very directly to the other letter.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE COMPANY INFORMED ONLY $30 MILLION AVAILABLE FOR FIRST YEAR OF PRODUCTION

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the minister for agreeing to table that letter. The minister has stated that Lockheed knew that his department had only $30 million available in the 1976-77 production year, but the letter from Mr. Heppe gives no indication of this. What it does indicate is that Lockheed was told that in the first six months of production, that is from August 1975 to March 1976, DND had only $25 million available instead of the required $52 million. Nowhere does Mr. Heppe appear to realize that DND's resources for the whole fiscal year 1976-77 would only total $30 million. Can the minister, now that he has begun to table letters to prove his points, table a letter showing when Lockheed was informed of the fact that DND would have only $30 million available in the first year of production?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the time of tabling this letter, it was to indicate very clearly there had been serious discussion with the Lockheed Company about its capability to finance the project, but I also made very clear at that time that we were talking about a different financing problem in July from the one we faced in December. The discussions in December, as is known, were verbal. They were related to the acceptance in principle by Lockheed that they could in fact help with the financing. It was from the letters that are tabled, and also from the subsequent discussions that my officials came clearly to the understanding that Lockheed could assist us in the financing of payment for the production phase.

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE FUTURE BUDGET ALLOCATIONS SUFFICIENT TO PURCHASE NEW EQUIPMENT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same minister. As the present situation regarding the Lockheed Company has put into jeopardy this country's plans for buying a new long-range patrol aircraft, can the minister assure the House that future budget allocations are sufficient to buy the new tanks, ships and eventually the fighter planes for which this country is committed during the next few years so that we will not have a repetition of the present deplorable situation?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure the hon. member that we have all the funds required for the long-range patrol aircraft approved by cabinet. The principal amount has been approved. The interest costs for the financing of the production phase have been approved. We have the total funds required. The only matter which is in the process of being solved is how we can finance the payments in the early years. This will not affect adversely the other programs mentioned by the hon. member.

Oral Questions

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—COST OF NOT SIGNING THE CONTRACT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I was of course referring to the great mishandling of the purchasing arrangements between the government and Lockheed. I shall direct my supplementary to the Minister of Supply and Services. As the minister has stated that Canada will pay $16 million to Lockheed if the contract is not signed, will he tell the House whether or not this includes the $12 million paid for the final definition phase, or is it in truth a fact that if the contract is not signed this country will be out $28 million?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to get the facts straight. I said that the government could pay Lockheed a maximum of $16 million. So, first, these $16 million are a maximum. Second, it is obvious that at the first stage of the definition of the contract, we had asked Boeing of Canada Limited and Lockheed to submit a proposal. That means that the payments were made to both these companies and not only to Lockheed.

● (1420)

[*English*]

Mr. Hees: I have one final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Therefore we are not mistaken that if this contract is not signed the country will be out $28 million, as I said.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGATIONS OF FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH CONTRACTS FOR CLEANING GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. Yesterday in the House I asked him for a report on a police investigation into federal cleaning contracts in Toronto. Can the minister now provide us with some information on that investigation?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the report is that the investigation is continuing. I think in the questioning yesterday the hon. member spoke of a raid or a search warrant, and I indicated that the matter was referred to the criminal law division. I am now advised that all documents in the case were voluntarily produced by those being investigated and the investigation is continuing. When the results of the investigation are completed, if they involve criminality they will be referred of course to the proper prosecuting authority, and if they involve violations of governmental regulations, they will be turned over to the Department of Public Works.

Oral Questions

PUBLIC WORKS

POSSIBILITY OF CLEANING CONTRACT BEING AWARDED TO PUBLIC SERVANT—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Public Works who said yesterday in the House that a contract between the government of Canada as an employer and the company in which a public servant has a direct and immediate personal interest is not allowed. I should like to know whether or not the minister can report to the House whether he has found any specific incident of a contract being awarded to a company of which a public servant has been or is the principal owner.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, subject to qualifying the last phase "the principal owner", we have discovered, as a consequence of the initiative of the hon. member I may say, a cleaning contract in which one of the participants was an employee of the federal government. That employment has since been terminated.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: As of yesterday?

An hon. Member: How about the contract?

Mr. Nystrom: I should like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether or not, in view of the fact that he has now found at least one incident where that has occurred, he will undertake a full investigation into his department to see whether or not there are other incidents of that type of contracting out, and can he also tell the House whether or not that type of practice will be allowed in future in view of the fact that yesterday he said that it is definitely not allowed?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that it is going to be allowed in the future. Perhaps I should point out that there are two aspects under examination here, one is the ability of the Department of Public Works to provide the most efficient and least expensive service to the taxpayer. To do this, we call for open tenders from the private sector, and provided the low bidder has the necessary financial and technical competence he is normally awarded the contract. The determination of technical competence is the result of an assessment made at an interview with those who are going to perform the work and a performance bond is also required before the contract is signed.

The other aspect is the carrying out of the guidelines governing the conduct of public servants. Perhaps I might read the first paragraph of the guidelines which are issued under the authority of the governor in council. It reads as follows:

> A public servant should not have a pecuniary interest that could conflict in any manner with the discharge of his official duties.

This is the essential element of the guidelines.

The hon. member has discovered—and I am grateful for this—a case in which a public servant did have a pecuniary interest in a contract with the government. He has asked whether we will be conducting a full investigation. I do not think this is warranted, but I welcome any information the hon. member or any hon. member of the House may have which is evidence of undesirable practices.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

DATE OF PAYMENT AND AMOUNT OF SUBSIDY TO SAINT-FÉLICIEN PAPER MILL

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I tried to reach him by telephone but his line was always busy.

My question deals with the paper mill project at Saint-Félicien.

Without taking too seriously the article published in local newspapers which quoted the minister as saying Donohue would get $300 million, can the minister tell us whether the federal grant will represent 50 per cent of the provincial aid? In addition, when does he expect to announce it publicly?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the hon. member, there have been many comments in the provincial and even local press in the last few months and weeks. I shall not dwell on all those comments but, in reply to the hon. member, I must say that, unfortunately, I cannot divulge at this stage what point negotiations between the provincial and federal negotiations have reached. Of course, we will have to wait till a final decision has been reached before that information can be released. So, unfortunately, the hon. member will have to be a little more patient.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary.

May I ask the minister to give us a date, where negotiations are concerned?

Mr. Lessard: Mr. Speaker, all I can tell the hon. member I have already said publicly, that is, that I am trying to pursue this matter with a view to reaching a decision in the near future. I said in this regard that I really hoped that by the end of April a decision, one way or the other, would have been reached. To my mind, the discussions have already dragged on too long; I would like the decision to be taken, if possible, before the end of this month.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF MEMBERS OF GENERAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before beginning another round of questioning, may I ask hon. members to join with me in calling attention to the presence in the gallery of very distinguished visitors in the form of a delegation, being the Standing Committee on General Affairs for the Western European Union, who are here for two days before

extending a further visit to the United States in an attempt to further good relationships between North America and this great union of European countries, headed by the distinguished member of the Bundestag, the Honourable Mr. Sieglerschmidt.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF CANADA GUARANTEEING BANK LOAN FOR COMPANY

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Lockheed, with the assistance of the Canadian government, is now engaged in seeking a large loan from Canadian banks to finance the first years of production of the LRPA. Will the minister state without equivocation that the Canadian government is not going to guarantee any loan by a Canadian banking consortium or by individual banks to Lockheed?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have said many times that the government of Canada will not be guaranteeing any loan.

Mr. McKenzie: Since the Minister of Supply and Services told this House yesterday that he had assessed Lockheed's financial position and found it such that he could consider signing a contract, what is the reason the government will not help Lockheed to get the money by guaranteeing the loan?

Mr. Richardson: Because it will not be necessary for the government to provide assistance. Lockheed is in the process of negotiating a major contract with the government of Canada, and that contract in itself will provide the basis for financing.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ALLEGED COLLAPSE OF NEGOTIATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the minister whether he has been advised, since his return from the west, of reports in the press indicating the near collapse of the negotiations with respect to the Orion, and does he agree with the present situation as expressed by the press? If so, is he or the Prime Minister now prepared to give a simple assurance to the Canadian military that in fact the aging and venerable Argus will be replaced, preferably with an Orion?

● (1430)

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear the support coming from the hon. member for the Orion. There is not any doubt in my mind that the aircraft we selected is more cost effective than any of the alternatives that were considered. There are many other factors which support the continuation of this contract. The negotiations which are taking place between the Lockheed Company and the banks are proceeding. To the best of my information, they are looking at it in a positive way and going ahead in a constructive way.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF GUN CONTROL MEASURE TO SUPREME COURT TO DETERMINE WHETHER JURISDICTION FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. It is with regard to the Di Iorio and Gerard Fontaine case in which the Supreme Court of Canada held that the provincial government should have the right to conduct a criminal inquiry within the terms "administration of justice of the province." In light of that, and in light of the fact that Bill C-83 contains several pages of provisions relating to provincial inquiries, giving jurisdiction, and the court having ruled that way, will the minister refer the whole or part of Bill C-83 to the Supreme Court of Canada to determine whether the gun control administration legislation is within the provincial powers rather than the federal powers as defined by the British North America Act? I ask this in light of the fact the Supreme Court of Canada ruling on provincial inquiries makes this redundant in the bill.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not really see what the Di Iorio case has to do with the gun control measure. Therefore, we have no intention of referring that to the Supreme Court of Canada. With regard to the decision of the court with relation to Bill C-83 and the provisions for crime inquiries, we are still examining the judgment very carefully. It is an extremely complex judgment. It is a matter I will want to discuss in committee when the bill is in committee after Easter.

Mr. Woolliams: Does the minister not consider that the sections dealing with the administration of gun control might well fall within provincial jurisdiction, in light of the decision on the other matter which is on all fours, and that the Supreme Court of Canada should have an opportunity to study and decide on this matter before we waste the time of parliament, the committee and the public? I ask this because the government has moved closure to gag the opposition in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, measures related to gun control have been in the Criminal Code for over 50 years. In my view, it is a valid exercise in the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada. That seems to be a proper question to be asked in committee where I will be happy to examine it in detail. I certainly cannot accept the premise of the hon. member.

Oral Questions

BILINGUALISM

NEGOTIATIONS TO ENSURE CONTINUATION OF SECOND LANGUAGE TRAINING IN OTTAWA AREA—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Last Thursday the House instructed the government to enter into negotiations with the appropriate Ontario authorities in order to ensure the continuation of French immersion language training in four Ottawa-Carleton area school boards. Has the minister in fact entered into such negotiations? Can he inform the House what progress is being made, especially in light of Mr. Keith Spicer's ruling, as expressed on "CTV Question Period" on Sunday, that the provinces are willing to co-operate in such efforts?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had a discussion with the Ontario minister of education on the telephone. We are meeting on Monday.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that. May I now ask the minister whether he is considering taking the leadership in terms of advancing this program by agreeing to an extension? Is this among the possibilities or options of the government? I ask this in view of the fact that a lack of federal funding could have a great effect on this very valuable experiment, which is really a pilot program for the development of teaching methods in second language training in other jurisdictions aside from Ontario and the national capital area.

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would want to be fair.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Faulkner: I am prepared to make that assumption for the moment. The hon. member surely knows that program would never have happened in Ottawa if it had not been for federal leadership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: We paid the total shot for that two year program.

An. hon. Member: Who is "we"?

Mr. Faulkner: The federal government, the taxpayers of Canada. That should be recognized by members opposite. The other point, and I am sure the hon. member is as aware of that as I am, is that we are prepared to continue to pay 9 per cent of the additional cost of an extended French program. If the boards of education are saying to the federal government and to the provincial governments that that does not cover the cost, let them identify the cost. That is what the discussion on Monday will be all about.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to concede to the minister the leadership of the federal government with regard to this matter. I commended him when he did it and I commend him now. I now ask the minister to carefully consider the effect on this program for the very reasons that he mentioned. Without the federal funding, that program, which is basically to benefit all of Canada, would place an unfair burden on the ratepayers of the national capital area. It is only in that regard that I ask the question.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

POSSIBILITY LOTTERY WILL BE CONTINUED AFTER GAMES

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Bearing in mind that during the program "In Conversation" over Montreal CFCF radio station the Prime Minister stated that the federal government is still prepared to support the province of Quebec with self-financing programs for the 1976 summer Olympic Games, could the Prime Minister tell the House whether, first of all, the Quebec premier and the Mayor of Montreal have made representations to the federal government to ask for the continuance of the Olympic lottery program after the games, second, whether the federal government would consider such a request, which would not result in a direct disbursement from the federal treasury and, third, when he expects to be able to report to the House about the possibility of continuing the Olympic lottery program after the 1976 summer games?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House knows that the federal government has always had the attitude summed up by the hon. member as far as the Olympic Games are concerned, namely that we support self-financing programs but not the principle of taking funds from the taxpayer. These self-financing programs include lotteries and sales of stamps or gold coins. These are techniques which we are prepared to consider. I said so publicly. As recently as last summer, the House approved a new formula concerning the sale of gold coins. On the principle, the position of the government is always the same.

Practically speaking, I did not receive any urgent request on this subject from Premier Bourassa or Mayor Drapeau. However, I think there were discussions between provincial and federal officials to consider other possibilities. No specific proposal has been made to me by the Quebec government, by COJO or by the City of Montreal. Of course, my position is always the same.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

SUGGESTION MINISTER WITHDRAW PROPOSAL TO CHANGE REVENUE GUARANTEE ARRANGEMENT WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Will the Minister assure the House that he will not resubmit to the meeting of first ministers to take place in the first week of May his proposal to revamp totally and retroactively the revenue guarantee arrangements with the provinces cover-

ing the period 1974-76? I ask this because it has been rejected as an approach by all the provinces as being a reneging on an earlier commitment and, specifically, will cost the province of Ontario, for example, some $300 million and the province of Manitoba some $30 million.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the description by the hon. gentleman of the government's position with regard to revenue guarantee. The figures we have set forth are an accurate estimate of our obligation under the revenue guarantee program. Therefore, while this matter will be discussed, while the provincial reaction will be discussed prior to the meeting of first ministers, it would not be my intention at this point to change in that regard.

● (1440)

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With respect, the minister's description of the facts flatly contradicts the understanding of all provincial governments. Is the minister telling the House that he did not propose to the meeting of provincial ministers of finance a change in the formula which was worked out in the early 1970's and which the provinces thought would apply to the end of 1976?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to the meeting that the method of calculation originally proposed by Manitoba and Ontario, that is to say, side by side calculation, can now be carried out because of the additional information available. It now indicates with greater precision the amounts to which provinces would be entitled under the revenue guarantee.

PROPOSED CEILING ON EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the report concerning the minister's meeting with the provincial ministers also suggested that the federal government wants to impose a ceiling on yearly increases in equalization payments to the seven poor provinces, will the minister assure the House that the federal government does not intend to put a ceiling on equalization payments, because such a ceiling is a contradiction in terms and would negate the government's entire approach to equalization in Canada?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is our view that the federal government's obligation under equalization should not be infinite. If the hon. member shares that view, he must agree with me.

Mr. Broadbent: Well, what's equalization all about?

ALLEGED CHANGE IN CALCULATION OF REVENUE GUARANTEE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance? Is it correct that the change the minister is suggesting in the calculation of the revenue guarantee relates to 1975 and 1976? If so, how can he argue that this is not a retroactive change in the equalization formula, as interpreted to date by the federal government and the provinces?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is confusing equalization with revenue guarantees.

Mr. Stanfield: With respect, no.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If the hon. gentleman is talking about the revenue guarantee, or the obligation to pay, the calculation commences two years after the year is closed. Therefore a calculation for 1974 will be possible with the information now available. The more precise calculation we can make relates to 1974, 1975 and 1976. From information available, it appears that there probably was an over-payment in 1972 and 1973. The federal government does not seek to recover that.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Who is the authority on the correct method of calculation? Is the Minister of Finance setting himself up as the unique authority on the correct method of calculation, or will this be done by some method of determination consistent with federalism as practised in this country?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the Parliament of Canada has given responsibility in this regard to the Governor in Council and the Governor in Council will exercise it.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATION "HOW YOUR TAX DOLLAR IS SPENT" TO SCHOOLS—ALLEGATION OF EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. As most Canadian high school students at some stage in their school careers study the economics of government spending, is it the policy of the minister's department to distribute a modest number of copies of the annual publication entitled "How your Tax Dollar is Spent" to all Canadian secondary schools?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is the policy but, most assuredly, the publication will be available to those who want it.

Mr. Jarvis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain why his department, which is preoccupied with restraint, sent 2,000 of these booklets to Listowel high school which has a student population of less than 1,100?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I imagine the department listened to the hon. member's exaggerations and thought there was a bigger high school in Listowel.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Revenue. Will the minister explain why his department sent six cartons of the publication to a school

in my constituency with 80 high school students. They were so upset by this extravagance that they wrote to their member of parliament and complained.

Some hon. Members: Supplementary?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the students in the hon. member's constituency will do the same as students would do in mine, see that the pamphlets are distributed so that there is a proper expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

ASSESSMENT OF LANDING FEE WHEN AIRCRAFT ENGAGE IN SEARCH AND RESCUE MISSIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a supplementary question, but another hon. member asked it. May I put my question to the Minister of Transport? It has to do with the proposed landing fee of $2.60 for light aircraft landing at Ministry of Transport airports. Will this fee be levied when aircraft are engaged on search and rescue missions or other errands of mercy, and how will it be possible to determine the difference?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the levying of the tax and the manner in which it is levied is being discussed with the Owners and Pilots Association. I am sure that such details and other matters of concern will be looked at.

* * *

ENERGY

TURNING OFF LIGHTS IN GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS TO CONSERVE ENERGY

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. On national television on Sunday night, April 4, the minister stated, "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem." The presentation showed lights off in all our major cities except Ottawa, which was still ablaze after dark. In light of the government's expensive request on television, in which it asks Canadian citizens to conserve energy, when is the government going to practice what it preaches and turn off lights at night in all government buildings, in Ottawa and right across Canada?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Fairweather: What's the latest excuse?

Mr. Gillespie: —the government has already started to do just that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fairweather: Where?

Mr. Hees: Not in the external affairs building.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question, so I should be allowed to answer. I very much regret the way that particular program was handled. I spoke to the producer of the program and asked him when he took his pictures of the government buildings shown. He told me, at 8.30 p.m. I said, "Why did you take them then?" He said, "We thought we would find the lights on then." Of course he was right, because many offices are cleaned then. If he had taken those pictures around eleven o'clock, he would have found most lights off.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

AWARDING OF MAINTENANCE CONTRACT FOR ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Public Works has to do with departmental procedures. Does the minister agree with the way maintenance contract PRO 662901, Alaska highway, B.C., mile 300 to mile 496 was awarded?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the contract.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member realizes that that specific information should be obtained some other way.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

POSSIBILITY OF REMOVAL OF CEILING ON PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the restrictions imposed by the Anti-Inflation Act on dividend payments by corporations, and in view of the fact that the payment of dividends to shareholders makes it possible to delay the reaching of the aggregate ceiling beyond which a small enterprise may benefit from a special tax rate if its annual profits before tax are not in excess of $100,000, can the minister tell the House whether the government intends to raise the aggregate ceiling so that small enterprises do not lose their entitlement to the special tax rate because of the provisions of the Anti-Inflation Act prohibiting the payment to shareholders of the dividends required to stay within the $500,000 aggregate ceiling?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I received some representations on that issue from the hon. member and others in the House. We are now considering whether there is such a conflict inherent in the provisions of the government policy. I hope I will be able to take a position and give an answer in the near future.

● (1450)

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—POSSIBILITY OF REDUCING IMPORTS TO IMPROVE POSITION OF WORKERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Late last week I met the director of the Manpower Centre in Montmagny who declared that the unemployment rate is now around 20 per cent in the south shore area, following the heavy laying off in the textile industry. Would the minister advise the House whether or not he expects to take very serious measures in the near future to limit the textile imports to 33 per cent of the Canadian demand, in view of protecting our own industry and Canadian jobs?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I have given a number of answers in committee on various aspects of the textile problem and I have also replied to questions here in the House on occasion. I believe I advised the hon. member recently that there are two or three different groups working at the present time to see what can be done to meet this problem. At the earliest possible moment, when we have all the information, we shall determine what steps it will be possible for us to take. At the present moment, however, I am not in a position unfortunately, to indicate what form policy may take.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Would the minister indicate to the House whether the import level during the last twelve months went beyond the recommendations of the Textile Board Commission and whether those massive imports are responsible for the present precarious position of the Canadian textile industry?

[*English*]

Mr. Jamieson: Since there are so many varieties of textile involved I would prefer to give the hon. member a written answer setting out the different categories and the levels of imports. My recollection is that there has been an increase in imports from the so-called low cost countries but whether that increase is of any great size or whether it is only marginal I could only determine by looking at the statistics, and I will get those for the hon. member.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE THAT STATUTE REMAINS BRITISH STATUTE FOLLOWING PATRIATION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Was the Minister of Justice stating government policy when he said, according to reports, that after the patriation process, which the right hon. gentleman has discussed recently, the British North America Act, which he described as the heart of the Canadian constitution, will remain where it has been since 1867, a statute of the United Kingdom Parliament at Westminster? In other words, it would appear more Canadian, seem more Canadian, but would remain a British statute?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have not seen the reference and I would want to look at it and speak with the Minister of Justice. I am certain that historically what has been quoted seems correct: if a statute was a statute, it remains a statute of the British Parliament. The essence of the question in this case, and I believe I stated it clearly a couple of weeks ago, is this: patriating the constitution will mean that the British Parliament would declare, now, what it declared for other Commonwealth countries at the time of the Statute of Westminster, to wit, that they would no longer make laws for Canada. That is the essence of what we are trying to obtain.

POSSIBILITY OF PROCLAMATION OF NEW CONSTITUTION FOLLOWING PATRIATION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): May I, first of all, tell the Prime Minister that the statement attributed to the Minister of Justice appears in the *Gazette* of March 29. My supplementary is this: has the Prime Minister looked recently at the recommendations of the Joint Senate and House of Commons Committee with respect to a process of patriation which would clearly, in the committee's view, involve the proclamation of a new constitution by Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have not looked at that recently, but this was part of many reports which were studied at the time of the discussion which led to the Victoria Conference. Of course, we realized that once patriation has been obtained a whole series of steps could be taken, some of them involving a new distribution of powers which we would certainly not want to contemplate at this time. Another is a modernization of the language of what was the former BNA Act and the provinces might wish to consider this aspect. The discussion which preceded Victoria did in fact cover a series of such possibilities. I have told the House that I do not want to complicate the present suggested operation by getting into all these matters. Once the constitution is truly Canadian, in the way I have stated, we would obviously wish to look at these various steps.

* * *

ENERGY

OIL—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PRICE—REQUEST THAT PRICE NOT EXCEED AVERAGE PRICE IN UNITED STATES

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. When will the federal government and the provinces complete negotiations and be able to announce a new price for domestic crude oil in Canada?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I am sure the hon. member is aware that the first ministers will be meeting early in May to discuss this very question.

Mr. Gillies: Because of the uncertainty surrounding the pricing of Canadian oil, can the minister give a categorical assurance that the price in Canada will not be allowed to exceed the average price in the United States?

Mr. Gillespie: That is one of the questions the first ministers will want to discuss.

* * *

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO DATE OF PRESENTATION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): A related question, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the answer given by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, will the Minister of Finance tell us whether the budget will follow shortly after that first ministers conference, bearing in mind the pattern set last year when the budget followed shortly after the agreement was reached with respect to the increase in the price of oil? Would May 17 be a fairly good date?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): The Prime Minister has suggested May 5 and 6 to the premiers as dates for the first ministers meeting. I have suggested the last two weeks in May. So May 17 is within that two-week period.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONFLICTING STATEMENTS CONCERNING FRENCH LANGUAGE UNIT AT GREENWOOD—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. It has nothing to do with such an esoterical thing as high finance and more to do with the sensitivity of French language units in the armed forces. Last week, the Secretary of State for External Affairs was in the Annapolis Valley for many reasons, one of which was to make a speech before the Board of Trade in which he said, among other things, that no decision had been made regarding the French language unit squadron at Greenwood and that "preparations and proposals were being worked on in the Department of National Defence". Yet six weeks earlier, on February 11, General Dextraze, speaking at the same type of meeting in Moncton said, and I quote: "No amount of exercise on the part of anyone will make me change my mind on this." He was referring to the French language unit squadron at Greenwood. My question to the minister is: which one of these gentlemen is levelling, who is telling it correctly and has a decision been made?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): No formal and final decision has been taken, but the Chief of Defence Staff was expressing the views of the department and my views.

Mr. Nowlan: Bearing in mind the high degree of interest in this subject across Canada where French language unit squadrons are being considered, would the minister undertake, in order that the public might be informed before a decision is taken, to make some type of statement either in this House or outside it, outlining not only the 18 French language unit squadrons presently in existence but defining the three experimental ones which are presently in place and especially outlining the 17 which are proposed in different parts of the country?

Mr. Richardson: The hon. member may not be aware that other bases using long-range patrol aircraft would be pleased to have a French language unit. Perhaps we shall have to close down Greenwood.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

* * *

● (1500)

PUBLIC WORKS

REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF CLEANING CONTRACT INVOLVING CIVIL SERVANT

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. Earlier in the question period this afternoon the minister refused an inquiry into the problem in Toronto. Would the minister give the House a few answers to the specific problem there and tell us who was fired and when? Since we are rather well into the question period, Mr. Speaker, and I probably will not be able to get in a supplementary, may I ask whether the contract was on public tender, when was it let, was it a low tender, and what is the current status of the contract?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the situation in Toronto is currently under investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The incident to which I referred concerning a contract in which a one time civil servant had been involved was in Ottawa, not Toronto. The contract has since expired and the public servant is no longer with the public service.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I have a very definite point of privilege. In view of the answer of the Minister of National Defence, which absolutely shocked me, I should like to know, in terms of my duty as a member, whether I am entitled to ask serious questions about government policy, pending or proposed, without the minister, in reply, suggesting that parts of the answer will be blackmail of that particular member or some other persons in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: I was trying to elicit information on a matter that is highly sensitive and I am very much aware of the sensitivity of the issue. I was absolutely appalled when the minister inferred that perhaps government

policy regarding the establishment of French language units across this country will depend on the blackmail, in effect, of members who have bases in their ridings, in an effort to prevent members putting serious questions on matters of government policy. My rights as a member of parliament to ask questions about a matter that is of fundamental importance to my riding are seriously and adversely affected by this kind of answer.

I was trying to elicit information, Mr. Speaker. As the Commissioner of Official Languages has said, it is time that the whole shroud and cloak of secrecy and hocus-pocus that is apparent in so many elements of the government's bilingual policy was removed, but the minister really polluted the atmosphere with that type of comment. I say that he has to withdraw his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, in response to the first question of the hon. member I gave a very clear answer. The Chief of the Defence Staff, General Dextraze, has made a statement on the intention of the department regarding the Canadian armed forces. I said that it was a statement that I supported, and I think that was sufficient answer for the hon. member.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order having to do with the statement made by the Minister of Public Works at the beginning of the question period in connection with the bidding practices of the government. First the minister asked for compliance with tendering practices, and I should like to take this opportunity to specify several inconsistencies in the government's apparent acceptance of the bid that was submitted by R. Owen Ltd., Box 838, Fort Nelson, B.C. To be concise, it appears that there has been a non-compliance with clause 5, subsection 1, page 1 (a) in that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Paproski: The minister wanted some information about compliance, Mr. Speaker. Ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair notes the fact that the hon. member for Edmonton Centre has received expanded treatment of this question.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in connection with the meeting this morning of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications which commenced examination of the estimates of the Department of Transport. During the course of this morning's proceedings the chairman of that standing committee recognized the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport for the purpose of asking questions.

I submit to Your Honour that under the Standing Orders of this House, specifically Standing Order 55, the rules of the House shall apply in committees. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the government whip, whom I hear interjecting, was responsible in the first place for the ruling I shall refer to, so perhaps he should sit quietly and listen.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I have not said anything yet.

Mr. McGrath: Shortly after Your Honour was elected Speaker by this honourable House, Your Honour made a ruling on a question of privilege that was raised by the hon. member for St. Boniface. As reported at page 1060 of *Hansard*, for November 5, 1974, Your Honour said, in part:

> It is obvious, certainly, that members of the ministry ought not to enjoy the privilege of being able to both represent the government in answering questions in the House of Commons and, in turn, to use the time of the question period to ask questions.
>
> Similarly, the privilege, of course, of being elevated to the position of parliamentary secretary falls only on those among the government ranks. This extends to those hon. members not only the recognition, prestige and advantage that comes from their position but the obligation of answering questions—

The examination of estimates in committees of the House is a question and answer procedure. I submit that the rules of the House as defined by Your Honour apply equally in committee as in this House. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport receives an extra emolument from the Crown, he occupies a special departmental office within the Department of Transport, and he takes a special oath of office under the Parliamentary Secretaries Act which gives him, of course, special privileges and responsibilities.

I submit to Your Honour that by virtue of the position that the parliamentary secretary enjoys, and equally by virtue of the fact that there will be occasions during examination of the estimates when the minister will not be present and the parliamentary secretary will have to stand in for him, the parliamentary secretary should not enjoy the same privileges as other members of the committee and be permitted to ask questions of his own minister. This is especially so when we consider that under the present Standing Orders of the House which deal with estimates, all estimates are deemed to have been reported on or before May 31, which places a particular responsibility, in regard to pressure of time, on members of the House who have to try to do the best they can with what I submit is an inadequate procedure at best.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization has before it at the present time the question of allocation of time and the practices of committees of the House. I submit that the ruling Your Honour made on November 5, 1974, dealing with the role of parliamentary secretaries and their position in regard to questions in the House ought to apply equally and with the same validity in the standing committees of the House.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I wish to support the point of order that has been raised by the hon. member for St. John's East. I point out that the parliamentary secretary in question has on a number of occasions stood in place of the minister as a witness before the committee. I foresee a danger in allowing this procedure to continue. The committee is an arm of this House, and if one rule applies to the House, traditionally it also applies to the committee. The reasoning behind your ruling as recorded at page 1060 of *Hansard* for November 5, 1974, is quite clear. It takes away the right of an hon. member to continue this game of charades, having the same person ask a question and answer it as well.

● (1510)

This morning, at the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, the hon. member for Assiniboia, who is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, acted in the minister's place on a number of occasions and asked two questions which were clearly self-serving and intended, in essence, to allow the minister to explain a previous position he had taken or explain something he had previously said.

An hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Horner: That is not the purpose of the committee. The purpose of the committee is to examine and inquire into government spending. The hon. member for St. John's East has pointed out that our time is limited and that we must be given as much time as possible in order to do that. Let me suggest, sir, that you not make any hurried ruling on this matter raised by the hon. member as it is very important and will certainly be precedent-setting in respect of the procedures of the committees of this House for some time to come.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order now under consideration. There has been a practice, not only in respect of the standing committees of this House but also in respect of joint committees of the House of Commons and the Senate to have parliamentary secretaries among their memberships. I am not suggesting they are not well-intentioned, but from time to time they leave their place at the committee table and move to the position of the witness being examined in the absence of the minister.

I can remember that happening in relation to the hon. member for Ottawa West on the joint committee in respect of the Finkelman report. It also happened on another occasion in relation to a joint committee on which I had the honour of serving. This involved the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. He was a member of that committee when it was dealing with the national capital.

It seems to me that in considering the point raised by the hon. member for St. John's East, added to by the hon. member for Crowfoot, regarding this ability to both answer and ask questions in the committees and on the floor of the House of Commons, we ought to take into account the fact that they occupy a special relationship in respect of the operations of a ministry. Because of this special position which they enjoy, involving an additional emolument, with access to information and other things, with the ability to influence policy in a way not available to the average private member, we ought to consider this role in terms of the presence at all of parliamentary secretaries on committees. They are in a position to examine material not available to the average member, and if Your Honour is going to consider this question at some length you should consider the special position enjoyed by parliamentary secretaries.

I want to make it very clear, especially to the parliamentary secretaries whose names I have mentioned in the course of these remarks, that I am not suggesting they have in any way acted in bad faith. I make these remarks more in terms of proper practice or the practice that ought to prevail in committees of this House as well as joint committees.

In the event Your Honour does not find there is a valid point of order, I hope you will give this question consideration. I think it is important that this matter be considered in terms of the practices of the House. It may be that reference of this matter to the committee on procedure and organization would be in order. We cannot forget that parliamentary secretaries enjoy a special position in this House and a special position in terms of the ministries, and we ought to consider that special position in terms of having them form part of a committee of the House of Commons which may very well be dealing with a specific matter coming under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: There are at least four other hon. members who wish to participate in this matter. Let me make it clear, as a preliminary observation, that I do not intend to stop any hon. member participating in the discussion. However, I think I should point out that there are two points in respect of which my opinion is quite clear.

The first point relates to my opinion in respect of the role of parliamentary secretaries with the special responsibilities they have and, therefore, the limitations I would propose to exercise in presiding over the meetings of this assembly, specifically during the question period. I have no reason to change my opinion in that regard. I made that decision after careful consideration and representation. This is my view, and it is the view I take in exercising my decision whether to recognize a parliamentary secretary for the purpose of asking questions during the question period.

The second point has been amply demonstrated here, and I think it is worth while. We have under review another decision in respect of a complaint about the proceedings of standing committees, namely, a request that the Chair review a procedural decision concerning a complaint by an hon. member of one standing committee regarding the comments or remarks of another hon. member of the same standing committee. My second observation in this regard is that the Chair does not exercise procedural control over standing committees. Let me reaffirm my opinion that standing committees are, and must remain, the masters of their own procedure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Unless the rules of this House are changed in some way, I have no intention or desire of entering into, by way of appeal or review, in any way, shape or form, the decisions that ought to be made or taken into account by a standing committee. I am certainly not going to look over the shoulder of any chairman of any committee or enter into a procedural matter by saying it was proper or improper.

There is a question of privilege before the House and I at no time intend to restrict comment on that matter. The hon. member for Athabasca raised a question of privilege the other day and I heard a number of contributions on that matter. I intend to listen to the fullest possible development of any question of privilege, but that is not going to draw me across the line as far as supervising the procedures of committees by way of suggestion or appeal.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the position you have taken. There is one point I want to make. There has been an attempt by hon. members of the opposition who have spoken on this question of privilege to suggest that parliamentary secretaries in some way are conspiring to defeat the role of the opposition. Surely, in committees, as in the House of Commons, we are involved in an adversary contest. The government attempts to pass its estimates or its legislation, and the opposition resists or opposes.

Apparently the opposition is not satisfied with the effectiveness of its role in opposition. It is the right of hon. members to be dissatisfied with that role, but surely it is the right of government supporters, backbenchers or parliamentary secretaries, to debate or ask questions in the committees in the same way as members of the opposition. Their behaviour in that regard should not in any way be taken as a conspiracy to defeat the opposition. That is the whole purpose of this House and its committees, namely, to present legislation on the part of the government and to oppose it on the part of the opposition.

Parliamentary secretaries, as well as backbenchers, have an obligation to support the government in measures presented to this House or to committees. It should not be suggested that because they participate in that role they are frustrating the opposition in its attempt to oppose the government.

● (1520)

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member for Nipissing has seen fit, in effect, to cast a reflection on your ruling in respect of the position of parliamentary secretaries when you clearly indicated that under the Standing Orders they ought not to direct questions to ministers during the course of the question period.

I contend that when the hon. member in fact says that the same rights flow to parliamentary secretaries under the Standing Orders, he is clearly incorrect in that contention. The fact is that I almost felt obliged to raise the question as a matter of privilege rather than a point of order, in that I felt the rights and privileges of members of this House in a particular instance this morning were affected by the parliamentary secretary in question, because rather than ask his questions in the parliamentary context of the House of Commons, he took the circuitous route of asking questions of his own minister in the committee structure.

I would refer Your Honour, in the consideration of this matter, to Standing Order 55 (1) which provides as follows:

> The Standing Orders of the House shall be observed in committees of the whole House so far as may be applicable—

Then exceptions are stated with regard to the seconding of motions. In other words, I suggest, with great deference, that you as Speaker of the House, have an obligation to ensure that the rules of the House and the Standing Orders are applied fairly and properly with regard not only to the affairs of this House but also in reference to committee proceedings. I have mentioned the fact that almost a question of privilege arose by virtue of the incident this morning. I, personally, was affected as a member of the committee who wanted to examine the estimates.

The fact is that my privileges as a member to investigate and to question the minister were affected by the intervention of the parliamentary secretary who wanted to speak at the same time as me. I was excluded from getting on the list this morning by virtue of the fact that he was there. I would even question, for example, the right of a parliamentary secretary to ask a question of another minister, because it seems to me there is a special relationship between the ministry and a parliamentary secretary.

I take great exception to this practice, and I think Your Honour should be firm in respect of a parliamentary secretary asking questions of a minister of his own department and taking up the time of the committee when there is a time limit and when many members, including many backbenchers on the government side, want to participate and ask questions in the time that is available. In the committee system there is limited time. We have only ten minutes in which to ask questions. If the parliamentary secretaries continue to participate in these debates, it will very much affect the rights and privileges of each member of this House in representing his constituency as he feels he should and has the right to do.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think I must refer to the legislation which created the role of parliamentary secretaries and what was said at that time, as well as what has been said by various Speakers along the way concerning their role. I think it would be superfluous to repeat what Your Honour said, to the effect that parliamentary secretaries have the right to ask questions except of their own ministers in this House. The same principle should apply in committees. After all, I think it heaps abuse upon abuse when one considers that often the parliamentary secretary is a substitute for his minister, as he should be, in a committee, and then the very next day or later in the same day he questions his own minister. I think this is a clear abuse of the role of parliamentary secretaries.

Regarding the other question which was put by the Chair and brought up is the matter raised by my colleague from Athabasca the other day as a question of privilege, I would, with respect, remind you, Mr. Speaker, that there does lie an appeal from the ruling of the chairman of the committee to the Chair itself; that is, from the chairman of the committee of the whole where the estimates are being considered and whether they should be brought back in when we are in committee of the whole on tax legislation. There the Chair not only has the right but must decide on the point of appeal. It must do it, also, on a question of privilege.

I pointed out the other day—I do not want to get into that argument again—that the chairman of a standing committee of this House will decide questions of order and the committee will be master with regard to order. There is an appeal on this question. But all through our Standing Orders there is a very clear distinction between a point of order and a question of privilege. My colleague the other day raised a question of privilege, and what my colleague today has raised is, I believe, a question of privilege. It is my humble and respectful submission to you, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility lies strictly with Mr. Speaker on questions of privilege.

These privileges extend all through the House. In the particular instance of the other day it was in the House and just outside. They were related questions of privilege. I do not think anyone can draw any particular distinction between the two. Questions of privilege might arise in committee of the whole, and if an hon. member is not satisfied with the ruling by the chairman, the rule provides that there shall be an appeal directly to Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker sits in judgment and, to rather transverse the words used, Mr. Speaker is dragged into the affairs of the committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: There is no serious disagreement, of course, about the fact that procedure is provided specifically for such an appeal. There is a marked contrast, of course, in the relationship between the proceedings of committee of the whole and the proceedings of a standing committee in that regard. In fact, the contrast between the two is quite significant.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make two points. First, it is clear there is a considerable difference between the operation of the House of Commons and the operation of a standing committee. In some respects there is greater power in the hands of a standing committee than in the hands of the House of Commons. The second point I want to make is that Standing Order 65 which governs committees of this House provides no restriction concerning who may or may not be a member of a standing committee.

In point of fact, we have had the example of cabinet ministers having been members of committees, and we now have a cabinet minister who is chairman of a committee. It strikes me that the fact that he should be able to join a committee of the House of Commons and act as its chairman also probably means he has the power to act as an ordinary member of that committee, and if so, surely the logic is that he can ask questions of witnesses who appear before the committee and can participate in the activities of the committee.

I think it is important to remember another purpose of a committee: it is not only to examine the minister, but also to invite a whole host of people to participate in the affairs of the committee and the discussions before it. Surely, anyone who is eligible to be on the committee should have the right to ask questions. On the question of whether or not a parliamentary secretary should ask questions of his minister, one could argue whether it is intelligent, wise or proper to do so; but in view of the ruling you gave, Mr. Speaker, about parliamentary secretaries asking questions in the House of Commons, I submit there is nothing in the Standing Orders which prevents a parliamentary secretary doing so. I would suggest that until there is something in the Standing Orders that prevents him from doing so, he should be permitted to do it: he has not broken the laws, regulations or traditions of the standing committees. Parliamentary secretaries have been asking questions of ministers and others ever since we developed the procedures for standing committees.

● (1530)

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comment that you would not wish to breathe down the necks of all chairmen of standing committees. I can understand the physical difficulty of doing that, let alone the practicality of it.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

I am trying to reconcile what your honour said earlier about what you would or would not permit in the House regarding parliamentary secretaries asking questions in the question period and what I invite Your Honour to read in the proceedings of this morning's meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications which will be printed in the next two or three days.

I appreciate the fact that what the parliamentary secretary did this morning at the committee meeting is something that Your Honour would not allow in the House in terms of the questioning of his own minister. But if the Standing Orders apply to this chamber, they should equally apply to the operations of the committees. I fail to understand how one rule can apply in the House during the question period and another rule can apply in the standing committee with regard to questioning of ministers. If you do not permit something in the House, I fail to see how it can be permitted in a standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: To put the matter in perspective, it might be more appropriate to say that I have certain powers to permit or prohibit something here, but I do not have the same powers to permit or prohibit certain things in the standing committees.

The hon. member for St. John's East raised what the hon. member for Edmonton West described as a question of privilege. I should like to draw his attention to the fact that it was raised not as a question of privilege but as a point of order. I think that is quite proper. It concerns business in the standing committees. It relates to proceedings and in fact is a procedural question pure and simple. It is, in fact, a point of order concerning the privileges of hon. members. As others have said, if it is not a point of order, they would quite readily volunteer to put forward the matter as a question of privilege if that would change its character. I do not think it would.

Hon. members have said that when a parliamentary secretary asks questions of his own minister in a standing committee, in fact he interferes with their right as opposition members to ask questions. You do not have to go very far from that proposition to see the difficulty that precisely the same thing would apply if it were another government member proceeding to take up some of the time of the committee and asking the very same questions of the minister. I do not say that in an effort to put forward an argument on one side or the other of the case; I say it only to illustrate the impossible position in which hon. members are seeking to put the Chair by asking the Chair to pass judgment on a description, on a second-hand basis, of events which have taken place in the standing committee, a description—which is certainly far from agreed upon—of the argument and nature of the proceedings.

For many years in this House, the Chair has refrained from sitting in appeal on procedural decisions taken in standing committees. Hon. members are seeking my guidance as to what steps I would take if I were chairman of the standing committee involved. Surely hon. members have the intelligence to appreciate the reasoning, that I have exposed under considerable fire, in respect of my attitude toward the role of parliamentary secretaries at

proceedings over which I preside. However, with all due respect to hon. members who participated in this debate, let me point out that that is the limit of my authority, and unless procedural changes are made that remains the limit and I do not propose to attempt to exercise a non-existent authority to decide appeals of standing committees in procedural matters.

As I said, my reasoning is obvious and clear in respect of a situation in which one hon. member asks questions on one day and answers them on another. I exposed my reasoning on that, and one can only speculate as to what I would do if I were sitting in the chair of the standing committee involved. I do not propose to cross that line unless in some way members of the House deem it proper, in their wisdom, to amend the procedures that have been followed so carefully which keep the Chair out of questions of order—and essentially this is a very serious and important question of order—in the standing committees. A question of order it is, and the Chair will not sit in appeal on questions of order in standing committees.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order arising out of the remarks you just made. I am sure you must recall the time when in the twenty-ninth parliament I was chairman of the Standing Committee of Transport and Communications presenting the fifth report of that committee and I was ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker disagreed with the chairman of the committee and said that a ruling made by the chairman of that committee had been in error, and therefore the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications was not in order and could not be introduced and concurred in at that time. I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in the twenty-ninth parliament Mr. Speaker felt that as part of his responsibility for accepting and approving committee reports he had the right to change, and perhaps at times overrule chairmen of committees.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in a moment.

The hon. member for Crowfoot has raised a point of order in respect of a precedent. The fact is that the Chair has stayed out of the proceedings of standing committees, as required by the citation in Beauchesne's before the proceedings of a committee are reported to the House. Once the proceedings of a committee are reported to the House, the House has authority to come to grips with what has taken place in the standing committee. That is the clear distinction.

If, for example, the matter before a standing committee is legislation, the matter then comes to the House at the report stage if amendments have taken place in the standing committee. The fact is that an appeal against procedural rulings in a standing committee is not provided for, but the same amendment can be, and frequently is, introduced in the House at the report stage that was refused on procedural grounds in the committee. Therefore, the House has to address itself as a whole to the very same decision that was taken in the standing committee.

When the proceedings of a standing committee, such as the one referred to by the hon. member for Crowfoot, are reported to the House, a number of arguments may be put forward relating to the proceedings that took place leading up to the report. Then the House is seized with the proceedings that take place in the House in a regular, procedural way. That is quite different from asking the Chair to make a judgment on a second-hand description of a decision that was taken in a standing committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief. I merely wish to point out that not only is there the precedent in the twenty-ninth parliament to which the hon. member for Crowfoot referred, but there is a precedent in this parliament in which Your Honour did what you now say is your right to do. I refer to the report which came back from a standing committee on Bill C-44. You found something wrong with the report, and that was the same with respect to the report in the last parliament.

I support Your Honour's position. It is quite a different thing for you to deal with a report that has been tabled and to find in your judgment that there are things in the report which should not be there, from Your Honour ruling on what a chairman did in the handling of a standing committee.

● (1540)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,039, 4,065, 4,124, 4,155 to 4,157 inclusive, 4,167, 4,301 to 4,303 inclusive, 4,595, 4,607, 4,608, 4,768, 4,777, 4,911 and 4,945.

[*Text*]

MECHANICS' LIEN AGAINST PART OF CFB COLD LAKE PROPERTY

Question No. 4,039—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. Is the government aware that a mechanics' lien registered in the Land Titles Office for the North Alberta Land Registration District at Edmonton on November 23, 1959 as Number 491, Book LS, Folio 16 is still registered against part of the Cold Lake Air Base property and, if so, does the government intend to vacate it?

2. Does the government intend to continue extradition proceedings against John Blandy Jenkins, former comptroller of City Construction Company Limited, in order that he may be tried in connection with fraudulent sworn declarations regarding monthly progress payments for the Cold Lake Air Base?

3. What progress has been made with the United States authorities in this case?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Defence and Justice as follows: 1. Yes. The Department of National Defence does not intend to vacate the mechanics' lien since such a lien filed pursuant to provincial legislation against

property held in the name of the Crown federal has no force or effect.

2 and 3. At the request of the Attorney-General of British Columbia extradition proceedings were instituted in August 1966 to have John Blandy Jenkins returned from the U.S. to British Columbia to face charges of false pretences and obtaining money by swearing false documents. On November 30, 1966, extradition was refused on grounds that the evidence adduced was insufficient to commit for extradition. No instructions have been received from the Attorney General of British Columbia to pursue this matter.

CONSTITUENCY OF ROBERVAL—PROJECTS UNDER THE NEW HORIZONS PROGRAM

Question No. 4,065—**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):**

Did the Department of National Health and Welfare approve projects under the New Horizons Programme in the Constituency of Roberval and, if so, in each case (a) what was the name of the project (b) to what groups (c) to what municipalities since the beginning of the grants up to and including 1975?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes.

(a) and (b)*		(c)
1972-1973	Retraités à l'action	Lac Bouchette
1973-1974	Corporation du Foyer de Rivière au Doré Inc.	Rivière au Doré
	Club d'Accueil	Normandin
	Club de l'Âge d'Or de St-Félicien	St-Félicien
	Club Âge d'Or les Joyeux 50-60	St-Thomas Didyme
	Club d'Âge d'Or	Girardville
	Club Âge d'Or de Chambord	Chambord
	Club Joie de Vivre de l'Âge d'Or de Roberval	Roberval
	Club Âge d'Or de Mistassini	Mistassini
	Club Âge d'Or St-Méthode	St-Méthode
	Le Club de la Gaieté	Albanel
	Comité de Loisirs du Foyer de Rivière-au-Doré	Rivière-au-Doré
	Club de l'Âge d'Or	Notre-Dame-de-la-Doré
	Club d'Âge d'Or Vie Nouvelle de St-Prime	St-Prime
	Club de l'Amitié, Âge d'Or de Dolbeau	Dolbeau
	Le Club des Retraités de Normandin	Normandin
1975-1976	Retraités à l'Action	Lac Bouchette
	Club d'Âge d'Or de Chambord	Chambord
	L'Âge d'Or	St-François de Sales
	Comité des Bénéficiaires de l'Oasis de Mistassini	Mistassini

*(a) and (b) NOTE: No distinction is made between the name of t project and the name of the group.

[Mr. Sharp.]

PLAN TO CONTROL POSSIBILITY OF INTRODUCTION OF LASSA FEVER DURING 1976 OLYMPICS

Question No. 4,124—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does the government have a contingency plan to control the possibility of introduction into Canada of "lassa fever" during the 1976 Olympics from countries where this disease is prevalent?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): A detailed Canadian Quarantine Contingency Plan, specifically directed to the containment and control of the four major quarantinable diseases, smallpox, cholera, yellow fever and the plague, has been developed by the Department of National Health and Welfare in consultation with the Provincial Departments of Health; the guidelines therein form the basis for action in the event of the inadvertent importation at any time of such dangerous communicable diseases as lassa fever. Constantly updated contingency plans exist to deal with the possibility of the introduction into Canada of "lassa fever" during the 1976 Olympics, including the emergency adaptation of existing isolation facilities.

QUEBEC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,155—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. Who is in charge of the Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre?

2. Does his formal education include (a) first degree (b) second degree (c) any additional degrees?

3. What is his salary level?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. Dr. Pierre Déom.

2. (a) Yes; (b) yes; (c) yes.

3. $34,500 to $44,900.

ONTARIO REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,156—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. Who is in charge of the Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre?

2. Does his formal education include (a) first degree (b) second degree (c) any additional degrees?

3. What is his salary level?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. Dr. Robert Brown.

2. (a) Yes; (b) yes; (c) yes.

3. $34,500 to $44,900.

PACIFIC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,157—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. Who is in charge of the Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre?

2. Does his formal education include (a) first degree (b) second degree (c) any additional degrees?

3. What is his salary level?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. Dr. Chunanil Roy.

2. (a) Yes; (b) yes; (c) yes.

3. $34,500 to $44,900.

LOANS TO PROVINCES FROM CANADA PENSION PLAN FUND

Question No. 4,167—**Mr. Gillies:**

1. Have any loans been made to the provinces from Canada Pension Plan fund and, if so (a) to which provinces (b) in what amounts (c) at what rate?

2. Have any other loans been made from the Plan and, if so, at what rate of interest?

3. What steps exist to ensure that the funds of the Plan are recompensed?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. (a) and (b) The following statement reflects the total investments of the Canada Pension Plan Fund by provinces from March 1, 1966 to February 9, 1976. (c) The applicable interest rate is the weighted average of market yields of Canada bonds having terms of 20 years or more. The monthly interest rate on new Canada Pension Plan investments varied between 8.21 percent and 9.48 percent in 1975.

2. The only loans made from the Plan are those made to the provinces and, in some cases, to their provincial crown agencies; the residues not taken up by the provinces are loaned to the Government of Canada. The monthly interest rate is the same as that given in part 1(c).

3. All loans made to provinces and/or provincial crown agencies are duly guaranteed by the respective provinces.

Canada Pension Plan
Investment Fund
Total Investments for the Period
March 1, 1966 to February 9, 1976

Prince Edward Island	$ 36,166,000
Nova Scotia	362,031,000
New Brunswick	273,505,000
Quebec	50,554,000
Ontario	5,094,196,000
Manitoba	541,109,000
Saskatchewan	419,025,000
Alberta	883,387,000
British Columbia	1,347,150,000
Newfoundland	180,255,000
Government of Canada	60,437,000
Total	$9,247,815,000

Order Paper Questions

QUEBEC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE—OUTSIDE EVALUATORS

Question No. 4,301—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Were outside evaluators contracted to evaluate the Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre and, if so, what (a) programmes were evaluated (b) are the names of individuals who evaluated such programmes (c) was the cost of each evaluation (d) conclusions were drawn from each evaluation?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): No.

ONTARIO REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,302—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Were outside evaluators contracted to evaluate the Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre and, if so, what (a) programmes were evaluated (b) are the names of individuals who evaluated such programmes (c) was the cost of each evaluation (d) conclusions were drawn from each evaluation?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): No.

PACIFIC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE—OUTSIDE EVALUATORS

Question No. 4,303—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Were outside evaluators contracted to evaluate the Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre and, if so, what (a) programmes were evaluated (b) are the names of individuals who evaluated such programmes (c) was the cost of each evaluation (d) conclusions were drawn from each evaluation?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): No.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SEARCH AND RESCUE HELICOPTERS

Question No. 4,595—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. How many Armed Forces helicopters stationed on the West Coast were serviceable and ready to take to the air and/or in the air on (a) February 26 (b) February 27 (c) February 28 (d) February 29 (e) March 1, 1976 and, in each case, what flights were made by each such helicopter?

2. In each case, were passengers carried and, if so, (a) what are their names (b) what were the points of embarkation and disembarkation (c) for what purpose?

3. For the same period, did the helicopters respond to calls from the Air Sea Rescue Centre at CFB Esquimalt and, if so, to how many?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1 and 2. See following statements.

3. Yes. Ten calls were received and helicopters responded to all ten calls.

Date	Number of Helicopters Available	Helicopters Number	Flight Mission	Purpose	Points of Embarkation and Disembarkation	Names of Passengers
February 26, 1976	2	1	SAR Widden	Air distress	Comox	—
		1	Medical Evacuation	Treatment of crushed leg	Race Rocks—Victoria	Mr. Anderson
		1	SAR Sea Rock	Marine distress and airlift of survivors	F/V Sea Rock—Victoria	Mr. J. Craig
		2	Transport Minister of National Defence and Party	Ministerial visit to CFB Chilliwack	Abbotsford—CFB Chilliwack	Hon. J. Richardson LCol Burger Mr. Batten LCol Wawrychuck Capt. Davies

Order Paper Questions

Date	Number of Helicopters Available	Helicopters Number	Flight Mission	Purpose	Points of Embarkation and Disembarkation	Names of Passengers
February 27, 1976	2	1	Transport Minister of National Defence and Party	Ministerial visit to CFB Chilliwack	Chilliwack—Abbotsford (Remained in Abbotsford overnight due to bad weather)	Hon. J. Richardson LCol Burger Mr. Batten Col Robertson Capt. Davies Lt. Baird
		2	Scheduled Flight No. 45	Resupply	Comox—CFB Holberg	—
		2	Medical Evacuation	Medical Treatment	CFS Holberg—Comox	Mr. Mercer
February 28, 1976	3	1	Return to Base	—	Abbotsford—Comox	—
		2 and 3	No Flights	—	—	—
February 29, 1976	3	1	Medical Evacuation	Medical Treatment	Weather ship Vancouver —Victoria	Mr. Willman Mr. Vant Mr. Hill
		1	SAR Starshine	Marine distress	—	—
		2	SAR Bruce 1	Marine distress	—	—
		3	No Flights			
March 1, 1976	2	1	SAR Starshine	Marine distress (Located survivors and directed Coast Guard ship)	—	—
		1	Pick up survivors of F/V Starshine	Transport	Victoria—Bamfield	(Media Personnel) Mr. Stevens Mr. Morton Mr. Dufour Mrs. Dufour
		1	Transport survivors of F/V Starshine	Transport	Bamfield—Victoria	As per item above plus Messrs. Wulf and Manson
		2	SAR Bruce I	Marine distress	—	—

ATLANTIC COAST FISHING INDUSTRY—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Question No. 4,607—**Mr. Matte:**

1. In 1974-75 and 1975-76, did the government make grants under the financial assistance programme to the Atlantic Coast fishing industry and, if so, in what amount?

2. What (a) species of fish were eligible for such grants (b) was the amount of such grants (c) was the year in which such grants were made?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): 1. 1974-75, Yes—$9,336,614; 1975-76, Yes—$36,074,978.

2. (a) All groundfish species except halibut, crab, lobster, smelt. (b) $45,411,592. (c) 1974-75, 1975-76.

PACIFIC COAST FISHING INDUSTRY—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Question No. 4,608—**Mr. Matte:**

1. In 1974-75 and 1975-76, did the government make grants under the financial assistance programme to the Pacific Coast fishing industry and, if so, in what amount?

2. What (a) species of fish were eligible for such grants (b) was the amount of such grants (c) was the year in which such grants were made?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): 1. 1974-75, Yes—$779,911; 1975-76, Yes—$1,709,343.

2. (a) All groundfish species, exclusive of halibut. (b) $2,489,254. (c) 1974-75 and 1975-76.

[Mr. Richardson.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE—BUDGET 1973-76

Question No. 4,768—**Mr. Matte:**

What was the (a) total budget for the Department of National Defence (b) budget for the Canadian Armed Forces in the Province of Quebec for (i) 1973-74 (ii) 1974-75 (iii) 1975-76?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) (i) $2,248,509,780; (ii) 2,532,847,300; (iii) Figures for 1975/76 will not be available until the close of the fiscal year. (b) The Department of National Defence does not apportion its annual budget/estimates on a provincial basis but to activities in the Defence Services Program without regard to geographical location. However, the Department maintains a record of actual expenditures by province and they have been as follows for Quebec: 1973/74, $349,368,245; 1974/75, $394,468,343; 1975/76, not yet available.

PRIVATE RAILWAY CARS

Question No. 4,777—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. (a) How many private railway cars are owned by the government (b) what are their numbers and/or name designations (c) how many miles has each travelled since April 20, 1968 (d) what is the present cost per travelling mile of each (e) what was the total cost for all travelling made by all cars since April 20, 1968 including salaries of personnel, etc?

2. (a) What are the names of all persons who have made use of such railway cars since April 20, 1968 other than the Governor General or members of the Royal Family (b) what is a complete list of all trips

including (i) points of departure (ii) points of destination (iii) dates involved (iv) purpose of each trip?

3. What are the names, addresses and job designations of all passengers including those who made use of the cars during any of the trips?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. (a) A two-car train set used by the Governor General is owned by the Government and two private railway cars are on loan from Canadian National. (b) Car 5; Car 53, Northwind. (c) Records are retained only one full year. Since April 1, 1974 Car 5 has travelled 25,269 miles and Car 53 has travelled 28,894 miles. (d) $1.95 per mile. (e) Total cost to Transport Canada since April 1, 1974 is $150,600.

2. (a) (b) (i) (ii) (iii)

Car Number 5			
Hon. Paul Martin	Ottawa-Windsor	April 20-22	1974
Hon. J. P. Goyer	Ottawa-Montreal	May 3	1974
Hon. J. E. Dubé	Ottawa-Campbellton	July 8-10	1974
Hon. Otto Lang	Ottawa-Saskatoon	Aug. 20-24	1974
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Quebec	Sept. 16-18	1974
Hon. John Munro	Ottawa-Toronto	Sept. 20-21	1974
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	Oct. 4-5	1974
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	Dec. 13-15	1974
Hon. D. MacDonald	Ottawa-Toronto	Feb. 19-20	1975
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	March 21-23	1975
Hon. John Munro	Ottawa-Toronto	April 2-3	1975
Hon. J. P. Goyer	Ottawa-Mont Joli	May 9-12	1975
Hon. Ron Basford	Ottawa-Quebec	June 27-29	1975
Hon. John Turner	Ottawa-Kenora	July 31-Aug. 2	1975
Hon. John Turner	Ottawa-Kenora	Aug. 23-26	1975
Hon. Otto Lang	Ottawa-Regina	Aug. 27-Sept. 1	1975
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Quebec	Sept. 26-27	1975
Hon. Don Jamieson	Ottawa-London	Nov. 14-16	1975
USSR Railway Delegation	Ottawa-Vancouver	Dec. 5-12	1975
Hon. J. Chrétien	Ottawa-Quebec	Feb. 13-17	1976

Car Number 53			
Hon. Paul Martin	Ottawa-Windsor	April 10-12	1974
Hon. John Munro	Ottawa-Toronto	April 21-22	1974
Hon. J. E. Dubé	Ottawa-Campbellton	April 26-29	1974
Hon. J. E. Dubé	Ottawa-Campbellton	May 17-20	1974
Hon. Jeanne Sauvé	Ottawa-Montreal	July 31	1974
Hon. S. Haidasz	Ottawa-Toronto	July 26-27	1974
Hon. John Turner	Ottawa-Kenora	Aug. 24-26	1974
Hon. Ron Basford	Ottawa-Winnipeg	Nov. 11-14	1974
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	Oct. 26	1974
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	Nov. 29-30	1974
Hon. J. Chrétien	Ottawa-Sherbrooke	Feb. 21-24	1975
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	May 3-4	1975
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	May 31-June 4	1975
Hon. A. Andras	Ottawa-Thunder Bay	June 5-8	1975
Hon. J. P. Goyer	Ottawa-Quebec	June 13-15	1975
CTC Officials	Ottawa-Quebec	June 23-26	1975
Hon. D. MacDonald	Ottawa-Sydney	Aug. 2-12	1975
Hon. B. Danson	Ottawa-Vancouver	Aug.19-Sept.3	1975
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Montreal	Oct. 18-19	1975
USSR Railway Delegation	Ottawa-Vancouver	Dec. 5-12	1975
Hon. J. Chrétien	Ottawa-Shawinigan	Dec. 30-Jan 3	1976
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Quebec	Feb. 12-16	1976
Hon. J. Chrétien	Ottawa-Shawinigan	Jan. 23-26	1976
Hon. A. Ouellet	Ottawa-Quebec	Jan. 31-Feb.3	1976
Hon. J. Chrétien	Ottawa-Shawinigan	Feb. 27-March 1	1976

2. (b) (iv) Purpose of each trip is unknown.

3. In all but two instances, the cars were used by Cabinet Ministers. Exceptions were once for official business of the Canadian Transport Commission and once on request from External Affairs for a senior delegation of USSR railway officials. Records on passengers are not kept and therefore the information requested is not available.

SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMMES

Question No. 4,911—**Mr. Matte:**

What amount did the government spend in each province under the social security programmes for the fiscal years (a) 1973-74 (b) 1974-75 (c) 1975-76?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): (a) See Public Accounts of Canada, 1974, volume II, section 34, pages 12 to 14. (b) See Public Accounts of Canada, 1975, volume II, section 34, pages 12 and 13. (c) Fiscal year not yet concluded.

Order Paper Questions

TOTAL AMOUNT OF OLD AGE PENSIONS PAID

Question No. 4,945—**Mr. Matte:**

What was the total amount of old age pensions paid in (a) Canada (b) each province during the fiscal years (i) 1973-74 (ii) 1974-75 (iii) 1975-76?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): (a) (i) and (ii) See Public Accounts of Canada, 1975, volume II, section 34, page 13; (iii) 1975-1976 fiscal year not yet concluded. (b) (i) and (ii) See Public Accounts of Canada, 1975, volume II, section 34, page 13; (iii) 1975-1976 fiscal year not yet concluded.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 3,319 and 3,490 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS LOCATED IN HULL

Question No. 3,319—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What departments or offices are located in Hull, Quebec?

2. Do any such departments or offices have offices located outside of Ottawa or Hull?

3. How much area or space is occupied by each department or office in Parts 1 and 2?

4. How much of the area or space in Part 3 is (a) privately (b) publicly owned?

5. (a) How many employees are employed in Hull (b) what is the total annual payroll (c) how many are (i) unilingual French (ii) unilingual English (iii) bilingual?

6. What are the details, including rent, unit rate for each tenancy or lease of all area or space rented or occupied by departments in Hull?

7. How many more departments or employees does the government plan to locate in Hull in the next (a) year (b) two years (c) three years (d) four years (e) five years?

8. Is space available or can space be allocated for such employees in Ottawa?

Return tabled.

GRANTS TO CONSTITUENCY OF RICHMOND

Question No. 3,490—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

1. How much money has been granted to the Constituency of Richmond from 1968 to November 1, 1975, with the exception of grants made under the Opportunities for Youth, Local Initiatives and New Horizons Programmes?

2. For each such grant, what is the (a) date of approval (b) amount (c) name of the municipality concerned (d) nature of the project?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

[*English*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

OBJECTIONS TO REPORTS OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS—ONTARIO

The House resumed, from Monday, April 5, consideration of objections to reports of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions for various provinces.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now resume consideration of the objections to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief comments with regard to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario, 1976. When the idea of an independent commission on electoral boundaries was first implemented in 1964 it was to get away from the government bringing in a bill setting out what the boundaries would be for redistribution, with the principal aim being to prevent gerrymandering of the ridings either by members or by the government.

The commission itself is a very independent one; it is not appointed by the government but by Mr. Speaker and other independent bodies. Another aim was to get away from the long debate and study of the redistribution question by parliamentary committees. One might ask, if this is the second time the independent commission has acted to bring in a report, has this all worked out? There can be no question that the commission has shown that it is an independent body. I think we may ask ourselves with regard to the present redistribution which has been going on since the 1971 census—really, since 1972—whether this is the most expeditious way to handle redistribution, because hon. members will recall that the commission brought in a report in 1973 which was not accepted by the House. That redistribution was stopped by an act of parliament and the number of seats in parliament was increased by a bill at that time. Since this redistribution started in 1972, this is the fourth set of maps which has been presented to the House.

Some hon. members feel that this report is a good one; some think it is terrible. I believe there is one matter on which there is a great deal of unanimity, at least on the part of the members of parliament and the people of northern Ontario, and that is that we are disappointed that this report proposes that the number of seats in northern Ontario be reduced from 12 to 11. The representations from communities, from municipalities and from other groups have been long and hard since the preliminary maps were published last August in an effort to maintain the present strength of 12 members in the House of Commons.

I believe that the town of Geraldton circulated a petition to practically every municipality in northern Ontario, and at least a dozen from my own constituency endorsed that petition asking that the present strength of 12 members in the House of Commons be maintained. Likewise, there were public representations at the hearings in Sudbury

and Thunder Bay, as well as here in Ottawa, to indicate support for the present 12 members from northern Ontario as well as representations and support for this position by all hon. members on both sides of the House. When the number of seats in the House of Commons was increased by the 1973 bill, seven additional seats were given to the province of Ontario, and we believed that surely we in northern Ontario would be able to maintain our present number of seats. I certainly hope that the commission will review this matter after the representations have been made in this debate.

If the commissioners would consider the special situation in northern Ontario, they would see why we should maintain the present number of seats in the House. By northern Ontario standards, the riding of Algoma is a medium-sized constituency; but even at that it is some 390 miles from one end to the other and it is not all combined in two or three municipalities. There are literally dozens of villages, hamlets, rural municipalities and unorganized municipalities, as well as several good-sized towns. Ridings like Thunder Bay, Kenora-Rainy River and Cochrane North are rural ridings which are even larger. I believe that they are the three special ridings under schedule F of the Canada Elections Act and they have to have earlier nomination meetings.

The constituents of rural ridings look to members of parliament, their riding officers and staff for special services which often are not necessary in urban ridings. Often the office of a member of parliament in a constituency is the only federal government office serving that constituency which is able to deal with problems relating to every government department.

If we examine the proposed redistribution, we can see that in northwestern Ontario the five present ridings will be reduced to four, and we can only ask ourselves how we can expect to maintain the standard of representation with only four members as opposed to five. Likewise, the citizens of that area will ask how they can expect to have the same standard of service with one less member of parliament and his staff. It can only be expected that we have the kind of representation we have had during the last 24 years or so in the House if we maintain the present number of representatives from northern Ontario.

In the redistribution which took place in 1966, which I believe was the first under the independent commission, the tendency seemed to be to separate rural and urban ridings. Some described this as the doughnut approach whereby the rural riding contained the small communities surrounding cities and the outlying rural area and the cities were separate constituencies. I believe this method has served very well. Often the people of rural areas feel they do not receive as much attention as that of city or urban centres.

Using the approach of having urban and rural ridings separated has served very well. Previous to that, ridings—at least in the Algoma, Sault Ste. Marie and, I believe, the Thunder Bay areas—were composed of mixed rural and urban areas. If one looks at the map of northern Ontario it is easy to see the great difficulty in trying to redistribute the ridings on an equitable and fair basis. The present redistribution tends toward the low end of the average population, either in the low 60,000s or middle 60,000s. However, Kenora-Rainy River has a population of some 71,000, and Nickel Belt in Sudbury has about 90,000, so there certainly is enough population to justify at least that additional seat by maintaining the present number of 12 members of parliament from the north. Essentially, the commission has added to the riding of Algoma the township of Prince and a portion of the southeastern corner of the city of Sault Ste. Marie, which amounts to about 11,000 additional people added to the present Algoma riding.

● (1550)

The other boundaries do not add significant areas of territory or population. Essentially, I have not received any representations from Algoma opposing the proposed redistribution. There is a history of the city having been a portion of the Algoma riding up to the 1968 federal election. Many of the services and agencies serving the rural part of Algoma are provided by the city of Sault Ste. Marie. A great number of the people living in the rural riding work in the city of Sault Ste. Marie. I have, however, received representations from the city council and the MPP for Sault Ste. Marie opposing putting a portion of the city in with the Algoma riding. Mainly, this was on the basis of mixing rural and urban areas, the community of interest being different, and so on.

I received some favourable comment from individuals looking at it from the point of view that there would be two representatives from Sault Ste. Marie with additional service from two members. However, the main representations from the city were indicated by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) when he spoke last evening. Representations from at least the city council and the provincial member opposed part of the city going into the rural riding. With these objections, we might ask what the alternatives would be. I must say that they are probably less workable than the ones proposed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. We have some idea of how the commissions would think, because this is the fourth set of maps that has been prepared; therefore we have some idea of the alternatives they would propose.

In the 1973 preliminary maps they proposed putting a large portion of the northern area of the Algoma district into the Algoma riding. That would have added some 20,000 square miles of territory. The disadvantage to that is the large amount of additional territory for a representative to cover and service, as well as the large number of miles to drive in order to provide service.

Another problem arises with this redistribution. Both Cochrane North and Timmins-Chapleau would lose if we were to bring the Algoma federal riding to the minimum levels required under the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. Their population base would slide below the minimum limits. The second proposal made in the final set of maps in the 1973 report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission was to put a portion of Sudbury in the Nipissing riding in with the Algoma riding. That would be a difficult proposal to see established because there is very little community of interest even though the size of the communities may be very similar. There is certainly no working relationship that we have ever had historically.

The present riding has representation from three territorial districts. This would be a fourth. I think it is an

unworkable proposal that was made in the report of the commission in 1973. Yesterday, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) spoke about the opposition to part of West Nipissing going into Timiskaming. I think the opposition would be even stronger to the 1973 report of the commission.

The third proposal which was made in the preliminary maps of the 1976 redistribution commission report proposes that a portion of the regional city of Sudbury be put in with the Algoma riding. There was strong representation from various representatives in the city opposing this before the Electoral Boundaries Commission when it held its hearings in Sudbury, as well as a long petition. I attended one meeting in Walden to hear the representations opposing this. I believe that on the basis of those representations and alternatives, the commission came to the decision to put a portion of the city of Sault Ste. Marie in with the Algoma riding which did not have adequate population to meet the minimum standards of the act. Perhaps this solution is not completely satisfactory. Perhaps it is impossible to come up with a completely satisfactory proposal. However, it is a workable solution to meet the minimum requirements of the act and to provide adequate representation and service to the ridings concerned.

I hope the commission will take a further look at the number of representatives from northern Ontario with a view to providing 12 representatives rather than 11 as is now proposed in the report of the commission.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think I could rise on a point of order in which I have less personal interest than this one, for we have very few speakers left in this debate. However, with the long list of speakers that I understand is still before us, and because of the fact we are dealing with these objections province by province, unless we do something we shall not reach British Columbia until about 3 a.m. I wish to suggest that the House now agree that from here on the speeches be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. Blaker: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would like to reinforce what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has said. I have been asked to take some responsibility with regard to members of parliament from all parties from the province of Quebec who wish to speak on this matter.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): How many have you got?

Mr. Blaker: I have a list of 22 members from the province of Quebec who want to speak. However, that may grow as others also have the right to speak. If they each take the time allotted to them, we will be some time. It is a matter of courtesy to the other provinces that we adopt this procedure I do not want to see members sitting here until two or three in the morning simply because some members decide to take their full 20 minutes. I support the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in requesting that we cut back speeches to ten minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I have a list of Liberals. They will take approximately an hour and 20 minutes. There are four Conservatives. I would say that within two hours we will be finished with the province of Ontario.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As you just said, Mr. Speaker, that is just the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Lachine-Lakeshore (Mr. Blaker) mentioned Quebec. There are others as we go across the country. I certainly would not want to impede the right of any member to speak; however, I hope the consensus will be such that we can now obtain a House order with respect to limiting the speeches of ten minutes hereafter, following the hon. member who I am sure will follow the spirit of the order.

● (1600)

I submit that all members must be given a chance to make their comments. There is at present a House order governing the time set aside for this debate; but if each speaker speaks at length there may not be enough time to complete this debate in accordance with the terms of the House order. Frankly, I am trying to discover when one parliamentary day ends and another begins.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It ends immediately before the new day begins, at five minutes to 2 p.m.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Bearing in mind that we must be fair to all hon. members, and what this debate is all about, I wonder if the House would not be prepared to agree unanimously to an order limiting speeches to, say, ten minutes.

Mr. Philbrook: Mr. Speaker, I oppose the hon. member's suggestion. I understand his position. I prepared a speech which will take more that ten minutes to deliver, and closer to 20 minutes. It is unfair to expect someone, on about a minute's notice, to cut a speech in half. I do not think it can be done properly and I am afraid I insist on opposing the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. Foster: If I may speak on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, as most members favour an agreement which would give all a fair chance to speak, would it not be better if the House leaders met, did their calculations and then returned with a proposal which the House could consider?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I understood that originally there were to be 13 speakers from the Liberal party. Several have already spoken, and two were to take only four or five minutes. I calculated that the Liberal side of the House would need about one hour and 30 minutes. It appears, from what I have heard, that the opposition party on my left wishes to put up four speakers. If they can tell me how much time they will need, we can make more accurate calculation

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the point you just mentioned, I am prepared to take less than ten minutes. I understand that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) is also prepared to abide by the suggested restraint. Perhaps it would be useful, if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook) agrees, if the hon. member were to speak later. That would give him enough time to shorten his speech. Perhaps he could keep it within the confines which might be suggested in the House order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I understand the concern shown by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) but I believe it should have been provided at the outset that speeches should be limited to 10 minutes. This formula should have have been adopted yesterday. Yesterday, members who had the opportunity to get the floor were allowed to speak for as long as they wished; in other words, those who wanted to take 20 minutes did take 20 minutes, those who wanted to take 10 minutes took 10 minutes.

On behalf on my party, I do not want to shoulder the responsibility of expressing the views of my colleagues without having consulted them, as well as my leader. That is why I would like to ask the Chair to allow me to consult them before giving my final decision. I am quite prepared to limit my speech to 10 minutes. However I believe it will be impossible since I am living in one of the most "chopped up" ridings in the province of Quebec and I would like to have the opportunity to make my point. Anyway, I will try to contact my leader and in a few minutes I will give you a definite answer.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I suggest that we leave the question for the time being. Perhaps the House leaders could meet and agree to limit speeches to 10 or 15 minutes. Until they report, perhaps we could carry on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I shall keep my remarks brief and allow my colleagues to put their comments on record. I shall talk about redistribution in Ontario. I, with others on my side, signed the objection filed by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick). My objections to the commission's proposals relate strictly to the points raised by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton. I signed the objection to give hon. members the opportunity to address themselves to the points raised in it.

I shall now deal briefly with my constituency. I suppose most members of parliament do not like to see redistribution taking place. It is impossible, after representing a rural constituency for several years and becoming better acquainted with constituents and their problems, not to harbour reservations about redistribution. Members representing rural constituencies are especially concerned as with each successive redistribution the number of rural seats declines and the number of urban seats rises. That means that after each redistribution it is more difficult to make the voice of rural Canadians heard in parliament. Therefore, the people of my area do not altogether like this redistribution. They do not like the idea that rural Canadians will have a diminished voice in the House of Commons. We know that it is necessary and equitable: we know that after every census, redistribution should more accurately reflect the demographic changes which took place in the previous ten years.

I shall voice some of the immediate concerns of my constituents. The proposed redistribution will radically alter our constituency. No member of parliament who has a good working relationship with his constituents likes to see constituents taken away from him and placed in another constituency. You develop a sense of loyalty to your constituents, a working relationship which may be difficult to reestablish from scratch, as it were, after redistribution. Thus, when new boundaries are drawn, difficulties for members and constituents are created. Sometimes constituents do not know to which constituency they belong. There is initial confusion.

Having said that, allow me to commend the Electoral Boundaries Commission working in Ontario for the excellent work it has done. It was forced to make a number of changes about which I harbour reservations, as do other members of parliament, I am sure, whose constituencies will be affected. Having examined the final report, I am convinced that the commission considered my representations and the representations of constituents. It listened to representations made by two municipal bodies in my constituency, those of the town of Wellesley and of Mount Forest. Those two town councils passed resolutions asking that the proposals they were making to the commission be considered. The commission considered both proposals, and the proposed changes are acceptable to the people of the areas concerned. Mr. Justice Campbell Grant deserves great credit for the tremendous work he did, and the members of the commission deserve the approbation of members of parliament representing Ontario constituencies for the work done in connection with redistribution.

Clearly, the commission tried to do two things. It tried to take cognizance of local concerns expressed by members of parliament and delegations appearing before the commission, and it tried to take into account the community of interest as made evident to the commission. The commission did something else. It tried to simplify constituency boundaries and make them conform as much as possible to municipal and provincial boundaries.

● (1610)

At the present time, I represent three counties and one regional municipality.

I should make it clear that I am extremely conscious of the fact that one of the aims of an Electoral Boundaries Commission should be to make it easier for a member of parliament to represent the whole of the area which falls within his boundaries, to make it easier for the people in the municipalities, when presenting briefs to government, to establish well ordered lines of communication with the government. These are things which the boundaries commission has tried to do.

There are one or two other points I would like to make. This is the fourth set of maps which has been drawn up by the commission. It is clear that a tremendous effort has been made and that this has been done at tremendous public cost. I would hate to see the commission sent back to the drawing board and told to start over from scratch as a result of the objections which have been raised. I do not share the doubt expressed by some members as to whether the commission was acting within its mandate. I have no doubt it was, and I believe it tried to discharge its responsibilities in a responsible and effective way.

Before the closing, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that there is need for an early decision on this issue. It is a matter which has dragged on for some years. The census on

the basis of which these proposals are based was conducted in 1971, five years ago, and the people in the areas affected are entitled to an early decision on the part of the government so they may know in which federal constituency they are to be located. I would urge consideration of the fact that if we are to start from scratch and redraw the maps once again, it would undoubtedly result in further delay before a final decision could be reached, resulting in considerable inconvenience for many people throughout Ontario who are entitled to an early decision.

The next election will be fought on the basis of the new boundaries, and one of our responsibilities to possible candidates and to the party associations is to clear up as soon as possible what the new boundaries will be in order to give them an opportunity to reorganize and start their work in preparation for the next election.

Once again, let me say I am generally pleased with the decisions which have been made with respect to my own constituency. I am sure the hon. member for Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Milne) agrees with the general concept. I am pleased that Dufferin county, for example, will be put into one constituency instead of being divided among two. I am pleased that Grey county, instead of being split three ways, as at the present time, will be split only two ways. I am pleased that in the case of Waterloo county, the regional municipality of Waterloo, the commission was receptive to the brief put forward by the council of the township of Wellesley which objected to their being placed in the Perth constituency when they should more properly be kept in with North Waterloo. I am pleased, also, that the commission recognized the brief which was put in by the township of Wallace asking that they be kept with Perth county and not included in the county of Wellington. I think the commission deserves a great deal of credit for the work it has done.

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, to come right to the point, the proposal of the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Commission, which would mutilate the traditional federal riding of Halton, is completely unacceptable to my constituents. The eastern half of the new municipality of Halton Hills, of which Georgetown forms the main part, should remain within Halton riding at this time. At any rate, Halton Hills, as an integrated municipality, newly created by the provincial government of Ontario, should remain intact whichever riding it is in.

Let me say at this point that we support the spirit of the representation of the hon. members for Ontario and Thunder Bay ridings that the Ontario commission has not satisfactorily justified its proposals with reasons. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) states that the commission is there to guarantee the democratic wishes of Canadians. Halton feels it unfortunately does just the opposite.

Again, let it be quite clear that Halton is not disputing the loss of the northern one-third of the riding in the current redistribution, that is, the part composed of Erin Village, Erin township and Hillsburgh village. That portion, delightful as it is, is more remote from the southern remainder of the riding, has stronger relations with Welington and other areas surrounding it, and was invariably lost to Halton sooner or later. Nor are the people of Erin apparently protesting the change.

[Mr. Beatty.]

We made our position quite clear in a combined presentation to the commission in Toronto on October 6, 1975, that we accept their first proposal on the northern Erin loss but totally reject their second proposal on splitting the eastern part of Halton Hills away from us and giving it to a federal riding to the East. Brampton apparently feels that it already has enough to handle and is as opposed to the change as is Halton, for similar reasons of rationalizing electoral boundary lines. However, the only change in the Halton proposal which the commission seems to have made since lat summer is to give the Georgetown area to the new urban constituency of Brampton rather than the new rural riding north of Brampton which was to be called Halton-Peel and is now to be called York-Peel. This would seem to make the situation even worse, rather than better. In fact, either change is unacceptable to both sides, either the over-all Halton or Peel regions, either the riding losing the Georgetown area or the riding due to receive it as an unsolicited gift. Last year the local people submitted a combined brief from the two regional governments, and a Halton Hills town council brief, both in support of my own brief as federal MP, all rejecting the commission's proposal.

Our Halton Hills mayor, his Worship Tom Hill, and the Halton regional chairman, Mr. Allan Masson, both appeared in person with me before the commission to present a united stand to keep Halton Hills intact and to keep it for now with Milton and Oakville in the federal riding of Halton.

There are no known differences of opinion on this controversy between anyone in the local areas concerned. Not between Georgetown and Brampton. Not between Halton riding and either Brampton riding or York-Peel north of it. Not between Halton region and Peel region. Not within the various parts of Halton. And there is no partisan difference of opinion, to the best of my knowledge. I have taken the trouble to check, and the political parties involved agree wholeheartedly that the commission's proposal is a tragic mistake. That is, all the citizens involved at the local riding level, whatever their electoral area, whatever their political affiliation, whatever their level of government, are united in being appalled and upset about the commission's proposal for the Georgetown area. There are no apparent dissenters. The commission was so informed last summer but chose to ignore the pleas of these citizens and their elected representatives.

The commission seems to have placed most or all of its emphasis on balancing up the numbers of voters in each riding within the stipulated range. That is one of their main guidelines, but only one. There are, I submit, other important considerations, some official, some just a matter of common sense and recognition of the democratic wishes of the citizens concerned.

We have heard the same points raised time and again in this debate, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the House for their struggle against these injustices and inanities. The integrity of municipal boundaries must be maintained, that is, towns like Halton Hills must not be split up. After all, it was the Ontario provincial Conservative or Davis government which created this new municipal unit a few short years ago as part of its regional government movement. Welded together out of the independent juris-

dictions of Georgetown, Acton and part of Esquesing township, this new integrated town has worked hard to unite itself and is just beginning to experience the sweet taste of success. When it finds itself torn in half by a small group of appointed officials who seem to place higher priority on a set of numbers than on a set of human and social values.

What about the dilemma from the federal perspective? Picture two different MPs representing two different halves of the same small town, perhaps on the same local issue at the same time. How rational and efficient is that? What if the mayor and the town council are in the other MP's half of the town? Can I still approach them directly, or does protocol oblige me to approach the other MP first? Halton Hills must remain united, not split in half. Picture one small town council having to deal with two MPs instead of one.

Federal riding boundaries must be kept simplified and in line with the electoral boundary lines of other levels of government, particularly provincial and regional lines. My constituents are becoming confused, frustrated, threatened and even angry by a plethora of riding boundary lines and relationships. In our area, they are finding more and more, to their horror, that they belong to a number of different administrative areas—four governments, several government agencies, like UIC, and a number of private or semi-private zones such as Bell Telephone. They are all expected to keep these various jurisdictions straight in their minds when even a genius would have trouble sorting them out. Perhaps due to lack of co-operation in planning, perhaps due to lack of interest in grass-roots opinions, boundary lines are becoming a bureaucratic nightmare. The constituent deserves a break, with simple coordinated boundary lines, before it is too late to save the credibility and acceptability of our social-political system.

● (1620)

Traditional, close ties between towns and villages in the same riding must be preserved as long as possible and only be severed when each part is populous enough to form its own riding units. The Georgetown area is not only an integral part of Halton Hills now, but has always had strong inter-community ties of every kind with Oakville and Milton-social, cultural, recreational, economic and political. I myself grew up in that amateur sports network and have many long-standing friends all over the riding as a result.

Halton has never had strong ties with the Brampton or Peel areas. In fact, the riding based on Lake Ontario between Toronto and Hamilton have been characteristically tall north-south ridings without strong east-west relationships. The people would travel farther north and south for their activities inside the old riding than they would east and west outside the riding.

Perhaps such patterns of human activity can change, but not rightfully against the will of the people, not overnight and not without full consultation. One day, perhaps the next time around, the population spill-over from Toronto and Hamilton into the Halton area might be great enough to let Oakville stand as a riding on its own, and perhaps Halton Hills to combine with Milton, but not yet; not as long as towns like Halton Hills are threatened with being torn in half for part of its existence.

Population figures and the number of voters in a riding are important, obviously, but should not be the only or even the main determinant in assessing boundary lines. Whatever the commission's rules and guidelines, the amount of work in a riding and whether an elected official can handle it is only indirectly related to the size of his flock. There are many other factors—the nature of the riding, the demands they place on their MP, the ability of the MP and his organization to cope. In the final consensus, as long as the MP and his constituents are happy and satisfied with the existing situation, why should a small group of appointees, unfamiliar with the area, presume to change it against everyone else's wishes? To prevent gerrymandering yes, but what gerrymandering is there when all parties agree? They should not, I submit, buck public opinion, Gouging Georgetown out of Halton would be like tearing off a man's right arm.

Finally, there should be some provision to consider rapid growth centres such as those in the Toronto-Hamilton area. More remote areas like northern Ontario are entitled to retain their representation just on the vastness of their ridings alone, in spite of small and slow-growing populations. They are welcome to keep their ridings if in the bargain we may keep ours. I would be only too happy to take on a larger load than the commission considers proper—in other words, to keep all of my present riding—if it would give an extra riding to northern Ontario.

However, areas like Halton, Brampton and Peel need their own rules to avert chaos, not those of a vastly different area like the north. If part of Halton were given to Brampton, which may well be growing faster than Halton, we might find to our alarm that long before the next boundaries revision Brampton riding was even farther beyond the maximum allowable voter population than Halton.

So, for all these reasons, Mr. Speaker—preventing the axe slaying of the new town of Halton Hills, keeping federal boundaries in line with provincial and regional boundaries, leaving Georgetown at home with her family of communities, putting sacred cows, like population figures, in their proper perspective, opening our eyes to the realities of growth differences between areas like Halton and Peel within metropolitan areas, in contrast to remote areas with vastly different considerations—we implore the commission to reconsider their unbending attempt at surgery in the interest of the patients.

In fact, let us hear from the patient at this point through the voice of the Georgetown Independent, a Halton weekly newspaper, in its lead editorial on March 10, 1976, "Keep Georgetown in Halton":

> The Electoral Boundaries Commission decision to lump Georgetown and the former northeast end of ward 2 (Esquesing) with Brampton in a new federal riding, has to be the most unrealistic alternative the commission has conceived to date.
>
> Surely, there is no advantage in taking Georgetown and the northeast corner of Halton region in with Brampton instead of a Halton-Peel riding that included Caledon, Vaughan and King townships? It's like jumping from the frying pan into the fire.

Then a little further on, Mr. Speaker:

> The stupidity of the decision is only ameliorated by the knowledge no one from this area had a hand in it. No one on the commission knows the situation well enough to be able to comment knowledgeably on already confusing political boundaries carved out by the province and

the country. The commission apparently has ignored community of interest, concentrating on population to compile new ridings.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the editorial concludes:

Federal elections may be a long way off and the decision to change boundaries may seem unimportant at this time, but the situation will change when this area is overshadowed by a Brampton giant in the next trek to the polls. Let Georgetown district remain in Halton, a riding with which we have always held political, community and cultural ties.

The other Georgetown weekly newspaper, the *Herald*, reported that a non-partisan group of interested citizens was formed to oppose the loss of their area. A petition was circulated to obtain hundreds of signatures opposing the redistribution. The results of this petition, at least several hundred citizens' names protesting the commission proposal, have been forwarded to Mr. Nelson Castonguay, the Representation Commissioner of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Halton Hills Mayor Tom Hill contacted each of the political parties in town urging them to take an opposing stand on this issue and voice their concerns. Plans included the organizing of a committee of representatives from the chambers of commerce and service clubs in the area in charge of collecting and researching material for a second brief to be presented to the Electoral Boundaries Commission, stating the specific facts. Regional government put Halton Hills together and now the Ontario Commission is splitting it right down the middle at No. 10 sideroad, casting the Georgetown area adrift to an unfamiliar territory, the mayor contended.

These and other area papers, such as the Acton *Free Press*, reprinted the redistribution map along with a report of Mayor Hill's fight against the changes. The mayor said that perhaps Erin township should be returned to Wellington, as it was for years, but certainly Acton should not be split off from the rest of Halton Hills. Mayor Hill said he thought they had already submitted a strong brief based on population, assessment and community interests when the first boundary change was proposed, but it did not seem to do any good.

Last summer when the commission first proposed riding boundary changes for Halton, the proposals included Georgetown and Northeast Esquesing with Caledon, Vaughan and King townships to form a riding called Halton-Peel with a population of 66,700. Mayor Hill and I, along with Halton regional chairman Allan Masson, petitioned the commission to rescind their proposal, but to no avail. "Now we have to work to the best of our ability to try to persuade the commission to keep Halton, without Erin, the way it is and keep Halton Hills together", the Mayor stated. He said that interested citizens backed by the three political parties must band together to achieve this goal. Mayor Hill furthermore placed an "Important Message" in the local paper urging all Halton Hill residents to sign the form at the Bottom and send it immediately to his office.

However, in spite of all these considerations, what of this sole concern of the commission for riding population limits? Let us examine the figures. According to the 1971 decennial census, Halton had a count of only 82,679, well within the upper limit of about 102,000 even before losing a few thousand people from the Erin area. By contrast, the Brampton electoral district now has a greater population of 91,897 people, over 9,000, or 11 per cent, more than Halton, with Brampton growing even faster than Halton. The total voting count listed for Georgetown in 1974 was only about 10,000. Therefore, to leave Georgetown in Halton would only reverse the present count between the two proposed ridings and leave them both within the reasonable dimensions. At that Brampton, with the lower population, would be growing faster and would probably catch up to Halton by the next revision. Why, then, the urgency to rob Halton to pay Brampton? Does it make any sense at all? None that we in Halton can see.

[Mr. Philbrook.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the only thing which makes sense to the people of Halton is to leave Georgetown in Halton regardless of the population figures. Haltonites are apparently not complaining about how well they have been represented in the past, and their MP is not complaining about the workload. Failing such a sensible and acceptable move, the second and less preferable option would be to leave Halton Hills, including Acton, intact and let it join Brampton in a new riding called Halton Hills, Brampton, leaving Oakville and Milton together to form a small but fast growing riding still called Halton.

If the commission cannot accept either of these first two sincere and serious proposals, both of which are considered more sensible and acceptable than their own, then in my opinion, and undoubtedly in the opinion of those I represent, there is only one course left for them to follow as honourable men; that is, they should fold up their tents and steal away into the night. They should resign their posts and either permit new officials to be appointed or leave the federal electoral boundaries unchanged for Ontario for the present time.

● (1630)

The people of Halton realize that the last suggestion is a drastic one. However, in our minds it is no more drastic than the artificial proposal which the commission seems determined to inflict upon us and on the present system in general. We cannot register too strongly our complete disapproval of the commission's present position and whatever rules of the Electoral Boundaries Act they may feel contribute to that position. We would be more than pleased to meet with them again if they were willing, and we urge representatives of other governments in this area to make themselves available, including the Ontario provincial government.

Whatever the outcome, Mr. Speaker, the people of Halton Hills will never accept in their hearts being separated from each other, even just in federal matters.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario. In my opinion it has handled a difficult job in a fair and meaningful way. Some of the comments made yesterday and today by hon. members on the government side in respect of redistribution in Ontario approach the irresponsible. Let us remember that the ridings which we are now representing are based on 1961 census figures—15 years ago.

An hon. Member: No, 1971.

Mr. Stevens: I am very startled that some hon. members think they are representing ridings based on 1971 census figures. That is not correct; they are based on 1961 figures. Following the election of 1968 we began to represent the ridings we now have in this House. The suggestion that we are referring to 1971 figures when we look at our ridings is totally incorrect. I am startled that one hon. member who has already spoken about Ontario redistribution did not even know the elementary facts as to what we are trying to redistribute, namely, our ridings based on the 1961 figures.

The reason I make this statement is that our population figures in Canada have risen from 18,238,000 to 23 million between the years 1961 to 1976, or 26 per cent. That is an increase of almost 5 million. It would be most unfortunate if we were required to fight the next election with our present boundaries which, I emphasize, date back to the 1961 population figures.

There have been tremendous population changes in this country in recent years. I have in mind not only the 26 per cent increase but the tremendous population changes from area to area. I think it would be unfair to the Canadian public to suggest that an earnest attempt to redistribute and update ridings from the 1961 census figures was so irresponsible that the commission report, in the case of Ontario, should be scrapped. It is my belief that the redistribution proposal before us now is a great improvement over the first proposal by the commission. Redistribution which we are now considering is not perfect. But then, what is? Government members seem to want more political input in the matter. I think that would be a dreadfully backward step.

As we know, according to the 1971 census there were 7,703,106 residents of Ontario. This province, accordingly, is entitled to 95 members, seven more than at the present time, when and if this new redistribution goes through; that is, Ontario will have seven more seats, 95 compared to the 88 we have based on the 1961 census figures. In short, when hon. members suggest we should scrap what we have before us today, they are in effect saying they do not want seven more members representing Ontario ridings in this House. That is one of the reasons I suggest it is irresponsible for government members to be so adamantly opposed to the redistribution we are now considering.

Based on that figure of 7,700,000, the riding quotient in Ontario is 81,085. When we provide a variance quotient of 25 per cent, which the commission is required to do, we find that the largest riding in Ontario cannot be larger than 101,356 and the smallest cannot be smaller than 60,814. Under this redistribution, the region of York, the southern part of Simcoe county and the northern part of Durham region are included in six different ridings. In order of 1971 population, these ridings are Markham, Richmond, Vaughan with a population of 84,941, York-Peel with a population of 83,034, Durham West with a population of 77,905, Simcoe South with a population of 72,170, Victoria-Haliburton with a population of 68,743, and Dufferin-Wellington with a population of 66,817. Geographically, the biggest riding is Victoria-Haliburton which stretches for over 100 miles from one corner of the proposed riding to the other. Dufferin-Wellington, the second largest riding in geographical area, is about 70 miles across. Based on the population figures I have given, taking into account the relative geographical size of these ridings, I think the commission has done a pretty good job in apportioning the existing ridings.

While most of the people in my area of York-Simcoe appear to be satisfied with the commission's 1976 recommendations, I would point out a concern among the people of the town of Georgina who feel they would have greater affinity with the municipality adjacent to them, that is, if they were included in the northern part of the York region forming part of the proposed riding of York-Peel. To this end I received a letter from the chairman of the education committee of the Georgina chamber of commerce, Mr. Foss, who said:

> I would like to bring to your attention a matter which is of grave consequence to the future growth of the township of Georgina; that is, the redistribution of the federal electoral boundaries.
>
> At a general meeting of the membership of the Georgina chamber of commerce, it was unanimously voted that the chamber of commerce strongly oppose this redistribution. Our reasons are as follows:
>
> 1. Traditionally, Georgina township has always been York oriented. This York orientation is even more prevalent today and there is every indication that it will always be this way.
>
> 2. The majority of our residents "go south" every day to work, many of them to the commercial and industrial areas in York region.
>
> 3. We feel that York county hospital is "our hospital" and we look to York regional police for our safety and protection.
>
> 4. We have little in common with Brock, Beaverton, Bobcaygeon and Lindsay; indeed there is no public transportation available to the majority of the Victoria-Haliburton areas and little indication that there ever will be.
>
> 5. One of the major reasons given for the establishment of regional government in York in January, 1971, was the need for a unified planning process, one that would unite the area municipalities in York in an approved planning program under a regional official plan.

Mr. Foss continued:

> We are bound on the north and west by Lake Simcoe, on the south by our sister municipality and our future and destiny are vertically and not laterally inclined.
>
> Therefore, we are imploring you to do everything in your power to include Georgina in the York-Peel electoral riding, as certainly you can see our obvious affinity with your riding rather than our proposed isolation to the north and east.

I am sympathetic to the views expressed in Mr. Foss's letter, but I can also understand the difficulty faced by the commissioners in apportioning these ridings. As I have mentioned, the proposed York-Peel riding in 1971 had a population of 83,034: in 1971 the population of Georgina was 14,299 which, if added to York-Peel, would result in a total population of 97,333. That would make it the largest riding, after redistribution, of any riding now shown in the province of Ontario in the report now before us. Victoria-Haliburton, on the other hand, would be left with 54,444 people which is well below the minimum quotient to which I referred, which is 60,814. In short, I can understand the difficulty of the commission in finalizing the boundaries in our area. The smaller ridings in population, Victoria-Haliburton and Dufferin-Simcoe, are clearly smaller because they cover large geographical areas. On the other hand, the more urban areas have a faster population growth.

● (1640)

The municipalities within the proposed riding of York-Peel increased their population by 8,183 between 1971 and 1974 alone. In 1974, the proposed York-Peel riding had gone

up to 91,217 people. Georgina, in 1974, had a population of 16,312 which, if combined with the proposed York-Peel, would give a riding of 107,529 based on 1974 population figures.

Personally, I should like to see Georgina join with a North York region riding. Historically, Georgina has been part of a North York riding and it is unfortunate that it cannot remain so. On the other hand, something has to go. As already has been mentioned—and I believe it will be mentioned perhaps by the hon. member for Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Milne) following me—perhaps the town of Caledon could be joined with the proposed riding of Brampton. Here, again, we have an obvious problem because Brampton has a population of 91,897 and Caledon has 19,375, again based on 1971 figures. This would mean that that new riding would have 111,272 people, clearly well above the high quotient limit that has been abided by to date by the commissioners.

In short, it is difficult to adjust these ridings and be completely equitable and just to all regions and all people. However, on balance I believe the commission has hit a happy compromise. I think it is unfortunate that members insist overly strongly for changes without realizing that every change they ask for has a domino effect and will be felt in other ridings, perhaps with disastrous consequences for those ridings.

We know what we have here. We may not be 100 per cent sold on it, but let us accept the fact that we at least are 90 per cent satisfied, and for the other 10 per cent of protection the people might be striving for, let us not make the mistake of either having redistribution entirely discarded so that we will have to fight the coming election on the boundaries we now have, which I believe are quite unfair to the present population of Canada; or, secondly, that we trigger the commission into making changes which will be much worse in their final effect for most of us than the proposals now before us.

I believe it is unfortunate that there is not a York North designated riding in the present proposal. I understand that if the member for York North (Mr. Danson) is called upon, he will recommend that the riding of Markham-Richmond-Vaughan as proposed should have its name changed to York North. I believe that because of the historic significance of the riding of York North, and the fact that it was a riding represented in this House by a prime minister—granted, not a Conservative prime minister but one from the other side—and that we have had several cabinet ministers from the riding of York North, including Sir William Mulock, it is an unfortunate change if for no other reason than that the name York North not remain as it has since confederation as a riding represented in this House of Commons.

So I recommend that the commission take seriously the suggestion that the proposed riding of Markham-Richmond-Vaughan which, after all, is substantially made up of the present riding of York North, have its name changed to York North. In any event, if in their wisdom the commissioners see a way to include Georgina with my riding, I would point out that many people in my riding like the name York-Simcoe and would like to have it preserved. It may end up that we could have a York-Simcoe-Peel riding, if that is the solution the commission sees.

[Mr. Stevens.]

I should simply like to indicate that substantially we are in favour of the commission's proposal. There can be improvements, but basically let us not strive to get what some might consider to be perfection, only in reality later to discover that they have given birth to a monster which would truly be unsatisfactory to many people in this province and in this country.

Mr. Ross Milne (Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments in this discussion on riding boundaries. I should like, through you, Mr. Speaker, to ask the commissioners if they would consider the statement I am about to make in relation to that made by my colleague the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook). The hon. member for Halton, in representing the riding of Halton, and myself representing Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe, are in adjoining ridings and I think we share some of the same concerns. I should like my comments to be construed as being in support of the basic argument put forth by my colleague, the hon. member for Halton.

Back in August, 1975, when reported in the Canada *Gazette*, part I, the proposal at that time was to have a riding called Brampton which would include only the city of Brampton, and secondly that part of Halton Hills which the hon. member indicated earlier would be included with Caledon, King and Vaughan townships in the region of York. At that time I made no representation when the public hearings were held, because I thought the city of Brampton as a riding by itself was a very good decision taken by the commissioners. It was a decision I wholeheartedly supported.

I understand, however, that many people did make representations on behalf of the area of Halton Hills north of No. 10 sideroad and east of the seventh concession based on the fact that they had very little relativity with the north end of the region of Peel or the north end of the region of York. I think that on the second draft, and on the report that is before us for discussion at this point in time, the commissioners did take into account that argument and on this draft have added that part of Halton Hills to the city of Brampton, as opposed to putting it back in the riding of Halton as desired by my colleagues.

I would just comment, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the commissioners that I think if one of the problems the commissioners are wrestling with is to add to the ridings around, then it might be more acceptable in this case to add the town of Caledon to the city of Brampton than it would be to add that part of Halton Hills. The town of Caledon, as a previous speaker mentioned, has some 19,000 people and is very close to the number of people in Georgetown, so it would not really alter very much the population figures.

I want to say, before going any further, that should the commissioners decide, in their wisdom, to leave the riding boundaries as they recommend at the present time, I would be very pleased to represent the people of Georgetown and work very diligently on their behalf. I have many friends and acquaintances in Georgetown. I have lived very close to there for a period of 15 or 16 years. In fact, I have worked in the Georgetown area.

I rose, however, to make the point that I think there is a case to support the expressed wish of the people of George-

town and, second, to present to the commissioners the case that there might be more equal distribution between the proposed riding of Brampton and the proposed riding of Halton. I would think that one of the objectives should be—and many hon. members have raised this point—that there should be good relativity between the federal, provincial and municipal bodies. In this case, if the commissioners were to decide, in their wisdom, to have only the city of Brampton in a riding, this might be the only riding in Canada that would elect a mayor, that would elect a member to the provincial legislature and would elect a member to this House all within the same boundaries. That would be an ideal situation.

● (1650)

Returning to the point I was making previously, I think that the people in Halton Hills north of lot 10 and east of the seventh concession have the same point of view as the people in the town of Caledon, that is, that the north-south relationship is certainly stronger than any east-west ties. One could argue that the figures are difficult to relate to for the commissioners and that perhaps the town of Caledon would be a more acceptable area to add to Brampton than would part of Halton Hills.

I know that the commissioners are not allowed to take into account future growth. I think various hon. members have commented on how they think this should be handled the next time. I suggest that the next time redistribution is tackled, we should consider at least using up to date figures, if not giving some consideration to future growth. I want to put on the record the fact that the city of Brampton is the fastest growing area in Canada and possibly in north America. I should like to put some figures on the record to give the House an idea of the rate of growth in Brampton at present.

The city of Brampton has recently signed an agreement with the province of Ontario, through AHOP, to have 15,000 new homes built in that municipality in the next three years. This is a phenomenal rate of growth for any community. In 1971, using the figures that are available, the population of Brampton numbered 70,838. In 1973, it rose to 84,788. By 1975 it was 98,590. If we project those figures at 4.3 persons per home, and as a low estimate that perhaps two-thirds of these 15,000 homes will be occupied by the next election, that would give a population of 141,600. If all were occupied at that time, it would give a population of 163,000.

If you look at the voting statistics, you will find that in Brampton in the 1972 federal election there were some 41,000 voters. In the 1975 provincial election there were 52,419 voters. If you project this at approximately 2.3 voters per house owned, using the low figure for 1978, that would raise it to over 75,000 and it could well be in the order of 87,000.

The case I am putting forward for consideration is that if you add Georgetown to the riding, or that part of Halton Hills which we have described, in 1978 in terms of the population there would be 161,600 people there, or a possible total, if all the 15,000 new homes are occupied in 1978, of 183,000. That would be either 98,500 voters or 110,000 voters. This would make Brampton by far the largest riding in the whole of Canada. As a matter of fact, it would be 1½ times as large as the whole population of Prince Edward Island. I think we should give some consideration to that fact. I put these figures on the record for the consideration of the commissioners because I really want to draw the following conclusion.

I would like to recommend to the commissioners that riding No. 3 as set out in their report contain only the city of Brampton, and that riding No. 28 referred to as the riding of Halton be as described, plus that part of Halton Hills north of lot 10 and east of the seventh concession which it is now proposed be added to the city of Brampton. What I think is fairly easy for the commissioners to accept is that if they made this change it would not involve any riding other than the two adjoining ridings, in other words, the periphery boundary would not need to be changed in any way; it would only be a dividing line between the two adjoining ridings. In that case there is certainly unanimous agreement between the two members of parliament who represent the two ridings.

The whole purpose of asking the commissioners to reconsider this is simply the fact that having the city of Brampton in one riding only, and having Halton, as requested by my colleague, include that part of Halton Hills would give a better distribution of population between the two ridings because that change would align both these ridings very closely with the municipal and provincial boundaries and would give a better distribution of population between the two.

I think we should recognize—and I am sure the commissioners will—that making this very simple change will still mean that the riding of Brampton and the riding of Halton will be two of the largest ridings after redistribution. I think the commissioners would want to be very careful to achieve as close a balance as they can between the two ridings.

I should like to conclude by saying that if, in their wisdom, the commissioners should decide to leave the boundaries as set out in the report, I would ask that they give consideration to changing the name of the riding from Brampton to Brampton-Halton Hills or Brampton-Georgetown because that would reflect more accurately the make-up of the proposed riding. Finally, I should like to say that in general the commissioners have done a responsible job. It is certainly not an easy job to try to divide up Ontario with its various interests and various population densities. I think that one of the basic objectives must be to achieve as close a balance of population in adjoining ridings as possible. This could well be accomplished by transferring that part of Halton Hills north of No. 10 sideroad and east of the seventh concession to the riding of Halton and by establishing a Brampton riding embracing the city of Brampton only.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments about redistribution, particularly as it concerns northern Ontario where we had a net loss of one seat in 12, and northwestern Ontario with a net loss of one seat in four, or a 25 per cent loss.

First I would like to support the hon. parliamentary secretary, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) in his concern about the legality of the present report of the

commissioners, and also the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) who expressed his concern about long-term effects of the report of the Ontario commission. I think it is extremely important that before we go any further this matter be clarified—certainly before we go into another election—so that, as the minister suggested, the consequence of an election being for some members declared void because of inadequacy of the report of the commission.

I have considerable sympathy for the commission which had to write this difficult report. It was a difficult job. In this regard, Ontario is a very difficult province and very different from many others. The limits within which the commissioners had to work were such that their job was extremely trying.

● (1700)

However, the report of the commission has not been taken well in northern Ontario. As a matter of fact, since I was elected to this House in 1972 I do not think there has been an issue in northern Ontario which has bothered people as much as the loss of a seat through redistribution. People in northern Ontario, particularly in northwestern Ontario, see this as a basic reduction in their political power. This is an area of the country with many problems. There are problems of slow growth, economic problems, a series of communications and transportation problems. All these things need much attention, and the feeling is that there has been a noticeable reduction in power and that northwestern and northern Ontario do not count as much as they did before redistribution.

In many parts of the area government services are few and far between. We do not have the kind of services which are available in larger cities like Toronto or available to people 50 or 100 miles away from Toronto. The distances are great and the services are few; therefore, the role of the member of parliament becomes much more difficult and at the same time more vital.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) was talking about having one of the new ridings in his area and that the longest distance in it would be 100 miles. What about ridings where distances are 400, 500, 600, 700 and 800 miles, where communities are 100 and 200 miles apart and where constituencies run from Lake Superior to Hudson Bay and James Bay? These are the kinds of problems we face in northern Ontario.

I should like to deal briefly with one of my concerns. At the beginning I mentioned the legality of the report of the commission and the question of whether the report could stand up in court because no reasons are given. This point was made by the hon. member for Thunder Bay, but I should like to deal with another aspect of the report of the commission, and to give my opinion as to how the commission should view the meaning of the deliberations over the last three years in this House.

Most hon. members who were here in the twenty-ninth parliament will recall the long debate over redistribution as it was brought out in early 1973, and the fact that there was a change in the British North America Act to allow for more seats in the country so that no province would have fewer seats than they had at that time. If the commissioners would reread that debate—and I am sure they already have—I think they will find a strong feeling expressed that even though areas like northwestern Ontario are not provinces, they should maintain their political power.

Hon. members from northwestern Ontario and northern Ontario worked very hard and were instrumental in having the BNA Act changed. I think the meaning of the vote in this House was that northern Ontario, even though part of a province, should be treated as provinces like Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and would not lose a seat in this redistribution. Northern Ontario comprises a unique area. It is quite different from the northern parts of any of the other provinces. It tends to be cut off geographically and culturally. It spreads over perhaps 1,000 miles. It is very large. It tends to have quite a separate existence. In the field of curling, for instance, Northern Ontario is treated as a separate province. It was not possible under the amendment to the BNA Act—unless, of course, we want to set up an extra province—to allow for the maintenance of these seats in northern Ontario. However, I think most hon. members will agree—certainly those who took part in the debates in 1973 and 1974—that the meaning was there. The spirit of the change in the law was that northern Ontario would not lose a seat in this redistribution.

I hope that when the commission reviews the debate of yesterday and today and before coming up with their final report, it will take another look at the earlier debates to try to garner from them the intentions of this House when it voted to change the BNA Act to ensure that no province would lose a seat in the course of redistribution. I submit that northwestern Ontario should not lose a seat if the spirit of that debate is to be maintained.

Because of the changes which were made in the BNA Act, four additional seats went to Ontario. As the act stood in the first redistribution report, the minimum number of people in constituencies was to be 63,487. If northern Ontario were divided by 12, the figure would be about 63,500, only about 300 over the minimum allowed under the act as it read in 1973. At that point there was no question that the commission could not just set up a set of 12 constituencies under these conditions with a maximum deviation of only 300 in population.

However, by reason of the amendment to the BNA Act, Ontario received an additional four seats and this gave the commission considerable leeway, about 3,700 people per constituency. It was possible under this latest legislation—and I think we from northern Ontario demonstrated this to the commission—to set up 12 reasonable constituencies, given this deviation of some 3,700 people between one constituency and another.

Between the mid-term census of 1966 and the census of 1971, the population of southern Ontario increased by 11.3 per cent. The population of northern Ontario increased by 5.1 per cent. They both increased, one at roughly twice the rate of the other. However, let us see what happened in terms of redistribution because of these increases. Southern Ontario, with a population increase of 11.3 per cent, had an increase from 75 to 83 seats: that is eight seats. Northern Ontario, with a population increase of 5.1 per cent, went from 12 seats to 11 seats. Southern Ontario had an increase of 10.8 per cent seats, and northern Ontario a decrease of 9.2 per cent. Given the changes over that period

of time, it does not seem fair that southern Ontario should gain eight seats and northern Ontario lose one. This is the case we have to make.

● (1710)

I will conclude by restating one or two points. Most members of this House, especially those who debated this issue in 1973 and 1974, believe that no province or area like northern Ontario should lose a seat in redistribution. The members from northern Ontario and northwestern Ontario were some of the most assiduous in trying to make this case. Because of these efforts of members from northern Ontario and other provinces, this change was made. Southern Ontario, with its additional seats, is being well rewarded for its increase in population. Northern Ontario should at least hold its own. Northern Ontario, which needs help and does not have services like other parts of the country, should be looked after in terms of maintaining the number of seats it has at present. I hope the commission will look very carefully at the reduction of one seat in northern Ontario and reinstate the twelfth seat in its final report.

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be as brief as possible because I know there are members in the chamber whose interests are of more concern, generally speaking, than mine. I want to make two points, one in a general sense and one in a parochial sense, about an area which I do not represent but about which I have a great deal of concern.

The first general comment I wish to make is that in my assessment this commission, in terms of its integrity vis-à-vis southern Ontario, an area about which I know quite a bit, is to be commended. Without reservation or qualification, I offer them my very humble thanks. With regard to the first map I did not have a reaction to the same degree as the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) because it did not affect me as directly as many of my good neighbours and came as a shock to many people. However, when they had their hearings, particularly in London—which was the only one I attended—I was very impressed with the honest desire of all the commissioners to achieve something that was in the best interests of the Canadian people, not just members of parliament but those we are elected to represent.

The commissioners turned their backs on the numbers game in southern Ontario and the artificial boundaries. They looked to the community of interest of people who were in danger of feeling further and further removed from their own government. I say again, without qualification or reservation, that I offer them my most humble appreciation. I believe I speak for a good number of my colleagues in southern Ontario when I say that. If there could be any evidence of that, the nature of some of the objections that have been made in the last two days—and I do not minimize even changing the name of a riding, because it is important to the people there—might be referred to as being of a minor nature. I think that is a great tribute to the commission.

Having said that, may I take a few minutes to take up the cause in northern Ontario vis-à-vis the riding of Sault Ste. Marie. Yesterday the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) mentioned this. I will continue in that vein because we received some additional information an hour or so ago regarding the difficulty in which the people of that area find themselves. Possibly the commission will be able to make some accommodation for them. I preface my remarks by saying that in a political sense all parties of that area are in general accord with the difficulties that will be faced by people in the area commonly known in Sault Ste. Marie as ward I if it is split from the rest of the city. I have before me an excerpt from the Sault Ste. Marie *Star* of Thursday, March 4, 1976, which I presume is an accurate report of the attitude of the three political parties in that area. They express grave concern about and, indeed, opposition to the fact that the most densely populated residential area of Sault Ste. Marie will be orphaned from the rest of the city.

I think it is appropriate to read into the record a very brief resolution that we just received from the Sault Ste. Marie chamber of commerce. It reads as follows:

> The Sault Ste. Marie and district chamber of commerce is opposed to any electoral boundary adjustment which will reduce the present geographical size of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie because Sault Ste. Marie is a cohesive, densely populated urban unit with goals and problems which are generally different from those of the adjacent rural riding of Algoma.

Obviously, they want to be made one unit. It may be impossible for the commission to accommodate them. If there is room for some flexibility, and I do not speak for any political parties but simply for some of my friends from that area, I ask the commission to consider, rather than splitting ward I which is in the southeastern portion of the city, directing their minds to the possibility of ward VI which is generally that area lying west of Goulais Avenue. That appears to be a relatively new area. It is not densely populated. In comparison to ward I, it may be an area which would lend itself more naturally to inclusion with the other riding rather than ward I. I can sympathize with those people in ward I who face the prospect of being divorced from their traditional riding, particularly when I know it is a highly populated, residential area. I had the same condition in my own constituency in the 1967-68 redistribution. I picked up one municipality in an adjacent riding. It was not a happy situation for many of the good people in that area.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I again direct my thanks to the commission. On behalf of the good people of Sault Ste. Marie, I hope the commission will be able to consider some form of accommodation to make that riding a more natural one by retaining ward I within the city riding and, just possibly, considering taking ward VI in its place if that should be necessary.

Hon. Stanley Haidasz (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, we have initiated an important and vital debate in the House of Commons, a debate on our democratic institution of a freely elected parliament, the redistribution of federal electoral boundaries which are based on the important principle of representation by population.

May I take this opportunity of expressing our appreciation to the members of the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission of Ontario for their efforts and for hearing our representations in the past and again this afternoon. I made a representation to them on October 22, 1975, when they came to Ottawa to hear us. Today, I want to take the opportunity of again expressing what I believe are some

constructive suggestions which reflect the main viewpoints of the community leaders and residents of the historical region of Parkdale.

● (1720)

In 1879, the land area east of the Humber River to Dufferin Street and extending northerly from Lake Ontario was established as the village of Parkdale. In 1979, the people of the old constituency of Parkdale will be celebrating the centennial of the constituency's founding. The electoral district named Parkdale was first established under the redistribution act of 1914. Later, in 1924, it was included in the territory belonging to the city of Toronto. It would be desirable if the new federal constituency of Parkdale-High Park, as proposed by the Ontario boundaries commission and containing approximately 92,000 people, could be extended eastwardly from the Humber River and northwardly along Annette and Dupont Streets, thence to Dufferin Street and southwardly down Dufferin Street to Lake Ontario. The new boundaries which I have proposed will better take into account the community of interest and the nature of the social, political, cultural and geographical characteristics of Parkdale-High Park. The present constituency of Parkdale is populated by slightly more than 96,000 people. These people evince an ever-increasing pride, identity with and interest in the area.

The newly proposed constituency of Parkdale-High Park contains many organizations, groups and churches which are endeavouring to preserve and develop a new sense of community in this neighbourhood. For example, the area contains the Parkdale *Citizen* monthly community newspaper, the Polish language semi-weekly known as *The Alliancer*, and the headquarters of its parent organization. If contains, also, the Parkdale branch of the city of Toronto planning board, the Reymont Foundation, Parkdale Collegiate, the Lithuanian Cultural Centre, Parkdale United church, St. Casimir's church, St. Josephat's cathedral, St. John's Polish National cathedral Church, St. Stanislaus and St. Casimir's Parish Credit Unions, the largest credit union in Canada, I believe, with more than 15,000 members. It contains, also, St. Vincent de Paul Parish, Holy Family Parish, St. Joan d'Arc Church, St. James Church, St. Pius X Church, St. Anthony's Church, St. Helen's Church, St. Mark's Anglican Church, St. Jude's Anglican Church, the Church of the Epiphany, and many others.

These community churches and organizations help the people of the area develop a community of interest and provide many services. They help to integrate the people of the area, especially those coming from other countries as well as from other parts of Canada, into one cohesive community. The people of this area are becoming more aware of the historical beginnings of the village of Parkdale which, as I mentioned, was established in 1879.

These newly proposed eastern boundaries would better encompass the historic, reconstituted constituency of Trinity which I represented in the House of Commons during Canada's twenty-third parliament beginning in 1957. I also believe that my proposal would be less disruptive and less artificial. The constituency is urban in nature, and the new proposal would eliminate the highly undesirable boundary of the present CNR line. It is preferable to make a major arterial road a boundary line in urban neighbourhoods of today.

[Mr. Haidasz.]

There is a further consideration, Mr. Speaker. Federal constituencies and their boundaries should serve the people of the constituency and their interests according to law. The slightly enlarged constituency of Parkdale-High Park which is being proposed is a well-knit community with broad, common interests. Approximately half the population consists of new Canadians and their children. This characteristic imposes additional duties involving communication, education, service and representation. There is, therefore, an urgent and important need to involve constituents of the area which transcends artifical boundaries in the democratic, political process.

Another concern of members representing highly pluralistic, multicultural constituencies is this: they must encourage all residents of the riding to develop greater interest in the political process and involve themselves in all activities of our society. By encouraging them to use the legitimate avenues and mechanisms of social action we shall assist them to become full participants in and beneficiaries of the Canadian heritage of democratic institutions. We shall also enable them to participate in the spiritual and material well-being of our great land.

If we are to achieve this goal, our major requirements must be to preserve the community of interest of our people. This, I think, could be more easily encouraged if the members of the Ontario federal boundaries commission were to consider the extended boundaries which I respectfully propose this afternoon for the newly proposed constituency of Parkdale-High Park.

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I think the commission did an excellent job of redesigning electoral boundaries. I rise to support the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McRae) who said that northern Ontario is to lose one seat in this House. That means that members representing the north will need to cover a wider area and each will be responsible for more constituents. The situation across the border, in Manitoba, is similar. The member for Churchill represents a constituency 171,072 square miles in area. I sympathize with the hon. member who is concerned about the loss of one seat in northern Ontario. In Manitoba, one constituency of 171,072 square miles contains 62,758 people. At least one Manitoba constituency of 35,000 square miles contains 63,000 people. I cite these figures for comparison purposes.

I submit that the commission must examine all relevant factors. If a constituency is too large, its size ought to be adjusted in order to make representation easier. As it is, it is difficult for the member representing the constituency to visit all parts of it. Sometimes you cannot travel by road because there are no roads; you must use aircraft or a boat. If parts of the constituency are inaccessible, the member cannot service all his constituents adequately and, provide the kind of service he could provide if the constituency were smaller.

That is all I want to say. I support the hon. member for Fort William. I know what the loss of a seat in northern Ontario means. The members representing northern constituencies will have their work cut out.

● (1730)

Mr. John Roberts (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. Obviously the redrawing of constituency boundaries is a painful experience for us and a very difficult task for the commission. I want to support those who have complimented the commission on its work, on the effort it has made to arrive at a realignment of the constituencies to take into account shifting population patterns. It is important because of the mobility of the population, that, such changes should be made from time time so that the people may be more accurately represented in the House of Commons. I therefore have no great complaint with the conclusions the Electoral Boundaries Commission has reached.

However, with respect to the area I represent I cannot but regret that one of the traditional parts of the St. Paul's riding, the annex area which is one of the most vital areas of the city and long attached to St. Paul's, will disappear from St. Paul's and be attached to the Spadina riding. I regret very much its moving that part of the constituency. If I might put it in these terms, I feel a sense of loss at not being able to continue to represent the many good friends I have in that area.

The principal reason for which I rise today is to draw the attention of the commission to a small but important incongruence in the new boundary which has been chosen. Those of us who represent urban constituencies are aware that it is often difficult for our citizens to hold very clearly in their minds the boundaries of our constituencies. In a city such as Toronto, where there is a sense of community which far transcends constituency boundaries, it is often the case that people are not clear as to the constituencies in which they are registered. This often becomes evident during elections when workers from a variety of parties manage to put up signs in the wrong places. Many citizens are often not aware of who represents them in their federal parliament, or who is seeking to represent them during an election. There is a tendency in the voters' minds for boundary lines to be fudged. I think it is desirable to render as clearly as possible the boundary limits—to make them correspond to natural divisions within a city, the boundaries of existing provincial constituencies and even of municipal districts.

What is puzzling about the boundaries which have been drawn for St. Paul's is the incongruence I have mentioned. It is that in the northeastern part of the new constituency the boundary line runs steadily along Briar Hill Avenue and then, at Avenue Road, takes a short jog up to Lytton Boulevard. It would seem to me much more consistent if the northen boundary of St. Paul's continued straight across Briar Hill Avenue to Yonge Street. The boundaries of the constituency would then be Briar Hill Avenue, on the north, Yonge Street on the east, the CPR tracks to the south, and the Christie Road and Vaughan Road extension on the west. These boundaries would be more readily grasped by the public than the fudging which takes place by the slight jog in the northeast part of the riding.

The decision of the commission to jog the boundary in that way is puzzling because it runs contrary to the principle established in the legislation, that of attempting to equalize the populations of the constituencies.

The change I am suggesting would not give rise to a domino effect from one riding to another. It is only that there be a transfer of that small portion of what the Commission suggests should be St. Paul's—from Lytton Boulevard to Briar Hill Avenue—a transfer of that small portion from St. Paul's to the new constituency of Eglinton-Lawrence. If done there would be a more closely approximate equality of population.

By the Commission's proposal, the population of St. Paul's would be 90,732; the population in the Eglington-Lawrence constituency, as they have described it, would be 89,109. In other words, there is a net difference between the two constituencies of 1,600 citizens more in St. Paul's than in Eglinton-Lawrence. So it seems we would more closely approximate equality of population between the electoral districts if we were to transfer to Eglinton-Lawrence that one small part of St. Paul's, one which is almost, in geographical terms, an unexpected appendage on the northeast corner. In terms of logic and consistency it would appear better to maintain Briar Hill as one solid boundary, and in terms of the proportion of population the population balance would be better.

Since this seems to be a change which would not give rise to a series of repercussions affecting other ridings, and fits more precisely the idea that there should be equality of representation, it would constitute a more logical design and one more readily grasped by the citizens in the area. I would, through you, Mr. Speaker, earnestly beseech the commission to take very seriously into account making this minor but nevertheless logical change.

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, having now had an opportunity to examine the proposed boundaries of the new constituency of Ottawa-Centre I may say to the commissioners, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I am very serious in making the proposals I am now about to put forward with respect to certain alterations which I believe really ought to be made before any final determination is reached as to the boundaries of this riding.

All the constituencies in the country are, of course, exceedingly important. There are ridings across the land representing the hearts or centres of our cities and they usually bear the names of those cities. The riding of which I speak has some additional significance in that it is in the very heart of the national capital, the city of Ottawa. Since first being elected in 1972, Mr. Speaker, I have had the distinct honour of representing the people of this community and, like the city citizens of so many other ridings, they represent all the ethnic strains which form part of this great country of ours, including the two major founding races, English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians.

After this brief preamble let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do intend to be brief and I trust the commissioners will take seriously the submissions I am making at this time. The first is with respect to the easterly boundary of the riding of Ottawa-Centre, and in particular the part which has been deleted from the riding and which should properly continue to be part of the riding of Ottawa-Centre.

The commissioners, in proposing a new boundary on the eastern side of this riding, have taken the easterly boundary commencing at the north point of the Ottawa River, proceeding along the Rideau Canal to what we who have lived here all our lives commonly know as the Deep Cut. Then, instead of logically proceeding on along the CP line to Hurdman's Bridge, they take instead a cut to the south or southwest at that point along the Rideau Canal down to Craig Street, at which point they go back in an easterly direction to the Rideau River. The effect of this deletion is to divide what is and has been a community known for as long as this city has existed as the community of Ottawa-East—I refer to it as distinct from the riding of Ottawa-East, which is now Ottawa-Vanier.

● (1740)

This new division line going along the Rideau canal, rather than to Hurdman's bridge, and then following the natural geographic pattern along the river and so on, as in the new boundary, eliminates one half of that which has been an integral part of the city of Ottawa and a living community in itself. It has been a living community in that there is a community of interest as represented by the Ottawa East Community Association, the schools, and indeed the churches, all of which generally are on both sides of Clegg Avenue, or what has commonly been known from time to time as Upper Ottawa East and Lower Ottawa East.

The people of that area community for a long period of time have been represented by the member of parliament from the centre part of the city of Ottawa. It has been a pleasure to represent those people for these past years, and I ask the commissioners very seriously to consider that they continue to be represented by the same member of parliament who represents their neighbours and friends just immediately to the south of them. I also ask that the boundary not be from the Deep Cut to Clegg Avenue along the Rideau canal, but rather along the Rideau river, Hurdman's Bridge, and thence to the Rideau canal and back to the centre of Ottawa and the Ottawa river.

The second submission that I would make to Your Honour is that in extending the boundaries of the riding of Ottawa Centre considerably to the west the commissioners have also deleted from that national extension another community, and community of interest, that exist in the area known as Mechanicsville-Hintonburg. This area of Mechanicsville-Hintonburg, which can be defined in general terms as those lands lying south of Wellington street and between Bayswater Avenue and the CPR to the east and Holland Avenue to the west, also traditionally over the years has been an integral part of the city of Ottawa, but at the same time has formed a community and community of interest unto itself.

With respect, as the commissioners have proceeded along the westerly boundary of the proposed riding of Ottawa Centre, moving northerly along Fisher Avenue to Holland and then to Wellington Street, instead of continuing in a northerly directly, and I would propose, to the centre of the Ottawa river and then along the centre line of the Ottawa river to where it intersects with an extension of the centre line of the Rideau canal—instead of that logical, geographical pattern which would have the effect, that I submit is properly right, of continuing the community of interest and having those persons in the area represented by the same member of parliament who represented the persons on the south side of Wellington Street, by going from the corner of Holland and easterly along Wellington Street the commissioners have effectively divided this community in two, in a similar manner as they have divided the community of Ottawa East in two.

My submission is that in the best interests of these persons, and in order to avoid confusion as to which member of parliament represents them, it would be more logical from a geographic, demographic, and community of interest point of view for the people residing in the area that Holland Avenue continue to be the westerly boundary, that it continue to proceed northerly to the centre of the Ottawa river, and then along the centre of the Ottawa river as I have earlier described.

I am pleased to have had this opportunity of making these submissions, and I would ask the commissioners to consider very carefully the importance to the people of both communities of not having their communities divided, as well as the positive aspect that the entire communities in each of the Ottawa East and the Mechanicsville-Hintonburg area be represented by the same member of parliament.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I very much welcome the addition of the other areas that have been added to the riding of Ottawa Centre. It will indeed be a challenge to represent such an enlarged area and additional number of people. Although I do not have the exact measurements, I think the land area has just about been doubled and includes those newer areas in this great city of Riverside Park north and south, as well as others in areas south of the city.

Mr. Wm. Andres (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, may I thank you for the opportunity of participating in this debate. I intend to keep my remarks brief. The purport of my intervention has already been outlined and recorded in *Votes and Proceedings*, but I should just like to re-emphasize a few arguments on behalf of the constituents of the riding of Lincoln and the unique fruit growing area in the Niagara peninsula.

The Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act states very clearly that the commission may depart from a strict application of rules in a case where there is a special community of interest. In my argument I will maintain that the commission has ignored and overlooked the special community of interest found in the Niagara peninsula, especially as it relates to the fruit growing lands in the peninsula.

The commission's submission as it relates to the federal riding of Lincoln does not take into account the rural and agricultural community found therein, with its own economic, social, historic and traditional associations. Lincoln at present follows a long-standing and historic relationship based on its rural fruit growing and agricultural characteristics.

The Niagara fruitlands present a unique and essential industry and agronomy in Canada, especially as it relates to the Niagara peninsula. The fruit industry is beset with many problems and will not be served well if divided into five different ridings as proposed at the present time by the commission. It is agreed that the fruit industry must be

preserved and supported. Therefore it needs strong representation at the federal level.

It would be beneficial to everyone if the fruit producing lands could remain under one federal representative in a unified federal constituency, as in the past. Since agriculture is the primary industry in this area, the majority interest and concern of the constituents relate either directly or indirectly to this unique industry. The new proposal for Lincoln riding fragments the economic unity of the riding and would result in less significant and declining consideration being given to this important fruit growing industry. A decline in effective representation of the fruit growing region would augment the problems experienced by the agronomy of the area, and the loss of this great heritage, which is unique to this part of the country, would be felt by all Canadians.

The city of St. Catharines has always served as the urban centre and service centre for the Niagara fruit belt. St. Catharines was made a separate riding in 1968. St. Catharines, as the urban centre, serves very well the rural people and the fruit growing industry in the Niagara peninsula. The Niagara fruit belt stretches from Niagara-on-the Lake to the east to the town of Grimsby to the west along the north shore of Lake Ontario.

Niagara-on-the-Lake under the new proposal would be forced to turn toward Niagara Falls for its representation, with which it has no historic, social or economic relationship. Indeed there is not even a satisfactory highway system between these two areas. In addition, the eastern part of the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth has been added to Lincoln in the new proposal. This area represents a very distinct and separate community of ties and interests.

● (1750)

Urban encroachment is already a serious problem and threat to the unique fruit growing lands of the Niagara peninsula. This problem would be further augmented by tying them in with the highly industrialized centre of Hamilton.

At this time I would like to direct your attention to a film recently prepared by the National Film Board on urban encroachment in the Niagara Peninsula and, indeed, on the unique fruitlands there. Omitting Niagara-on-the-Lake and including that part of Hamilton contradicts all historic, social, traditional and geographical interests, as well as the important economic and commercial links now found in the rural riding of Lincoln.

In addition, the new boundaries set forth by the commission digress from the provincial riding boundaries, municipal and regional lines, thus diversifying further the common interests traditionally held by Lincoln constituents.

I am in receipt of many objections to the commission's report, while I have not received a single representation in support of the new proposals of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. The Lincoln federal riding association, the town of Grimsby, the Niagara Falls riding association, and many others all noted the point that no consideration was given to the community of interest in terms of historic, traditional, commercial and social ties which have long maintained Lincoln as a distinct and special riding with particular characteristics and concerns. At the same time, the Port Colborne association and the Erie provincial association submitted that they had no ties whatsoever to the area of west Lincoln which is also designated to be cut off from the riding of Lincoln.

In conclusion I would strongly submit that the commission failed to give adequate attention to the economic, traditional, and social cohesion in the new electoral district of Lincoln, and ignored the community of interest, thereby rendering inadequate representation of the people of that particular riding in the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief points to make in connection with the joint submission placed before the House on behalf of myself and the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Stanbury). I will deal first with the point relating to my own riding of Scarborough West.

I should like initially to commend the commissioners for having taken into account the representations made both by myself and by the Scarborough West federal Liberal association last summer in connection with the boundaries which have been altered in a much more logical way, as a result of which the main traffic arteries and bus routes are now used to delineate the boundaries between ours and other ridings, as against the former system in which they proposed to carve up small little neighbourhood streets. I think this is important in the over-all attempt to minimize the amount of confusion which the electors face at the time of general elections, and I commend the commissioners for having moved in this direction.

The only real question in connection with the Scarborough West area is the request I would make that the name Scarborough West be retained for the riding currently proposed to be renamed as Scarborough South. I make this request bearing in mind that the particular riding will continue to contain 90 per cent of the existing population of the riding known for the last 10 years as Scarborough West. In other words, there is really little or no rationale, in my view, for implementing the name change.

At the present time the southern half of the borough of Scarborough is covered by two appropriately named ridings, Scarborough West on the one hand, and Scarborough East on the other. This situation will not change with redistribution and, indeed, the Scarborough East name is being retained intact. The point is simply made that the same should apply to the present riding of Scarborough West. Both these ridings would then continue to be known under their current labels. In our view this would contribute to an over-all lessening of confusion on the part of the electorate, and is well worth while and in order.

In the event that that rather reasonable argument is accepted, and I trust it may be, there remains then the matter of establishing another name for the new riding that enters into the borough of Scarborough, which is currently being suggested as Scarborough West. That new riding lies between Eglinton and Ellesmere Avenues with a western boundary at Victoria Park Avenue. We have made no specific recommendations in our joint submission in this regard, but a suggestion might be to name it either Scarborough-Ellesmere or Scarborough Centre, the latter of which names was slated for one of the Scarborough

ridings in the earlier proposal put forward by the commission last summer.

I would just like to conclude with one short word about the riding of York-Scarborough on behalf of my distinguished colleague who unfortunately is unable to participate in this debate. It seems to us that this particular riding has indeed a long and distinguished record, having for many years in the past had the rather dubious distinction of being the most heavily populated riding in Canada. At the last redistribution it was cut up into almost four complete ridings, indicative of its vast size. The new Scarborough West and East ridings were created at that time as more and more people were tending to settle in this area of Metropolitan Toronto. In this connection the request is simply to retain the name of York-Scarborough and not switch to the proposed name of Scarborough North.

The other point I know my distinguished colleague, the hon. member for York-Scarborough, would like me to put forward, is the request that we maintain the western boundary of that particular riding which extends into the borough of York up along the Woodbine-Don Valley parkway, a very natural boundary line, rather than extending as it does now partly over the Don Mills road.

In concluding my remarks I should like to indicate my sympathy with the problems encountered by members from northern Ontario. I hope the matters they have placed before you will be resolved in some way in order that we will indeed know where we are going in connection with the over-all redistribution situation in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There seems to be an understanding or agreement not to see the clock at this time in order to allow the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas) to speak. He would be the last speaker on the Ontario report, and we would then proceed to open the examination of the Quebec report with the speech of one member who has to catch a plane, the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault).

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, I am sure you, like many members here, are very happy to see the hon. member for Bruce-Grey rise to his feet as it signifies the end of the list as far as speakers in respect of Ontario are concerned.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You should have spoken last night.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): I know that sentiment has been expressed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who, as old faithful, has stuck here through thick and thin during the debate on areas of a province some distance from his own.

I want to make a very few brief points, Mr. Speaker. Generally I agree with many of my colleagues from both sides of the House who have expressed consideration for the good work done by the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I speak specifically of members from western Ontario, such as the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Jarvis), and my colleague, who is very close to me, the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Mitges), who presented briefs and interventions to the commission when it met throughout Ontario. Generally speaking, in our particular cases we have found the commission to be very receptive and very open in its treatment of those briefs and interventions.

I want to raise a couple of points briefly that have been brought to my attention by other members. I speak basically of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) who mentioned the problem that could arise out of the naming of one of the constituencies "Durham West", as there is no particular Durham involved at the present time.

● (1800)

I speak primarily for the constituents who come to my riding as a result of the realignment of the boundaries, particularly the people of the town of Durham, Ontario. Perhaps some but not all members will know there has been some problem in respect of the town of Durham located in my riding and also of the municipality of Durham, which has been brought about because of the regionalization of government. That has been a particular problem to the residents of Durham. I think that the addition of Durham West as a constituency would add to the consternation the people now have. I would agree with the member for Ontario that if the commission could see its way clear to bring this about I believe it should take it into consideration.

The second point I should like to express to the commission concerns the change of the name that has been given to my riding. I think it will be very confusing for the constituents who live there because the name has been changed to the identical name of a provincial riding. I might point out that the riding of Bruce-Grey consists of townships in the county of Bruce which have emanated from the previous riding of Bruce when the county was a riding represented in the House of Commons.

Just before the election in 1972 there were five townships in Grey added to the easterly portion of Bruce. Since that time the name of the riding has been changed from Bruce to Bruce-Grey. That change was made by me through Bill C-228 which was given Royal Assent on March 13, 1975. Then we have the report of the commission which was tabled in the House of Commons, and lo and behold, for some apparent reason that I have not been able to determine, it changed the name around and it came out in the report as Grey-Bruce rather than Bruce-Grey.

At one time the name of the constituency was Bruce. Then it became Bruce-Grey, and now it is Grey-Bruce. The fact remains that the proposed name Grey-Bruce is almost identical to the name of a riding in the provincial legislature. For this reason I would like to draw to the attention of the commissioners that it is my feeling that the name Grey-Bruce would be very confusing to the people in the area particularly since there is now an almost identically named provincial riding in the area. I might point out to the commissioners that 12 townships in Bruce will be represented in the riding under the redistribution plan while only eight townships in Grey will be represented.

There is one other point on which I should like to dwell briefly. As many members have pointed out during the discussion in this House, there is a diminution in the power of the rural ridings and in their spokesmanship in the House of Commons. I think what should be lamented

more than anything else is the diminution in the speaking power of the rural representatives of Canada. This situation of course has altered over the years, but this is a subject which I hope the commissioners, when they prepare their final report to the House of Commons, will emphasize. This matter was mentioned recently by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Andres), and was also alluded to by members from northern Ontario.

I hope the commission will recommend to the House of Commons that at the next redistribution these things be taken into consideration and that they consider not only the number of people in a constituency but also the fact that many constituencies have a large land mass, and the fact that we would like to see these ridings have as much say as the urban ridings.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude by thanking the House for this opportunity to raise the points I have brought forward. In addition I wish to congratulate the commission for the work it has done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The House having considered the objections it is my duty, pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to refer the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Ontario, together with copies of the objections and also a copy of the *Debates of the House of Commons*, back to the commission for reconsideration thereof.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING QUEBEC

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you and my colleagues for permitting me to proceed immediately as the lead off speaker for the Quebec group. I shall try to be as brief as possible because I realize that hon. members would like to go to supper now.

[*Translation*]

First of all, I would like to address the Electoral Boundaries Commission through you, Mr. Speaker. I had the opportunity to meet with the commission members last summer when I appeared before them on behalf of the seven hon. members for the centre area of Montreal to suggest to them major changes in the boundaries of the seven ridings in the south of Montreal.

First, let me extend my sincere thanks to the commission for accepting the proposal I brought forth on behalf of the seven hon. members. I also would like to congratulate the commissioners for improving my original proposal in two ways, first by giving the Westmount riding the benefit of a north to south extension, and second by balancing the population of the constituencies, which I had unfortunately been unable to do, since I do not have the skills of the cartographers working for the commission.

I would like to recall for the benefit of the commission the highlights of the proposal providing for the ridings in the south of Montreal to be divided on a north-south basis rather than an east-west basis. The advantages of this proposal—and the commission was well aware of them—are that the ridings thus divided on a north-south basis are much more similar to what they are now. This means that all political associations, social organisations and even religious groups will be able to keep operating within the limits that are the closest to what they know now.

In addition, I had said that each riding would thus lie partly north and partly south of Sherbrooke street, which would enable each member to represent richer and poorer people, which I felt permitted a more balanced distribution.

I had mentioned also that a member of Parliament was more representative when he represented people of all social classes, because it is obviously too easy to represent a very specific section of the community and to ignore the views of the others.

However, I should like to point out to the commission that my remarks, even if they receive increasing support from most members for the southern part of Montreal, do not apply to the western portion of Westmount. I think I have made this very clear to the commission.

Now, speaking of the riding of Westmount, I should like to mention here that I am very pleased to support the remarks made by the hon. member for Westmount and Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury).

The hon. member rose yesterday in this House and asked to be given back that part of the riding of Westmount that he will lose through redistribution. He spoke of the area bounded on the north by the Camilien Houde Parkway, on the east by Peel Street, on the south by Sherbrooke Street and on the west by Côte des Neiges Road. The hon. member has every reason to ask that his constituents be returned to him because they have far more in common with the central part of Westmount than with the proposed riding of Saint-Henri in which they would find themselves.

That leaves in the riding of Saint-Henri the area which lies east of Peel Street, McGill University, whose student population extends in an easterly direction to Saint-Lawrence Boulevard, and which was included in the former riding of Saint-Jacques, now part of the proposed riding of Saint-Henri. In fact, an attempt is being made at regrouping the population around McGill University.

I can but support the remarks of the hon. member for Westmount; I am also happy that he should be pleased to welcome in Westmount the constituents of Saint-Henri, some of whom he represented in the past. Still, I should like to stress that there is a problem; I will deal with it only very briefly because I believe one of my colleagues wants to discuss it later on, and that is the problem of chosing names for the downtown ridings.

The proposed riding of Saint-Henri cannot be called Saint-Henri simply because the Saint-Henri parish, which gave it its name, is now part of the new riding of Westmount. In fact, the riding of Westmount should be called Saint-Henri-Westmount; then the people of Saint-Henri would have a greater sense of belonging; more-over, I am told that the riding did bear that name at one time. Still, I will leave it to my colleague from Saint-Henri to discuss this as he has indicated to me that the intends to pursue this matter.

One fact remains: the Saint-Henri parish will not be located in the proposed riding of Saint-Henri; when it come to chosing a name, the commissioners should have settled on either Saint-Jacques or Saint-Henri to take into account the areas added from other ridings. I think it is by mistake it was called Saint-Henri. However I leave it to

the commissioners to re-name the ridings, but I wanted to draw their attention on that matter.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes the brief comments I wanted to make, and I thank hon. members for their attention.

Mr. Loiselle (Saint-Henri): Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): I thank the hon. member who will be recognized later today. I understand there has been a special order of the House that we recess. Accordingly, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6.15 p.m. the House took recess.

[*Translation*]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Saint-Henri): Mr. Speaker, I hope the commissioners will be enthusiastic over my recommendations as my colleagues were when I rose to take part in this debate.

I wish first of all to thank the commissioners because during their hearings last summer in Montreal, I appeared along with my colleague from Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) in order to make a few recommendations and I heard representations made by various associations and individuals. I must admit that the commissioners have shown quite a remarkable degree of dedication and understanding and I thank them for the new electoral boundaries changes proposed for our area, following an initial draft.

Last night, the hon. member for Westmount and Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) made the following recommendation to the commission:

> The area bounded on the east by Peel Street, on the south by Sherbrooke Street, and on the west by Guy Street and Côte Des Neiges, contains many people who have long had a community of interest with those—

This is the sector which now appears on the map representing the new boundaries submitted by the commission. I must advise the commissioners that I have no objection to this area being incorporated in the new constituency of Westmount. The reasons for this annexation or extension have been given, and I am in full agreement on this point.

If the commission does not anticipate major changes, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I agree with this extension, but as the member for Saint-Henri, I feel I should convey to the commissioners a representation which was made last Friday evening at my office by seven spokesmen for the Saint-Henri district. As you know, the Saint-Henri constituency includes several wards of the city of Montreal. However, the seven people who came to my office Friday evening to explain the changes they required were from Saint-Henri proper, which includes the area extending from the CPR tracks to the Lachine canal, and from the western limits of Montreal as for east as Atwater Street.

Those people suggested that the new constituency of Saint-Henri should have as its northern limit the CPR tracks as far as Atwater Street, and that the boundaries should then go north up to Sherbrooke Street, and from there eastwards up to St. Laurent Street.

I have been advised through certain people that at this stage, the commissioners do not generally make major changes in electoral boundaries after completing their work. However, Mr. Speaker, I felt I had to pass on to the commissioners this suggestion which was made in good faith and which was supported by solid arguments.

On the other hand, I would like to strongly suggest to the commissioners who have set up these new boundaries that they realize that it is an addition of the whole Saint-Henri to the new riding of Westmount and I urge them strongly that in future the riding of Westmount should be called Saint-Henri-Westmount.

My proposal is not new, Mr. Speaker, because Westmount-St. Henri existed for many years and I suggest the commissioners read the Parliamentary Guide of 1974, page 443. At the general elections of 1917 and 1921, the following was stated:

● (2010)

> Former Division of Westmount-St. Henri (Established under the Redistribution Act of 1914.)

This means that at the time of the electoral redistribution in 1914, the Westmount-St. Henri constituency was established and at the 1924 redistribution, the St-Henri constituency was given the name of St. Henri alone. And to convince further the commissioners, I would urge them to read the book entitled: "Saint-Henri des Tanneries de Montréal». On page 17, the following can be read and I quote:

> Before 1874, writes again Mr. Massicotte, Saint-Henri des Tanneries included in the north, part of the city of Westmount today; at the south, it extended up to the St. Lawrence . . .

Therefore, I cannot see why the commissioners could not accept my definition, my proposal that the new constituency of Westmount should be called Saint-Henri-Westmount or Westmount-Saint-Henri, since it existed at the 1914 redistribution and even in 1875 St. Henri included part of Westmount.

Once that recommendation is agreed to, I presume, by the commissioners, we would want to give a new name to the riding of Saint-Henri. And I would like to suggest to the commissioners to call it St. Laurent for many reasons. If the commissioners wanted to honour a former prime minister of Canada, Mr. Louis St. Laurent, the people in the riding would be delighted and would readily accept that name. Moreover, St. Lawrence Street, from Sherbrooke to the river, is located in the present Saint-Henri riding which extends from Nuns Island in Verdun easterly as far as Delorimier Street the southern boundary of the county goes along the south shore of the St. Lawrence River; for all those reasons, Mr. Speaker, the only name I have to suggest to the commissioners for Saint-Henri riding, is St. Laurent, particularly to honour a former prime minister and for the other reasons I mentioned.

And I would like specially to reiterate my recommendation to the commissioners this new riding of Saint-Henri-Westmount, including the whole of the county of St. Henri represents a population which has its roots back till the founding of Montreal. It is an active working population.

The people in that area live in closer contact than in any other district of the city of Montreal. I feel strongly about this and I dare hope that the commissioners would be sympathetic towards my recommendation. If they do not accept to change the boundaries of the riding as I said earlier, I would recommend it be named Saint-Henri-Westmount since it cannot be named Saint-Henri anymore because they took out certain parts from that riding. The Saint-Henri district stops at Atwater Street and my western boundary is Atwater Street. Therefore, for those reasons, I hope that the commissioners would agree to my proposals and, in concluding, I would like to thank them for the work they have done.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, following the federal election of 1968, when I first came to this House it was subsequent to a redistribution. The result of these new boundaries was to delete the ridings of Dorchester and Montmagny. The Eastern part of Quebec was losing, by the same token, two representatives from a rural sector. The new Bellechasse riding results from the implementation of the 1964 legislation.

The changes which were brought about in 1968 caused reactions which are easy to understand. As a matter of fact, the Dorchester riding had a long history of which its people had every right to be proud. In the riding of Montmagny, there was a similar response. People from this ancient riding recall proudly of their fiery nationalist member, Armand Lavergne, who left his mark not only in the House of Commons but in the Parliament of Quebec as well.

For eight years now Mr. Speaker, I have attempted as a member to bring together the people from the various areas in the new riding of Bellechasse, and when these efforts are starting to show some results, the new distribution completely changes the limits of the Bellechasse riding.

I have carefully studied the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec. I am quite sure that the Commission did its best to distribute our ridings in an equitable manner however the fact remains that this report contains certain inequities which affect both the people from rural areas and the representatives from rural ridings. This is why I have tabled in the House my objection to the provisions of the report, which has been signed by nine of my colleagues in the House and I take this opportunity to thank them wholeheartedly for their collaboration.

The question of electoral boundaries has always prompted many discussions in our country. In fact, as far back of the Union Act of 1840 the people from Ontario thought it fair that their province as well as the Province of Quebec should have an equal representation. At that time, the province of Ontario or Upper-Canada was in a minority situation in terms of its population, in contrast with the situation of to-day. We have to say that representation by population, was to take place in Ontario as soon as its population would exceed that of Quebec, especially as a result of immigration.

The British North America Act passed in 1867 provides that the representation in the House of Commons shall be based on population as established by an official census taken every ten years. I think that the quota should be established at the national level and not at the provincial level. Lastly, we could adopt a percentage of plus or minus adjustments establishing the population of urban ridings let us say at 100,000 people and semi urban ridings at 80,000 and rural ridings from 50,000 to 60,000. This formula would facilitate a better balance in the representation of rural and urban population.

As our province is getting more industrialized and since industrial centralization tends to reduce rural population to the benefit of urban centres it is more imperative than ever to maintain the present number of representatives in rural areas otherwise their number will get very low. The governments have always been concerned with maintaining the quotas even between 1882 to 1900. The authorities were much concerned with this issue and they followed the principle by which they took into account riding boundaries as well as town and municipality boundaries regardless of the effects it could have on the size or shape of the riding.

● (2020)

In 1882, we find that the electoral quotient obtained by dividing the number of the Quebec population by 65 is 28,908. On the other hand, there were two ridings where the population varied between 6,000 and 9,000 another had a population of 45,000 and 36 others, a population of 21,000 to 24,000.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir John Thompson agreed on this subject. They were saying that urban electoral ridings were already over represented since the rural areas members came mostly from urban areas and represented to the House of Commons people from urban areas as well as the people of their own electoral district. How right they were!

There was a time where a general election provided many professionals from the cities the opportunity to go to rural areas in search of a seat, then they would come back to the city after the elections to live there until the next one. Fortunately, this mentality has changed and the rural areas are now in a position to elect someone chosen among themselves to represent them in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, many changes were made between 1882 and 1964 concerning representation. However, the present redistribution is conducted according to the law voted by Parliament in 1964. It seems that the members of the commission have applied section 13 to the letter but have not taken into account subsection (c) which states:

> The commission may depart from the strict application of rules (a) and (b) . . .

—of section 13, in any case where special geographic considerations, including in particular the sparsity, density on relative rate of growth of population of various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or share thereof appear to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable, or any special community or diversity of interests of the inhabitants of various regions of the province appears to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable. And lastly, the 25 per cent tolerance, higher or lower, has not been used as far as the eastern area of Quebec is concerned. There are now 10 ridings covering the area from Thetford

Mines to Gaspé, an area which has 635,000 inhabitants, or an average of 63,500 inhabitants per riding.

According to the commission report, eastern Quebec loses another riding. Thus the rural area loses a representative in the House of Commons and the average population per riding will rise to 70,548, which will be a very heavy load for the member of Parliament who will have to cover great distances as compared to a representative for a city where the population is much more dense. Eastern Quebec is developing at a very slow rate. The government measures will promote the creation of industries in the Montreal area and the young people must necessarily leave their rural environment to go and make a living in the big urban centres.

Not only are we penalized on the economic level, but also as far as the administration is concerned. Not a single minister in the present Trudeau cabinet represents the eastern area of Quebec. Furthermore, according to the commission report, we will lose a riding. So, we will be deprived of another representative who would have fought for the development of that area.

Mr. Ouellet: There is the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard).

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): I am still referring to the eastern region. The Lake St. John area is another region, to my mind. I have taken note of the remark made by the hon. member for Papineau—

An hon. Member: Because the hon. member for Papineau takes care of the Témiscamingue area.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Oh, come on! I am not criticizing.

I am dealing with facts, and I hope that some time or other, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will have an opportunity to appoint a member in what I call the eastern part of the Province of Quebec.

We may hear suggestions that the government wants to establish a just society, a new society, but that is at the expense of rural areas. I realize this is not within the commission's terms of reference. I would not like the commissioners to misunderstand my remarks.

The commission report proposes for Bellechasse a population of 80,504 as against 64,675 now, an increase of 15,829. Geographically speaking, Bellechasse covers as large an area as Belgium, and the report adds to it 95 percent of l'Islet, the neighbouring riding.

Mr. Speaker, the way things are going, I would not be surprised if I were given the whole of Quebec. The next thing would be to appoint me its president.

Since under the report five parishes are removed from the southwestern part of Bellechasse to be include in Lévis, the member will have to go through Lévis municipalities to reach the southern part of Bellechasse, which is preposterous and unacceptable.

Since in rural ridings, a member of Parliament has to visit every parish regularly, this adds to his responsibilities. It is therefore unreasonable to provide for a riding including 56 parishes as proposed for Bellechasse.

[Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse).]

Another thing must be considered too. If democracy is to survive, it is important that electors meet their representative as often as possible. This will be almost impossible if such a large number of parishes is allowed. For the time element must be taken into account. There are but seven days in a week, even for the rural member of Parliament.

I would therefore ask the Commission to reconsider its report and amend it in order to maintain the same number of ridings in the eastern area which I have referred to.

At the time of the 1968 readjustment, there were 640,403 people living in this area which was divided into 10 ridings, with an average of 64,740 people per riding. In 1976, there are 635,000 people and the Commission has reduced to nine the number of ridings in the aforementioned area. As I said before, these will have an average of 70,548 people for each riding. The ridings I am referring to are the previous ridings of Mégantic-Frontenac, Beauce, Dorchester, Lévis, Bellechasse, Montmagny-l'Islet, Kamouraska, Témiscouata, Rimouski, Matapédia-Matane, Gaspé and Bonaventure. In those days, all those ridings were included in that area, but there were 12 ridings with an average of 53,358 people per riding. After the 1965-68 readjustment, that same area was divided into 10 ridings with an average population of 64,029. The 1976 report shows the following results for that same area: a population of 635,000, and nine ridings with an average of 70,548 per riding.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, if you will allow me, I should like to request consent of the House to table this document which I would very much like to see appended to the *Hansard* for this day.

Mr. Béchard: What is it?

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): The figures I have just quoted on the area and its population.

● (2030)

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish I could agree with the hon. member's request to table this document in the House. But I regret that it is not possible, under the Standing Orders, to table and to append this document, unless, Mr. Speaker, I am mistaken.

[*English*]

In other words, as I understand it it is not the prerogative of individual members to table documents for any purpose.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Béchard: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry I do not agree with the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais), but I believe that the figures just given by the hon. member for Bellechasse speak for themselves, and I see nothing in the Standing Orders which would prevent the tabling of a document, when someone refers to it. On the contrary, he can be asked and forced to table it. I think this document would be very helpful to the commissioners and would enlighten their discussions on electoral boundaries in the future.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Citation 159(4) in Beauchesne's fourth edition reads in part:

Official papers quoted during a debate should be laid on the Table of the House.

A private member cannot table an official document.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Thus, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not get the unanimous consent of the House to table official figures from Statistics Canada—

Some hon. Members: Agreed!

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): If the House agrees, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this will help our commissioners make the revision I am asking for. This is the simple reason why I wanted to table this document.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that even if, at the political level, rural ridings have less importance in percentage than urban areas, we must not forget that the farm industry and agricultural producers in Quebec as well as small businesses we find throughout eastern Quebec deserve some consideration, that they have rights and that we should not reduce the number of the hon. members representing them in this House, because it is already too low.

I hope Mr. Speaker, that the Commission will seriously take into account the representations I wanted to make this evening so that in the future those who will survive us can see that we wanted to work very seriously on the distribution of ridings in our province, and also in our country, so that they commend us for the work we did, for our openmindedness instead of blaming us.

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment very briefly before the House the new electoral boundaries for the province of Quebec, and especially the new constituencies in northwest Quebec. But first, I should like, with leave, to commend the commission for its excellent work on the whole.

I think the commissioners showed great competence in the performance of their duties. Not only were they very wise in the preliminary project, of June 30, 1975, but they were responsive to the population's needs at the public hearings held last summer, especially those held at Trois-Rivières, Sherbrooke, Rimouski, Hull, Amos, Montreal and Quebec city.

I think it is proper to point out in particular the adroitness, humour and understanding of Mr. Justice Chevalier who conducted those hearings in a masterly manner. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that in such an undertaking, one cannot please everybody.

The commissioners were under pressure because Quebec was to have only 75 constituencies and consequently the commission had to rely on very specific criteria to please both city dwellers and rural communities.

I will not expound for long on the statements made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) who spoke before me and expressed grievances regarding rural communities. Clearly this is no easy task. One must try to maintain a proper balance in such a project and I think that, on the whole, the commissioners did a good job in redistributing the electoral map in Quebec in a manner which, in my view, appeals to the vast majority of the hon. members on this side of the House as well as on the other side.

They tried to find a middle of the road solution which, I believe, will meet the needs of practically everybody. It is clear that for certain modalities in some ridings, some cities, towns and communities, certain groups of people would benefit by belonging to one constituency rather than another. But I do not think there is any major flaw in this proposition which I feel should be accepted in the whole because it seems to meet the wishes of the general public.

● (2040)

I would like to emphasize tonight some findings concerning the ridings of northwestern Quebec, not because I represent such a riding, but because these last months I had several opportunities to visit this very beautiful area of our province. I was able to discuss with a lot of people and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that most of them have shown some reluctance towards the redistribution as it affects northwestern Quebec.

As a matter of fact, the new Abitibi riding proposed by the commission will include a section of the northern part of the riding, while the other riding, that of Témiscamingue, will include the two most densely populated, most important cities of this area of northwestern Quebec. I suggest that not only would such a change be drastic in several respects but it could adversely affect to a certain point the very interest of that whole area of Quebec. I do not think we should get serious objections against this part of Témiscamingue—formerly in the same riding as Rouyn-Noranda—being added to the riding of Rouyn-Noranda.

That is why, at the public hearings held last summer in Amos, many people made representations in order that Témiscamingue be finally added to the cities of Noranda and Rouyn. That step is entirely logical and acceptable, and indeed I commend the commissioners for having accepted it.

I think the most serious problem arises when these two ridings are cut off and the cities of Val-d'Or and Rouyn are brought together in the same riding. The problem stems from the fact that those two cities are natural attraction points in that area of Quebec. We might be concerned about the interest of these respective populations if those two cities are brought together in the same riding of Témiscamingue as suggested in the project of February 1976.

But aside from the argument that the population may be concentrated in these two urban areas, there are other factors just as important.

For instance, I point out that Val d'Or and Rouyn share the same communication, health and educational services. Would the new distribution not mean that any subsequent development of this immense territory might be detrimental to the whole area? Would it not be detrimental also to the economic and social development of the neighbouring riding which, according to the February report, would be cut from its main axis of development and influence?

I sincerely wonder how a true socio-economic consensus would be reached if the regional capital of northwest Quebec, Rouyn and Val d'Or, considered as the metropolis

of this region because of its industrial activities were to be combined. Because of their status, Rouyn and Val d'Or should be included in two different ridings; the social balance of northwest Quebec might depend on such a distribution; the economic development of the entire region will most certainly depend on that decision. Physical communications throughout this vast territory is, in my opinion, closely connected to that fact.

It is therefore for all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I should like the House to look fully into this matter and I dare hope that it will do so not in order to fill what might be a gap but rather to act for the future benefit of a large part of Quebec, namely the northwest Quebec. I know that the town councillors of Val d'Or would particularly like their city to be part of a constituency including all the northern part of northwestern Quebec, or the Abitibi constituency, as was suggested in the project tabled in the House in February 1976. Of course, the airport of the city of Val d'Or must serve all that part of James Bay, all the enormous development which is now taking place in northwestern Quebec. It would therefore be only logical and desirable that Val d'Or form part from now on not of the Temiscamingue constituency as suggested in this project, but rather of the Abitibi constituency.

Mr. Rod Blaker (Lachine-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the first thing I should do—and it might be better if I spoke in English—would be to urge the other members to join me—

[*English*]

It was with some surprise, Mr. Speaker, that I learned that the last speaker, the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet), has reason to receive the best wishes of the House. I would be most disturbed if my comments now were to be taken as being political input. I would simply ask the members of the House if they would give me their attention for one moment because I understand that today is the birthday of the hon. member for Papineau, and it might be a good time to wish him well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blaker: I am not entirely sure whether or not anything that I have to say in this redistribution debate will be of any effect whatever. This matter has been going on now for approximately four years and I have been rather intensely involved, not only as a member of parliament from the province of Quebec but also because of my role as chairman of the privileges and elections committee. I have also attempted to assist other members from time to time, particularly in what is called the West Island of the Island of Montreal.

I have seen the riding that I represent divided into three parts. I have then seen it brought back together again. I have seen changes made to the organization of the riding; it was originally organized on a north-south basis, and it is now reorganized on an east-west basis. Finally we have the riding as it is at the present time.

I want to take only a few moments of the House's time to address myself to the commissioners in an attempt to try to explain some of the rather curious problems that result from the manner in which the riding of Lachine-Lakeshore, or as the commissioners propose to call it now, the riding of Lachine, is to be organized.

I would point out that we amended the law on redistribution, if I recall correctly, about two and half years ago at which time it was suggested that all redistribution commissions across Canada would take serious account of the desirability of not dividing municipalities. Having done that, unfortunately the redistribution commission of the province of Quebec, or perhaps I should say the federal Election Boundaries Commission of the province of Quebec, has found it necessary to divide one of the oldest communities on the face of Canada, the city of Lachine.

I am not going to use the technique known to some members of the House and to some politicians in Canada of attempting to blame the commission for doing something that is unfortunate or distasteful, at the same time attempting somehow to make every effort to persuade the federal Election Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec to reverse itself. I fully recognize that the law requires of the federal Election Boundaries Commission that we have an approximate average of 83,000 people per riding in the province of Quebec. I fully recognize as well that this results of necessity in the division of the city of Lachine.

● (2050)

I do not want to blame the commissioners. In fact I would support what the hon. member for Papineau has just finished saying, that the commissioners by and large in my view have done an excellent job in the province of Quebec. I do not like the fact that they have decided to divide a municipality like this, and I know for a fact, because these commissioners have stated so publicly, that they did not like the idea of dividing the municipality. However, we are faced with an overriding law and I think it would be improper for a commissioner or any member of parliament to attempt to go against the entire system, whether it be the Electoral Boundaries Commission or the House of Commons, by overriding that law.

Having said that, I can only suggest through this House that I would rather hope the shift of population in the area which I represent will in due course, by the next election after the one coming, provide for the entire city of Lachine being returned to the federal riding of Lachine.

That leaves me with the problem as to what the commissioners did to the boundaries of the riding I currently represent. If I may, I would ask for the sympathy not only of the commissioners, and this is the method by which we address ourselves to the commission, but also of whichever members of the House of Commons may be interested in this particular problem.

I find that the Boundary Commission has taken a particular street in my riding, that is, 24th Avenue, and extended it beyond the physical extension of the street itself. The result of this is that my neighbouring member of parliament, who happens to be the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), and myself, and three other candidates for the three other parties for each of the two ridings, making a total of eight candidates at the next election, will be meeting halfway across the floors of dozens upon dozens of stores, warehouses, shops and whatever.

The process the commission has gone through has resulted in buildings being divided in two by the federal electoral boundary. I have this recurrent nightmare of having to draw a chalk line down the middle of some factory floor so candidates for the riding to the east, that is the riding of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, are forced to stay on one side of the factory floor, and candidates to the west, that is to say of the riding of Lachine-Lakeshore, would stay on the other side. Quite obviously that is not the way we want to try to give the people some identity of what the community is all about. I have previously approached the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec on this matter. I want to review it very briefly so that this topic can be sent to them for as much consideration as possible regarding what they might do in these circumstances.

Having indicated it would be most desirable to have the entire city of Lachine in the riding, and having also indicated that if that is not possible I would at least look forward to that being done by the time of the next but one election, I would go on to try to make some more sensible division of the riding than that which the commissioners in their wisdom have done.

Right now we have a line in the middle of the city which looks something like an arthritic dog's hind leg. I would very much appreciate the consideration of the commission in doing something a little more logical.

The area between 24th and 15th Streets in Lachine, and the one I proposed at the public hearings, which is 32nd Avenue, comprises a bloc of some 19 polls with an elector population of some 5,300 people. There would appear to be no reason why it could not be so arranged that the dividing line for the city of Lachine be moved to 32nd Avenue.

I want to make clear to other members who may be bored out of their minds with these details that I am trying to pursue the same thing we put through the Privileges and Elections Committee as guidelines for hon. members that is, that we should not have communities divided up by some mathematical calculation, the result of which is that a line is drawn down the middle of a street, when it may make sense in terms of numbers of people in the riding, but no sense whatsoever in terms of community spirit, as is the case in the particular city to which I refer, the city of Lachine.

There is every reason to assume, expect, and hope that the commission would see some sense in drawing the line down a street which is a major thoroughfare rather than a major residential street, that is, drawing the line down a street which will be a take-off point of a major highway, autoroute 13 in the province of Quebec, and drawing it down a street which is now a dual lane street. In this way we could have a heavy traffic division.

What I proposed to the commissioners is that they give some consideration to the fact that there is a natural dividing line in the community rather than the line the commissioners have drawn. In addition I have proposed to the commissioners that they give some consideration to the fact that this particular city has traditionally regarded its own east-west line as being 32nd Avenue.

When I made these representations to the commission, Mr. Justice Chevalier, who was chief commissioner, asked me to give him some figures. I do so now as a result of this request. The difference, as I mentioned, would be approximately 5,300 voters, and about 19 polls. I would go a little further and point out that I represent a lakeshore community. If the matter of population is of concern to the commissioners they might have given some consideration to the idea of adding the city of Baie d'Urfe, which has a population of 2,200 electors and a total of some nine polls. The issue I want to refer to is not simply the mathematics of that division of the riding, but the community sense of that representation.

There is some reason to suggest, I believe, that the commission should give some consideration to historical development. I heard members yesterday and again this afternoon from the province of Ontario express extreme concern about the manner in which the boundaries commission of that province has seen fit to draw the lines in northern Ontario, reducing the representation of that northern section by one riding. In the same way I think it is worth bringing to the attention of the commission that the development of this lakeshore area is one of the most historical, contiguous, and homogeneous along the lakeshore that exists anywhere in Canada. It is my hope that the commission will see the point I make and give some reconsideration to providing boundary lines that reflect cultural concepts, historical concepts, traffic concepts, and transportation and communication concepts, rather than simply adding up a bunch of numbers and arriving at one or another particular street.

Having said all that, I want to go back to what I began with, and that is that the Quebec Redistribution Commission in my view, and I repeat again what I said earlier and confirm what the hon. member for Papineau has said, has done an excellent job. There are bound to be some of us who are discontent. I am one, but I will accept the decision. Obviously I must as I have no choice. I am governed by the law. I accept the decision of the redistribution commission, but I hope it will be shown this evening that we have problems, and I hope the commission will give second thoughts to some of those problems we are trying to examine. We represent the people and we do perhaps have more sensitive feelings about those communities we serve.

I should like to turn now to something which is going on at the moment and in terms of my responsibility as part of the organization I would reflect upon the fact that there are quite a number of Quebec members who want to speak this evening. There are also a number of western members of parliament who want to speak. I would simply indicate to members of the House that there is a list of those Quebec members who wish to speak. I dearly hope I have not spoken for too long because, if I did, that would make it difficult for me to ask my colleagues from the province of Quebec to give every consideration to other members of parliament who really do not want to sit here until four o'clock in the morning. If we can keep down our time they will be able to get to their homes earlier tonight. I thank the House for listening to me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with a particular area or with the boundaries of the Champlain constituency that I have the honour to represent, I should like first to speak about the general princi-

ples on which is based this legislation under which the electoral boundaries are readjusted every ten years.

Mr. Speaker, when he tried to defend himself against the reflections cast on him by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau), the Quebec premier indicated recently that it was essential for the survival of Canada to have in its constitution official guarantees for Quebec within Canada and the Confederation. Yet, the act governing the change and readjustment of electoral boundaries seems to support those who predict a rather bleak future for Quebec within Canada, since we have to admit that it is simple matter of mathematics. Because of this review of the Electoral Boundaries Act, Quebec's representation is reduced from 28 per cent to 26 per cent. This reduced number of Quebec representatives in Parliament bears out those who simply advocate a complete review of the constitution and even the isolation of Quebec.

● (2110)

This legislation proves they are right since even though the province of Quebec gets one, extra seat, its number of seats increasing from 74 to 75, one must not forget nevertheless that we will only be 75 out of 282. Mr. Speaker, this point has not been emphasized strongly enough, in my view, since the sense and the very nature of our country are being gradually destroyed. Should there be as a result a one way immigration in Canada, that is to say an immigration movement almost exclusively out of the province of Quebec, within the next 10 years the electoral boundaries would have to be readjusted once more and Quebec would fall to 20 percent. Within another period of 10 years, it would be reduced to 15 percent and after that, it would be the end of our existence within this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think this point is extremely important and had to be emphasized. I am therefore basically opposed to this method of continuously readjusting electoral boundaries. Moreover, I would even question the ability of those who were responsible for establishing these boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, here, I weigh my every word: when one considers this is the third attempt at redistribution and that the said commissioners have not learned as yet where to draw these boundaries, I think one is entitled to ask serious questions, especially when these people tell us precisely, and I quote from Schedule D of the report they submitted to us, that they considered all factors in their specific and general applications and that the aims of the proposal are as follows:

1. to maintain municipalities as a whole wherever possible;

The hon. member for Lachine-Bord-du-Lac (Mr. Blaker) described how the city of Lachine was split up.

2. to compensate for the sparsity of population in certain regions, for example, Gaspésie, Saguenay—Lac- Saint-Jean and Abitibi—Pontiac—Témiscamingue by using for these regions a considerably lower electoral quota than that applied to the urban areas:

And finally, the third aim:

3. to attempt to group, if possible, populations who have a community of interests, be they economic, social or ethnic.

If we objectively consider the proposed boundaries, we must admit that these aims were not reached, as if on purpose. To name only one, the municipal entity was not preserved, this was not in several constituencies. Secondly, three regions were mentioned where the sparsity of population and the geographical vastness must be taken into account. Well, what happened in that case? The hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) mentioned it briefly a moment ago, a vast territory, northwest Quebec or Abitibi, becomes a small territory, its representation is reduced from three to two constituencies, which is absurd. A constituency larger than many provinces is created, all that is included in one riding, so that two ridings are made out of the previous three, a vast territory is contained in one riding, with a population of 88,000.

That is far from the original objective, since it is acknowledged when an area is that large the population could be below the average, but this is much beyond the average, and I cannot understand how such acrobatics.

Of course, when the population is concentrated, when the demographic density is high, it is generally recognized as a determining factor. It is well known that in a riding which is about one square mile, one normally finds a population of 90,000 95,000 and even 100,000. That is quite normal. Agreed.

But given that principle, how is it that the area of particular concern to me, the riding of Trois-Rivières, has become an exclusively urban riding with a population less than a riding as large as a province, like the riding of Champlain. I cannot understand anything. The riding of Trois-Rivières now has a population of 70,000 next to a vast rural riding, which is 350 miles from north to south with a population of 80,000.

Mr. Speaker, I was most surprised when I found that out, all the more as I question the competence of the commissioners. In August, I had the opportunity to appear before the commission in Trois-Rivières and I found at that time that the chairman of the commission, even though the matter was under study since 1971, did not even know where La Tuque was located. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the commission was in that area to hear representations from a certain number of ridings but he did not know where the main city in the riding of Champlain was located.

Mr. Speaker, these results show that the matter was dealt with lightly if all the briefs and hearings ended in this freak report. Mr. Speaker, I must simply infer that the commissioners are incompetent.

Not only do I question the basic principle, but I think that the act should be amended because to go on like this would simply result in the distruction of a national entity called the French Canadians and the Quebecers. If we keep on readjusting the electoral boundaries exclusively on the basis of demographic factors, the Canadian entity we would like to preserve is doomed. There is much more truth in this than it seems. I refer precisely to what the Quebec Premier said only a few weeks ago. This is my main concern.

Besides, I must say, with supporting evidence, that those who drew those electoral boundaries are totally incompetent. They do not know their business and they set out with very lofty aims on purpose, and then they did their best to ignore them. I wonder why. Is it because they would like to start all over again.

I do not know exactly how much they are paid but they seem to take pleasure in starting their work over and over again. I say this and everybody here knows it is true, because it is the third time the same thing happens. After three times, they have not managed to submit something sensible that would truly reflect their own objective.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I think that the commission should reconsider its position and look further into the question.

I do not mean that we should allow ourselves to be influenced by the hon. members, but I think that those who know something about the population, the economic and the community interests of an area are the members of this House, and I did notice during the same hearings in Trois-Rivières last August that the chairman of the said Commission would quite maliciously snub me as he interrupted me during my speech telling me that we had nothing to do in this particular matter and that fortunately the matter was not our responsibility; he told me so many nasty thing then. My answer is: Sure enough, it was perhaps fortunate that the matter was not our responsibility but, as for as I am concerned, I think that it is unfortunate that it was theirs.

Mr. Speaker, when you consider all the stupidities that have been done such as cutting up North-Western Quebec and the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, you may think this is an excellent opportunity to correct some of the anomalies. But not only the situation is not corrected but it is worsened.

As a consequence, I am utterly confensed and this is why not only do I firmly object to the electoral boundaries readjustments, but I am also objecting to those who have established them. I think that another Commission like this one should simply be set up. The commissioners, even after years of work in this field, cannot manage to accomplish anything better than what we see in this report. I think they only deserve a badmark and I think we should ask ourselves not only whether these boundaries should not be set anew, but also whether that Commission should not be completely revamped because its members seem to be absolutely incompetent.

Mr. Antonio Yanakis (Berthier-Maskinongé): Mr. Speaker, after having heard the previous speaker who stated his case on the redistribution of electoral boundaries, I must say that I was present when he made some representations to the Commission during the hearings held last August in Trois-Rivières. It is perhaps unfortunate that my colleague should have tried to point out the political undertones of the Quebec Redistribution Commission and this is perhaps why he was unable to intervene, as he would have liked.

I myself, was called after him before the Commission and I must say now that the Berthier-Maskinongé constituency was to be abolished after the tabling of the first electoral map. However, when I pointed out the rural character of my constituency, the Commission reconsidered the problem and asked me to table my submission and I am pleased to say here this evening that I obtained all I had hoped for, since Berthier-Maskinongé has remained untouched, the rule providing that rural constituencies be considered as such being complied with to the letter.

However, Mr. Speaker, some municipalities have been carved off the constituencies of Saint-Maurice and Trois-Rivières, and thus I received representations from the new mayor of Saint-Étienne-des-Grés in the constituency of Saint-Maurice who has regretfully noted that the municipality of Saint-Étienne-des-Grés is scheduled to be carved off the constituency of Berthier-Maskinongé.

● (2120)

This village's population is under 2,000 and, considering the rural nature of this municipality, I understand very well their dismay, since I have been representing this municipality for the last eight years. I believe I had to rise today, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Electoral Boundaries Commission to review this decision to take Saint-Étienne-des-Grès of the riding of Berthier-Maskinongé.

There would also be in the riding of Trois-Rivières certain municipalities which belong to the provincial riding of Saint-Maurice, which I have also been representing for the last eight years and which in my opinion should also belong to the riding of Berthier-Maskinongé. And I will mention the municipalities of Saint-Barnabé, Saint-Sévère, Yamachiche and Sainte-Anne-de-Yamachiche. Those represent a population of a little more than 4,000 which, added to the federal riding of Berthier-Maskinongé presently proposed by the commission, would give a population of about 70,000 for the riding of Berthier-Maskinongé.

I feel the four municipalities I have just named should belong to the riding of Berthier-Maskinongé because of their rural character. Saint-Barnabé has an agricultural fair that groups all the parishes in the municipalities of Maskinongé, Berthier and Saint-Maurice. That fair has been held in that area for over 100 years now, and the municipalities I have just mentioned would like to belong to the rural area I have described.

Mr. Speaker, following the tabling of the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission on March 1st last, I made representations on March 26, on four specific points: that the name of Berthier-Maskinongé, for which Berthier was substituted, remain as it was formerly. Barely a year ago, I believe, I introduced a bill to the House asking that the riding be named Berthier-Maskinongé. I note that in the new redistribution, the name of Maskinongé is nowhere to be found. This is a minor point, but I do feel that, to be fair with all my constituents, the name Berthier-Maskinongé should also appear.

The new boundary added about ten Joliette parishes to the Berthier-Maskinongé riding. Those new parishes are Saint-Côme, Sainte-Béatrix, Saint-Alphonse-Rodriguez, Sainte-Mélanie, Sainte-Marceline-de-Kildare, Saint-Cléophas, Sainte-Élisabeth, Sainte-Émilie-de-l'Énergie, Saint-Félix-de-Valois as well as a hamlet which is not a township in that sense that there is no administration office, and which is incorporated, if I am not wrong, to the village of Saint-Félix-de-Valois.

I am pleased to note that the people of those towns are very happy to belong to the new Berthier-Maskinongé riding since I did not receive any representation to the contrary, and they have accepted gladly to be included in the new constituency.

These are some of the claims I wanted to make to the Electoral Boundaries Commission through you, Mr. Speak-

er and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the commissioners for the magnificent job they did in surveying the various ridings.

As I say, we are very satisfied with the redistribution we have been given and, in order to meet the needs of the municipalities I mentioned earlier, if it were possible that a change be made in these municipalities so that they come back in the riding of Berthier-Maskinongé, I think it would be a complete success.

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. First, I wish to take part in this debate not to object to the report of the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission, but to congratulate the members of the Quebec commission for their attitude concerning the redistribution of the ridings in the Gaspé Peninsula.

I was first elected to the House of Commons in 1963 and at that time the constituency of Gaspé included the municipalities from Newport to Les Méchins. At the 1966 redistribution, the municipalities of Cap-Chat, Capucins and Les Méchins were removed from the riding of Gaspé. That part of Gaspé Peninsula is now part and parcel of the riding of Matane. I therefore, approve the commission's decision to restore the natural sociological unity by reintegrating the town of Cap-Chat in the beautiful riding of Gaspé. The town of Cap-Chat has common interests with the town of Sainte-Anne-des-Monts, and I gladly welcome the return of Cap-Chat citizens in the riding of Gaspé, more especially as they are very sympathetic people and very eager to cooperate in the economic and social development, not only of their town but of Gaspé Peninsula as a whole. Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasant to meet friends again after 10 years of separation.

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief to give all my colleagues from Quebec and from the other provinces a chance to take part in the debate. I shall not waste my time saying that the commissioners are totally inefficient because I think that the commissioners needed our advice since they produced the last report or the report before. As a matter of fact, like my colleague the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr) who almost became one of my electors, I am pleased to see that I have been left with a huge riding but that the hon. member for Gaspé keeps the riding of Gaspé and that a portion of this riding, which until 1949 was part of the constituency of Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine, has been reintegrated in this riding; I mean the town of Causapscal which is today so adequately represented by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané).

By the way, the hon. member for Matane mentions in his objection it would be more advantageous for some towns and municipalities included in the constituency of Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine and Gaspé to belong to the constituency of Matane. I do not understand his argument very well. It is impossible to figure out the intentions, and I do not want to attribute any intentions to him, but he says it would be more interesting for them to belong to the constituency of Matane. I want to reassure the future electors of Causapscal and the surroundings that their hon. member will do his utmost to represent them as adequately as the present hon. member for Matane did since he has been their representative in the House of Commons.

● (2130)

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleague from Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) and others in congratulating the commissionners to a reasonable extent however since as my colleague for Champlain (Mr. Matte) said quite rightly we should not comply only to the letter of the legislation but rather to its spirit and act with common sense.

I would not want to criticize the judges as it seems quite improper but at least, in this House, I enjoy parliamentary immunity.

I had asked, not only when the last Commission presented its report but before that and I did so on behalf of my constituents in that part of the Bonaventure riding called Iles-de-la-Madeleine that the Iles-de-la-Madeleine riding be recognized as a riding as it was since 1945, I think. Unfortunately, the commissioners who have to follow the letter of the legislation ignored my request because of the limited population of those islands and left them in the Bonaventure riding.

By the way, I am very grateful to my constituents of the Iles-de-la-Madeleine whom I have had the privilege to represent ever since 1968. But what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is to find out that rural communities are going to disappear in this House just because the act sets a population level for a given riding. Gradually it will eliminate the rural representation from this House. And I think that it might be this lack of strong representation of the rural communities which explains why our area in eastern Quebec which includes the Gaspe Peninsula, the lower Saint-Lawrence and the Iles-de-la-Madeleine, has been neglected for too long.

And today, because of that business of figures, a rural member will be given an immense territory even with a low density population while urban representatives are particularly privileged. As I said, a Montreal member can cover his riding in 15 minutes while in my case and many others as the representative of the Bonaventure and Iles-de-la-Madeleine riding, it might take one week or two.

The Bonaventure and Iles-de-la-Madeleine riding, in its continental part, is 170 miles long from east to west. The Magdalen Islands are located 175 miles from the mainland as the crow flies. Mr. Speaker, you will have the honour of visiting this beautiful section of my riding during your next vacation. You will be able to see by yourself what distance you have to cover to drive from Valleyfield to the Magdalen Islands.

So the member who represents Bonaventure and Magdalen Islands must go to the islands from time to time and the problems of these islands are not those of Bonaventure, or the Gaspe Peninsula, Témiscouata, Rivière-du-loup or Kamouraska. This is why, therefore, we had asked to make an exception and to make the islands an independent riding, and the present member might have gone and introduced himself to the islanders and I would have considered it a great honour and a great pleasure to do so.

Another point, Mr. Speaker. When we appear before the commissioners and complain, then they tell us: You make the law, we enforce it. We need 86,000 people here; we need

56,000 there, we distribute them so that we have the number of people we are asked to include, that the act requires us to include.

But the act gives no indication as far as name changes are concerned, for instance, and the commissioners do not care for statute when it comes to that. The Bonaventure riding, before Magdalen Islands were included, was named Bonaventure. After 1968, and indeed Mr. Speaker the situation is the same in your case, I introduced a bill to change the name of Bonaventure to Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine, and the bill was passed by Parliament.

Well the commissioners, who should act according to statute, decided in their wisdom that the riding when proclaimed should still be called Bonaventure. Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the way they go contrary to statute. If it is contrary to the act to maintain Magdalen Islands as an independent riding because there is not enough people there, it is also illegal to change the name of a constituency called Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine. And I hereby serve notice, Mr. Speaker, that since there is no other way, I shall introduce another bill that will cost money to Canadians once more. It will also cost money to commissioners, because they also have to pay taxes, and to my constituents in Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine. I shall take the time of this House and introduce a new bill that will cost more money to Canadian taxpayers, because of an error by the commissioners.

There is a lot I could say on that subject, but what is in order here is not to criticize judges, but maybe to criticize Parliament and ask that the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act be amended to give justice to all the people, to our Canadian rural citizens, to our urban citizens and also to our members of Parliament representing these huge constituencies without being paid a penny more than those representing small constituencies.

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to contribute to the debate on the readjustment of electoral boundaries, especially as it concerns Hochelaga.

To better explain my position to the commissioners and also to express my agreement with what the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) has said earlier to the effect that the commissioners had somehow distorted the major intent of electoral boundaries readjustment by giving greater significance to numbers than to municipalities or sectors, it is important for me to be able to tell the House and the commissioners that the Hochelaga-Maisonneuve sector is made up of two former municipalities which were amalgamated with the city of Montreal, Hochelaga in 1883 and Maisonneuve in 1918. Even though the area is very well established geographically with natural boundaries, it remains that this separation between the two municipalities is still present in the minds of the residents. The life in this community and the feeling of belonging are something vital to our people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I represent since October 14 of last year a constituency which is somewhat well delineated, I would naturally have liked to have the number of my constituents increased—at any event, I would like to say by the way that the commission did not have to add to my riding because I actually serve a great many people around Hochelaga. On the other hand, the commissioners could have done it by taking a part of Maisonneuve and a part of Sainte-Marie, and the Hochelaga constituency would still have remained the Hochelaga constituency.

But the way it is done Hochelaga actually replaces the Sainte-Marie riding, giving another fifty polls to Hochelaga. This means that the difference of 125 polling stations goes to the Maisonneuve riding. I still do not know the feeling of the people from Hochelaga because I have not dared inform them of the fact so far.

Mr. Speaker, these modifications can only cause confusion in the people's minds. Sometimes they do not know which riding they belong to and most often they do not even know which representative they should turn to. However you should notice that in Hochelaga the people know who is their member of Parliament!

I would like to make another point, Mr. Speaker. If the population of Hochelaga has diminished so considerably, it is not because of the people of Hochelaga, but especially because of so many demolitions in the southern part of the Hochelaga riding. When I said that we should have made encroachments to the east and to the west, this would have helped solve the problem and this is indeed what I propose.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the electoral boundaries should not be established so radically. The modifications should be made more logically and before I finish my speech, because I would like to give a chance to the other members who want to take the floor, I would like to suggest that next time around the Electoral Boundaries Commission organize meetings with the members of Parliament from each riding because they are the people concerned in this case and they should be consulted once and for all.

It is important that these commissions which have been given the task of making changes take the advice of the elected representatives of the people before getting down to work.

This wish I express to the House and the commissioners, hoping that the boundaries of the Hochelaga riding will be just and equitable so that I can better serve the people I have represented since October 14.

● (2140)

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, quite regularly, whenever there is a readjustment of electoral boundaries, there are bursts of protests from everywhere which show that this approach is certainly not the best.

To determine the population figure in a given area and then to set at 70,000 or 80,000 the number of constituents in any one riding is not a very difficult exercise. It is important to consider the georgraphical location, the distances, without forgetting the services to which the constituents are entitled when they wish to meet their member and make their representations all the right time. It is the legislation which provides that a commission has to use such an approach that should be changed to be better adapted to the situation. Several proposals have been made with respect to the number of seats. This personal should be considered. It would probably be possible to improve the situation in that respect.

Electoral Boundaries

In July 1973, I pointed out to the hon. members in this House that the residents of the Kamouraska constituency were highly interested in keeping the name and the limits of their riding. Kamouraska is a georgraphical and a well structured unit with its county seat being St-Pascal; it has a private college in Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, an agricultural school, a CEGEP and, in St-Pascal, and well-know teaching institutions catering to hundreds of students.

A number of villages have ostentatiously celebrated their tercentenary. The novel by Anne Hébert was made into a motion picture entitled "Kamouraska". So it is a riding hundreds of years old which its population cannot disown. That is why its residents insisted and still insist on keeping the riding's name. Apparently the commissioners have taken those geographical and historical factors into account with the result that the name of Kamouraska has been maintained. However, the 1976 Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Quebec has again some unacceptable mistakes.

The commission has not given enoughh consideration to the area of the territories and to the distinction which must exist between rural and urban ridings. This problem of representation has been pointed out on many occasions and facilities have been supplied to allow the people living at the far end of the riding to get in touch with their representative through secretariats which may be located in certain districts of the territory. However all efforts made to get in touch with people and advice them will be jeopardized by officials who are not aware of regional problems. It is obvious that the residents of rural constituencies have excellent reasons to protest against that attitude of those responsible for such a mess in carving out the electoral map.

A few years ago, the riding of l'Islet was amalgamated with the constituency of Kamouraska with the addition of some parishes of Témiscouata. At that time, the commissioners tended to amalgamate towards the west, while in 1976 the trend is eastwards. The merging of Kamouraska and Témiscouata is a hardly understandable blunder and the residents of Témiscouata have every reason to make representations to keep the name and the present boundaries of their electoral constituency.

As I often have the advantage of meeting constituents of Témiscouata, many of them have told me about the struggle led many years ago by the late Senator Jean-François Pouliot to preserve the riding of Témiscouata whose existence was then being threatened. That attempt to delete the riding of Témiscouata from the map has already been called a cyclical calamity.

Several representative groups presented briefs exposing the views of the citizens of Témiscouata. Many people are rather surprised to see that the commission does not seem to have taken them into account. It should be possible to group some 60,000 to 80,000 people into a riding without hopelessly carving out the electoral map.

Circumstances would allow it easily enough that I can quote an excerpt from an article published in the local newspaper *St-Laurent* on this cutting up of federal ridings in the province of Quebec. I quote:

> The riding of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata as it now stands forms an indivisible whole both historically and sociologically.
>
> It is most unfortunate that, at regular intervals, the task of redistribution, federal and provincial, should be entrusted to drawing room cartographers. The latter, in their ivory towers, shuffle the electoral boundaries, most of the time unaware of the geographic, social and economic factors that together create natural entities endowed with a very strong feeling of belonging.
>
> It seems that these members of the judiciary, who are generally entrusted with the task of making the redistribution as a hobby, are not aware of or ignore the wrongs and the embarrassments they cause to the people of the ridings concerned by taking pleasure in moving them from one riding to another.
>
> The respectable gentlemen should know that in man as in any animal there is a regional instinct which, when submitted to such arbitrary constraints as those imposed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, generates deep frustrations, persistent resentment and quarrels between neighbours whose first victims are the people of the ridings concerned and, that, against their will. In addition, the people of Témiscouata have fought too long already to make a place for themselves under the sun for us to affront them by making them disappear from the electoral map. Such undeserved humiliation and punishment are totally unacceptable to people who suffer the cruelty of being refused an identity.
>
> In the county of Témiscouata, such cyclical attempts to divide, disorganize, and destroy a natural unit are no less irritating than tragic, and that persecution must cease once and for all.
>
> In the very heart of a well organized and homogenous area, that of Témiscouata, the Church has been the first, for more than half a century, to maintain a dividing line which, although invisible, still contributes to separate communities linked together by a common economic interest and normally destined to have between them just as close social relations. Well, it is that diocesan demarcation, safe for a few parishes, that some people want to impose upon us under the disguise of a suggestion, as a dividing line in Témiscouata, between the counties of Kamouraska and Rimouski.
>
> To such a suggestion, we oppose a categorical no, and we reiterate that such a plan is stupid, unfair and totally unacceptable.

[Mr. Dionne (Kamouraska).]

This illustrates the reaction of the people in the riding of Témiscouata to this attempt to readjust electoral boundaries on the south shore of the St-Lawrence River.

The representatives from the constituency council in Rivière-du-Loup had summed up in their submission the reasons for their representations. That is why the citizens of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata are not accepting that decision, and the Electoral Boundaries Commission should wake up and try to be both consistent and fair. I hope that the decisions made earlier will be changed in a satisfactory way. It is not a matter of electoral advantage or disadvantage, it is a problem of fairness in the distribution of voters in each constituency of the eastern section of the province.

● (2150)

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Orientals, we do not have the qualities required to accept to commit hara-kiri with a smile. That is why a general outcry was raised against the decision of the commissioners to eliminate the riding of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata.

It might be useful to recall that when the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act was introduced in this House, we were willing to prove our candor to such an extent that we did not want to let the government or the Parliament unduly interfere with the carving of the electoral map and we agreed to give the commissioners the responsibility for action, and to Parliament, merely the trouble of making representations.

It is all very good that we have been given the opportunity these last two days of making representations to the

commissionners but, as happened at the hearing, it is hard to know wether or not they will take them into account.

Some hon. Members: Long live democracy!

Mr. Gendron: After listening to the hon. members for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) and for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne), I would sincerely confess that I am under the impression that it would be easier between members even of opposite parties to come up with an agreement on a rational redistribution which would take into account the social and democratic facts as they exist in our area. In my opinion, it is a good thing to insist upon this for people are sometimes confused about it and everybody knows that at the provincial level the National Assembly has kept for itself the privilege of decision-making while, in this instance, we can only make recommendations to the commissionners witout knowing whether they will take them into account. But since Easter is forthcoming, I would, therefore, suggest to them that they take heed of the representations made by the members for Bellechasse and Kamouraska, as well as mine, if they truly intend to perform their Easter duties.

Mr. Speaker, since we have instructed the commissioners to proceed with this revision, before the establishing of new electoral boundaries which often gives the impression of being more of an arithmetical exercise than the pursuit of a

true objective, we should seek to gather in as much as possible people having common economic, social, or ethnic interests.

I think that if we really wanted to go along with this quotation we should first seek advice from our people, from the members of parliament, as well as from the electoral county councils, the municipal councils. The latter actually know very well where exactly there are common interests, where there is a sense of belonging and they could readily indicate to which riding they wish to be attached.

However, this first consultation which should have been the preamble to the layout of the proposed electoral map was never done. I have not met a single voter in my riding, who has told me he had had any contact whatsoever or any opportunity to make any representations concerning the revision of the electoral map. And when the time of the public hearings came, these were only announced around mid summer and advertised in one newspaper only, *Le Soleil* which is read by only a quarter of the population so much so that a very large number of people knew nothing about it. And when they are faced with the facts, and hear that their riding has been eliminated, of course they go through the roof, they get mad and lose all patience and they cannot be blamed for it.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I invite the commissioners to reconsider this revision. I would not like to have to rehash all the briefs which have been submitted. I still shall indicate that, from a historical point of view this riding has been in existence since 1854. It has been illustrated by names which made the history of the riding and of the country, such as the Mailloux, the Pouliots, the Grandbois, the Gauvreaus; and as the hon. member for Kamouraska said earlier, the man who best illustrated this riding has been the Hon. Jean-François Pouliot who was a member from 1924 to 1957, that is for 33 years, and represented this riding in the House of Commons. I believe that if he were here tonight he would certainly explode in anger at the thought that a riding which was so dear to him should disappear.

There are some historic reasons which are easy to understand since that constituency has developed near main arteries. All the civilizations of the world were to be found in the vicinity of thoroughfares leading to the area where parishes and municipalities became established. There we find the Trans-Canada Highway, the Témiscouata railway and today the electronic system and the press. There are some common projects such as an outlet to the sea, the famous seaport the project of Gros-Cacouna, the airport and also all the government and judicial services, and others, which gives a riding a sense of identity and its people a feeling of belonging with the will to preserve it.

An hon. Member: It is justified.

Mr. Gendron: Yes, it is justified.

Then what could be done? I am referring to the statement made earlier by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) to the effect that it was possible by strictly following the objectives of the Commission to preserve the riding and I shall quote here from the submission of the Regional Board to the commissioners.

We believe that this margin of availability is sufficient to enable a sensible electoral redistribution in which the riding of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata may be maintained, thus safeguarding the geographical, social and economic entities around which the various population centers of Eastern Quebec are gathered.

Let us have a quick look on the following list of counties:

1) Gaspé	62,500 of population
2) Bonaventure	62,900
3) Matane	67,009
4) Rimouski	74,882
5) Kamouraska	75,210
6) Bellechasse	74,099
7) Beauce	72,313

which amounts to a total of 488,913 people for seven (7) counties, or a total of approximately 68,000 people over the quota, which leaves a sufficient reservoir to keep the riding of Rivière-du-Loup-Témiscouata.

And surely this kind of redistribution, as the honorable member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) pointed out, may give rise to public protests, to parochial disputes, while we need so badly in this particular region to put our energies together for the development of a region which is currently being drained of 95 per cent of its youth on average as well as its most active adult population, a region which suffers from a considerable alienation feeling from the social and economic point of view and which, for these very reasons, needs the most adequate representation possible. And we think we must delete one riding, when we are able to maintain it under the legislation.

I respectfully submit to the commissioners the need to proceed to this readjustment. Nevertheless, the two ridings of Kamouraska and Rivière-du-Loup which are to become the proposed riding of Kamouraska should not feel so much frustrated as to experience an alienation feeling that would paralyze their common efforts to put their energies together for the development of this part of the country. I think it is possible, and it was done within the great portage in school boards, it was done also in regional

development movements, to work jointly in order to help one another. And we should, beyond nonrepresentative arbitrary electoral boundaries, not develop a feeling of alienation that would destroy the energies, the dynamism of our people but contribute to the well-being of our fellow citizens.

And I would suggest to the hon. commissioners, should they come to this conclusion, that for a proper identification and to remove any chance of confusing provincial counties and federal constituencies, they should add the name Rivière-du-Loup while retaining the historical name of the constituency of Kamouraska, which will then form the constituency of Rivière-du-Loup-Kamouraska. I am sure that my hon. colleague will endorse this project.

● (2200)

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to take part in this debate on the new electoral boundaries of federal ridings.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that because of bad communications in eastern Quebec, the people have been unable to really take part in this debate. Very few are aware of this federal act that requires that every ten years judges are put to work on redistribution and draw up new boundaries. I would even go as far as to say that even municipal authorities were not aware of this.

Having said this, I should like to congratulate the commissioners on their final draft tabled a month ago, which is a great improvement over the first rough draft dating back to three years as well as over the one tabled last June.

I should now like to make a few remarks. First of all, a part of the Matapedia Valley which is now in Matane riding, namely Causapscal and the neighbouring areas, would become part of Bonaventure. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a telegram sent to me by the following organizations; the town of Causapscal, the Administrative Committee of the County Council of Matapédia, Saint-Jacques-le-Majeur parish of Causapscal, Saint-Raphaël parish of Albertville, the municipality of Saint-Edmond, the municipality of Sainte-Florence, the municipality of Sainte-Marguerite, the Junior Chamber of Causapscal and the Chamber of Commerce of Causapscal. The telegram reads as follows:

This is to inform you of our opinion concerning the electoral boundaries readjustment for the ridings of Matane and Bonaventure. Our representations are belated because the diffusion of information is very bad in our area; thus the very large majority of the citizens involved have not been made aware of the state of the question.

Whereas the Matapédia valley constitutes a very characteristic human and geographical entity altogether different from the entity constituted by the riding of Bonaventure;

Whereas the citizens of the following localities: the town of Causapscal, the municipalities of Saint-Jacques-le-Majeur-de-Causapscal, Saint-Raphaël-d'Albertville, Saint-Edmond, Sainte-Florence and Sainte-Marguerite usually do business in the upper part of the riding in the towns of Matane and Rimouski and that they have almost no business relations with the present riding of Bonaventure;

Whereas there are uninhabited areas exceeding twenty-five (25) miles between the present riding of Matane and that of Bonaventure, which does little to encourage communications;

Whereas our area, the Matapedia Valley, is still one of the worst, economically speaking, in Canada, and that once again it would be at a disadvantage if it had to deal with more MPs;

[Mr. Gendron.]

Whereas in rural areas, it is extremely rare if not unique that a village should have been separated from its parish (Lac-au-Saumon and Saint-Edmond), that is to say the village is in the riding of Matane and the parish in that of Bonaventure;

Whereas our area has already lost its riding, that of Matapedia, and whereas it should not be used to "plug holes" since at the time of the last redistribution, the upper part of the valley was used to complete the riding of Rimouski while this time, that part is returned to the riding of Matane and the lower valley is used to complete the riding of Bonaventure.

For those reasons, we advise you that we are in complete disagreement with the current proposal of the Electoral Boundaries Commission and request that you intervene on our behalf to change the situation with a view to assuring that Matapedia remains within the riding of Matane.

I read, at the start, the name of the municipalities that sent me this telegram.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree whole-heartedly with them, and I support as strongly as I can the representations of the Matapedia Valley. I could of course add to their argument the fact that the people is the lower mainland deal far more with the upper part of the riding than with that of Bonaventure.

Causapscal and the first town in Bonaventure riding, Carleton, are 80 miles apart. That is far and services are non-existent. When people come down in the valley, they go to Campbellton in New Brunswick. It is unfortunate but, on the other hand, Causapscal and Matane are only 50 miles apart.

As for the other end of my constituency that is to be cut away, that is the area of Cap-Chat, Mr. Speaker, since the commission stated itself its intention to group in the same electoral constituency people with the same affinities, similar needs and a community of interest, I cannot understand why Cap-Chat is taken out again of the constituency of Matane to be included in the constituency of Gaspé.

I remind you that the children of Les Méchins attend high school in Cap-Chat, that people in Les Méchins, for instance, do as much business with Cap-Chat as with Matane, that Cap-Chat serves a good part of the constituents of Matane and is a most important centre.

As far as I am concerned, and the same holds true in respect of the people of Cap-Chat, I would be very unhappy to see this town leave the constituency of Matane to be become part of the constituency of Gaspé. Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the commissioners will reconsider their decisions and that they will ensure that Cap-Chat will remain in the riding of Matane. It will be recalled no doubt that Cap-Chat was in the Gaspé riding for a few years and I think it is unfortunate to move a municipality from one constituency to another every ten years. This does not make for a feeling of belonging.

Once again, I ask the commissioners to review that part of their report. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, having gone through the commissioners' very carefully and having looked in the Quebec Revised Statutes, and in particular chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of 1964, since the report refers to this Quebec legislation, I must say that the description of the constituency of Matane is rather obscure. For instance, it is not quite clear, according to the commissioners' description, that the parishes of Saint-René, Saint-Jean-Vianney, Sainte-Paule and Saint-Nil are included in the federal constituency of Matane. All the

more as these parishes according to the plan put forward in June 1975 were to be included in the riding of Gaspé, and I would like to ensure they are actually in the federal riding of Matane.

Third, I think that in the proposed new federal riding of Matane, both parishes of Saint-François-Xavier-des-Hauteurs and Saint-Charles-Garnier should be left out. As everybody knows to get these two municipalities, you have to go through Saint-Gabriel in the Rimouski riding, and those two municipalities are 27 miles away from Sainte-Angèle-de-Mérici, the closest point to the federal riding of Matane.

A quick glance at the map is enough to note that it is not sensible to wish to go through St-Gabriel in the Rimouski riding to go to those two towns, especially as they happen to be situated outside the Matane riding but their interests and history are linked to the Rimouski constituency. The best proof of this lies in the fact that the present federal member of parliament for Rimouski wishes those two towns to stay in the federal Rimouski riding.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo a demand which I have often heard in my riding, namely, to stop calling it Matane and call it by the name of Matapédia-Matane to which it is rightfully entitled. I do not know why but before I had the honour of representing this riding, a law had been passed to discard the name "Matapédia". When we look at the shape of this riding, we notice that it is made of two distinctive parts: The area along the coast and the one in the lower mainland.

● (2210)

I find that we should go back to the former name and call it the riding of Matapédia-Matane. I have never felt I represented the town of Matane, but the whole riding. I have sworn not to show preference for a parish or another and while I understand that the citizens of Matane are proud that the riding is called after their town, yet we have to admit that this name does not do justice to the people of the valley whom I also represent.

I strongly recommend that the former name of the riding of Matapédia-Matane be restored for it would better meet the requirements of the two groups which constitute the population of the riding. The town of Matane is undoubtedly the largest centre of the riding with its 13,000 residents but when we consider the population of the new riding, about 67,000 people, we must bear in mind that we have to be fair to everybody and that the member of Parliament must resist the temptation of favouring one section over another. I consulted an impressive number of people in the constituency, and many names were suggested if compound names are not appreciated. There are such names as Mitis, Metis, D'Amours, Kent, Fraser, Des Monts, Du Golfe. In Matane, the reference is of course to one of the pioneers in the area, the sieur Mathieu D'Amours de Chaufour, and we already have in Matane a school and a dam named after him. Others would rather insist on a family name that would be de Chaufour rather than keeping a town name that does not reflect all opinions and all the people in the other 50 municipalities in the riding.

Mr. Cyr: The De Bané constituency!

Mr. De Bané: My friend the hon. member for Gaspé also made a suggestion that should be discarded. I would like that this be brought to the commissioners' attention. Of course I would prefer the name of Matapédia-Matane. To conclude, I insist on both ends of the old constituency remaining in the proposed one. This includes both the area of Causapscal, an important municipality in the valley and Amqui's sister-town, and at the other end the municipality of Cap-Chat, an extremely important one where we hope, with the Quebec government's cooperation, to launch soon two significant projects that will finally allow the hard working population to survive the very serious depression they have been going through for a number of months.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the judges who are charged with the drafting of the new electoral map, independently of every partisan power, and on which we as members have no influence whatsoever other than some meek representations, will consider the remarks I am making this evening. I want to point out that these are not only my personal views, but the result of an extensive consultation process with people in every area of the riding I have had the honour of representing for a number of years.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Perhaps, following the usual procedure, it would be helpful if the Chair were to indicate the order of the next six members from the province of Quebec who will be taking part in the debate. I would propose that they be called in this order: the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Demers), the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), the hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard), the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy), the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard), and the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Demers (Duvernay): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to comment this evening on a rather important matter concerning the representation here in Ottawa of my constituents.

● (2220)

Before the new redistribution, the city of Laval included two ridings and was divided in two approximately equal parts: the ridings of Laval and Duvernay. The commissioners used a very precise and above all excessively rigid tool. They took as a basis the 1971 statistics. As a result, Laval now extends over two and a half ridings. They took part of the riding of Duvernay and part of the riding of Laval; they blended that with the north of Montreal on the other side of the river.

I suggest that besides using a very rigid tool such as the 1971 statistics—and especially the fact that they used only that tool—the commission should have taken into consideration other factors such as geographic factors. As a matter of fact, as you know, the city of Laval is limited to the north and to the south by rivers. If it can be said that the motto of Canada is "A mari usque ad mare", it certainly can be said that the city of Laval stretches from one river to the other.

Three of Canada's boundaries are oceans and the city of Laval is an island completely surrounded by water.

Mr. La Salle: A small Canada!

Mr. Demers: A small Canada, like the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) said. It therefore seems completely illogical to me to form a new constituency by taking the southern part of Laval commonly called Laval-des-Rapides and a sector of Northern Montreal on the other side of the river. A large number of the problems faced by Laval because of its geographic position are, if not restricted to Laval, at least quite inherent to Laval. We have problems and, especially at this time, floods which are not a problem on the Montreal side, but many people in Laval have had to move because their basement is full of water.

Since Laval is also a developing city, we also have a lot of road construction. We have transportation problems since people will have to be transported from northern Montreal to Mirabel. They will pass through the whole of Laval. We also have residential and industrial development like nowhere else in Canada. Furthermore, Laval must build hospitals. So, because of its geography, the city of Laval has very special problems which are very different from those of surrounding areas.

There is also the type of population. The commission should have considered and examined the kind of population of Laval. Unlike the Montreal constituencies, we have still in Laval many farmers and vegetable gardeners, people who from one generation to the other farm the land and who, as you all know, have problems with which all hon. members from rural constituencies are familiar. And next to these farmers and gardeners, we have the city of Laval that most people know, a bedroom area from which most residents work in Montreal where the businesses and offices are. From this point of view also, because of this mixture of rural and urban dwellers, the problems of the city of Laval are certainly very different from those of Montreal.

However, census commissionners, as I mentioned before, have used an excessively rigid tool, that is the 1971 statistics, and did not consider the local population's expectations. There is also an extremely important factor in Laval. Laval lies north of Montreal and south of the new airport of Mirabel, so the entire metropolitan expansion occurs in Laval and the Duvernay and Laval ridings absorb an annual growth rate of 7,000 people.

In other words, on the basis of the statistics for 1971 they say, for instance, that the Duvernay riding has 93,000 inhabitants. However, a little arithmetic reveals that at the next election in 1978 in the Duvernay riding alone, there will be about 135,000 inhabitants. And, as we know, the national census is taken only every ten years and the next one will be in 1981. Then, we can assume that it will take about two years to study the new electoral boundaries. Then, the new redistribution will probably not take place before 1983. I think that in 1983 a part of Laval only, the Duvernay part, will have about 160,000 inhabitants and this is a very conservative figure.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Duvernay population should be represented as well as any other population in Canada and that these factors should have been considered in the new electoral boundaries. Laval should include three ridings all on the territory of the city of Laval.

And in the hope that the judges who worked on that redistribution will have the opportunity to carefully read my arguments, I suggest to them to divide the Laval territory in three separate ridings.

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I know that our time is very limited in this debate. Therefore, I will simply put forward the arguments that justify, I suggest, some important changes in the findings of the commissioners' report on electoral boundary redistribution in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I am not the only one who believes that the commissioners' report, as tabled in this House, is not in the best interests of the Quebec voters. As a matter of fact, no less than ten objections were filed in the House for the province of Quebec alone. That means that at least 100 members of Parliament thought this report had to be amended for one reason or another. Even members who represent other parts of the country have signed the objections filed for the province of Quebec. These members recognize that representations made by most Quebec members to have the commissioners amend their report after taking in consideration the arguments put forward in the House, are well founded.

I know that the commissioners' task is not an easy one and that it is difficult if not impossible to satisfy everybody at the same time. However, one must admit that when 100 members of parliament regardless of their party or province, rise to protest against the proposed electoral redistribution, it is an indication that something is wrong.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the report as a whole concerning the province of Quebec. I know that other honourable members will address themselves to the regions they represent and that they will very ably make their points in favour of changes in the commissioners' report. I for one would like to deal in particular with the problems created by the commissioners' report as regard the Northwestern part of Quebec. I wish to congratulate the honourable member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) who made a very good case for Northwestern Quebec tonight.

● (2230)

As I said, I represent the northwest Quebec with my colleagues the hon. members for Abitibi and Témiscamingue (Messrs. Laprise and Caouette).

Mr. Speaker, my two colleagues were first elected to the House of Commons in 1962. They have seen the name and size of their respective ridings change once since 1968 when the redistribution added a new riding in northwest Quebec. All the people in that area were happy with the new division. At last, that large territory would be represented by a number of members more consistent with its huge size.

Mr. Speaker, the riding I now represent is one of the largest in the country. It extends on hundreds, if not thousands of miles and includes municipalities such as Cadillac and Chibougamau more than 400 miles apart. My colleague the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) also represents the largest riding in the country. Its extends, so to speak, to the North Pole.

Both of us, and I am sure that I speak for him today, are proud to represent in the House of Commons people who put their confidence in us. We do our best to express their views in the House in all debates and we try to deal to

their satisfaction with the problems they refer to us. I believe that the mere fact that the Social Crediters have been elected at every general election in those ridings since 1962 shows that we do our job as the people want. The citizens of the northwest are satisfied with our work as federal members.

However, Mr. Speaker, to do away with a riding in the northwest might place an overwhelming burden on the members of that area. It is hard enough to cover hundreds and hundreds of miles to travel across the constituency. If the size of the riding is doubled as required by the present redistribution, it will take an angel with wings or a superman to serve everyone as they expect to be by their member.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I object to the redistribution bill submitted by the commissioners. Whatever system is used for the redistribution, it is nonsensical to have only two ridings in an area as vast as northwest Quebec. The other point I want to strees today, Mr. Speaker, is the gross injustice done to the area I represent compared to other Quebec areas such as the Gaspé peninsula. In the bill tabled in the House, the three Gaspé area ridings hardly include 180,000 constituents, while in the northwest, the two proposed ridings contain more than 171,000 constituents.

How is it, Mr. Speaker that there are three members for the Gaspé area and only two for northwest Quebec for an almost identical mumber of constituents? All the more as the northwest Quebec constituencies cover a far larger territory. I do not mean to say, Mr. Speaker that the Gaspé area should lose a riding. Indeed I think it is large enough to be represented by three members of Parliament but I also believe that northwest Quebec with its vast territory and its population which, according to the last census, has only 10,000 fewer contituents than the Gaspé peninsula, should have at least three members as well in the House of Commons.

It should also be noted that the census on the basis of which the actual proposals for a redistribution have been made does not take into account the fact that thousands of workers live on the James Bay working sites. Even if the commissioners are to work from the 1971 census, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the James Bay workers will go on living there for many years to come. They will still be there when the next elections take place and they should have been taken into account when redesigning the electoral map for these voters are also entitled to have a representative worthy of speaking for them in the House of Commons.

This, Mr. Speaker, means that the Villeneuve and Abitibi ridings have each at least 5,000 more electors than is shown from the figures used to revise the electoral map. With all the work that is being done on the James Bay development sites, we can be sure that the number of voters will still be increasing at a very fast rate in the next few years. So, Mr. Speaker, it should be logical that they be provided for. This is what I ask the commissioners, when they read the Hansard, so that they can give a fair ruling in the case of the people of Abitibi.

We must recognize that the Villeneuve and Abitibi ridings have more voters than all three ridings in the Gaspé peninsula. On the proposed map, our huge ridings in Northwestern Quebec have a much larger population than some urban ridings like Langelier, which has 86,073 people as against 88,164 for the Témiscamingue riding, or that of Hull which has 81,195 people as against 83,667 for the Abititi riding. We could give many other examples such as Montmorency or Saint-Jean, or even Berthier which has 67,000 people, I think.

These urban ridings cover hardly three or four blocks. In these cases, the representative just need a "little walk" to go from one end of his riding to the other. These ridings are so small that you can hardly see them on the electoral map proposed by the commissioners. On the contrary, the Témiscamingue and Abitibi ridings are easy to see. In fact, those constituencies cover more than half of the map we are studying today. Mr. Speaker, I can say without any apprehension that giving such large ridings to members of Parliament does not make any sense. The tremendous distances between the various municipalities in one of the northwestern constituencies should be compensated by a smaller number of people. This is not the case with the electoral map discussed today. This map gives to the northwestern constituencies more people than many an urban one.

If we were to cut out three constituencies from the two proposed constituencies, the average number of people per constituency would be over 57,000. In the Gaspé Peninsula, the average per constituency is hardly 61,000 people. If we take into consideration the workers living in the James Bay area, it is obvious that the average for the northwest, even with three constituencies, would be higher than that for the Gaspé Peninsula ridings. If we wanted to apply strictly the rules governing redistribution, it would always be possible to take the three thousand people missing in each of the three constituencies which could be set up in the northwest in the neighbouring constituencies. It would be more logical to increase the area of existing constituencies by a few square miles than to bluntly eliminate a constituency, thus doubling the area of the two remaining ones.

I suggest the commissioners should consider this possibility in order to avoid creating two rural ridings that would have more voters than any of several urban ridings. All the more so, since these two ridings are the largest in the Province of Quebec. That is what I am suggesting to the commissioners today.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I would like to point out the fact that the population generally and that of Northwestern Quebec in particular, find it very difficult to accept this proposal. Considering the very different treatment given to the Gaspé Peninsula and Northwestern Quebec, several people do not hesitate to say that Gaspé has obtained three ridings while our northwestern region has obtained only two.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the objectives that the commissioners should strive to reach we can see, as several other members have already pointed out,—and I would also like to emphasize it,—it was expected of the commissioners to keep municipal unity wherever the situation allowed it, by compensating in some areas like Gaspé, the Saguenay, Lake St. John, Abitibi, Pontiac-Témiscamingue, the low density of population by attributing a quotient substantially lower than the one prevailing in the cities.

Mr. Speaker, if the commissioners would follow the guideline, they should give to northwestern Quebec what is due to this area, and without delay, and I mean three electoral ridings.

● (2240)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): For the information of the House I can now indicate that there are six members remaining on the Quebec list, and I propose to call them in this order: the hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard), the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy), the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois), the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) and the very patient member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief and I hope to set an example by the length of my intervention, not for those who will follow me because I think they have rights to indicate and views to express, but when it comes to the reform of parliamentary procedure one can express one's views very shortly without repetition and thus avoid political partisanship.

I just want to commend the members of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec for their exceptional work as regards the heart of Quebec, and particularly the constituency of Drummond which I represent. The centre of Drummond is in the middle of the Quebec City-Montreal-Trois-Rivières and Sherbrooke route and has the privilege of having on its territory a very important highway, a vital artery, which is Highway 20, the Trans-Canada Highway. And they have extended the Drummond riding northwest towards the St. Lawrence River, which is very rational since henceforth the Trans-Canada Highway will form a genuine backbone for this riding as it does for neighbouring Lotbinière.

It seems to me that the commissioners have shown practical experience and sound knowledge of the constituency I represent, and I am much obliged for this.

Following this change in the election map, the Drummond riding has now acquired two other municipalities, Saint-Léonard and Saint-Wenceslas, which is a very wise change since those two municipalities have a great deal of natural economic and social affinity with Drummondville, just like smaller municipalities in Bagot have with Saint-Hyacinthe.

I regret however that some municipalities located in the southwestern and eastern limits of the riding had to be cut off to be linked to other nearly ridings. I do understand of course that the commission had to abide by some criteria.

It had become impossible to prevent the municipalities which formerly belonged to Drummond from being integrated in other constituencies because of the changes made necessary by the population criteria, by economic and social affinities.

I simply wanted to stress how sorry I am to lose some municipalities but I understand that the commission, following the criteria established under the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, had no other alternative than cutting them off. On the other hand I am pleased about the new municipalities. As far as my area is concerned, the work of the commission as a whole seems to me to be once again logical and practical, and to conclude I congratulate the members of the commission and I also thank the House which allowed me a few minutes to voice my views on these changes.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): I indicated that the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) would be recognized next. He, of course, retains his right to speak before the end of this debate, regardless of his temporary absence.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is my duty to speak like my colleagues from Quebec of all parties, at this stage of the debate on the proposals made by the commissioners.

Mr. Speaker, my first comments about the federal constituency of Lotbinière as such are to say how very satisfied I am with the proposals of the commissioners since they recognize as a constituency the same area that I have had the honour to represent since 1968.

It is normal, Mr. Speaker, and this will be my first point, that the commission should respect the historical, the geographical, and especially the economic entity of this part of the country. Indded, the Bois-Francs are an entity as such, and if I could make a suggestion, to be completely logical concerning the Bois-Francs, this regional entity should truly be respected. The commission should add to the constituency of Lotbinière the city of Plessisville and the five sister cities of Warwick, Arthabaska, Victoriaville, Princeville and Plessisville, which would be united as a whole and form a urban conglomerate which would respect not only our historical past, but also our cultural, social and economic entity. The only change proposed by the commissioners concerning the rural part of Lotbinière, since the riding is half urban and half rural, is that the municipality and parish of Saint-Apollinaire de Lotbinière be added to it.

Mr. Speaker, this is again a good thing that we accept with great pleasure since those who know this part of the country are well aware, as I said previously, that Saint-Apollinaire is a natural part of the rural entity of Lotbinière. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was truly an anomaly for the parish and municipality of Saint-Apollinaire to be part of the Lévis riding since there was no social, cultural or economic community of interest between Saint-Apollinaire and the rest of the Lévis riding, except perhaps Saint-Agapit.

The only point, Mr. Speaker, on which I should like to make very positive comments is about the municipality of Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet, and I very sincerely hope that the commissioners will not only examine but also accept the proposal I make to them. Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet is home to about 650 or 700 electors. So it is not a big number, it is not a parish that might change anything on the quotient of the riding as a whole.

In other words, it is not by giving Dosquet to Lotbinière or by systematically projecting it into the riding of Frontenac, as proposed by the commissioners in their report, that numerically anything is changed as regards the quotient. This only represents 650 more electors in one riding

or 650 fewer electors in another. In such case, given the small size of that municipality in terms of electors.

● (2250)

In view on the other hand of the very strong points made by people in Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet, who for decades and decades have had very close historicalties with the rest of the rural constituency of Lotbinière, and considering the insignificant number of people involved, logic would have it that commissioners willingly accept to leave Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet in the Lotbinière constituency. We indeed accept Saint-Apollinaire, quite naturally as I said before, but let Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet remain here.

Mr. Speaker, if Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet went to Frontenac, as proposed in the commissioners' report, the people in that municipality would be underrepresented. They would be represented in a totally inadequate way, not for partisan reasons, not because of lack of seriousness on the part of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Corriveau), but strictly because Dosquet has no contribution whatsoever either cultural, social, nor economic to make to the constituency of Frontenac. Mr. Speaker, Dosquet has no ties whatsoever with the whole of the constituency of Frontenac, which centers around Thetford Mines.

I therefore respectfully express the hope that the commissioners will accept to grant the absolutely unanimous request by the people in Dosquet that they remain as full-fledged citizens in the constituency of Lotbinière.

Mr. Speaker, Dosquet is quite near Saint-Flavien, not even five miles away, and very close also to Laurier Station. It is almost bordering the Trans-Canada Highway, and if it were to remain in Frontenac, it would be the last neighbouring parish in Frontenac, while they are naturally part of the rural basin of Lotbinière.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to bother the commissioners with that, but spontaneously the people in Dosquet, without partisanship signed a petition from which I shall quote, because I know that under our rules I cannot table it. But nevertheless, I want to show it to you, so that you may know how important that is to the citizens of Dosquet. We read this:

We, the undersigned, citizens of Saint-Octave-de-Dosquet, want to signify our objection to the transfer of our parish from the federal riding of Lotbinière to the federal riding of Frontenac.

For historic, geographic, economic and social reasons, we ask to remain citizens in the federal riding of Lotbinière.

In testimony whereof, we have signed:

Follow 571 signatures of citizens, constituents, from the municipality of Dosquet, who share the views I have just stated, indeed only as their humble spokesman to make the commissioners take their proposal into consideration.

In brief, to conclude that first point and introcuce the second one to the extent that we respect those famous quotients, since some principle must be the starting point in the redistribution of the electoral map, to the extent that it is materially possible and we comply with the principles of the representation quotient, we must make every effort to attain the highest degree of representativeness possible in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, Canada does not have 1,000 representatives as in other countries. Not even 500; we are only 264 members at present. The proposed formula in the report of the representation commissioners tend to increase that representation very slowly. Because of the quotient principle, the trend is towards rural members representing ever larger and less populated territories as against urban constituencies which become overpopulated but cover very limited areas. All this arises from our assumption that in a country as vast as Canada we cannot enlarge our Parliament since we cannot enlarge or improve our representation. In so far as we are caught in that kind of administrative strait jacket which of course cannot be discarded overnight, I hope that the commissioners, in the course of their review, since the law provides for those debates to reach them through you, Mr. Speaker, will realize the importance Canadians give to their being represented in the House of Commons, regardless of their political affiliations, therefore I believe and most hon. members I am sure will agree with me, that this is the kind of representation the commissioners will make.

It is very important for the people of Canada to identify themselves with their Parliament and with their M.Ps. It is important that their M.Ps. give them the best possible services. It is important that they have access to their M.P's door and be able to meet him. It is absolutely essential that the member of parliament have excellent communications not only to make laws public but also to inform his voters so that they avail themselves of this information and do not become victims of a law they were not aware of. When I speak for instance of the municipality of Dosquet, which is very dear to me, I must say it is exactly in the kind of situation I am referring to. Naturally, the people of this municipality are always in Lotbinière, but for the purposes of representation, if the commissioners were not to reconsider their position, they would be included in Frontenac with which Dosquet has no relationship.

Mr. Speaker, and this is how I should conclude, I think we should take advantage of this debate and start putting forward ideas for the future. Amongst others, and some of the members who have spoken before me have expressed the same views, there should be two for quotients representation purposes, one for the rural ridings and one for the urban ridings. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely essential. We must provide solutions for the next 20, 30 or 40 years, as administrators and legislators. Otherwise, we will end up with an absurd situation where rural Canada will be under-represented and where urban Canada will also be under-represented, because we will then have huge groupings, under the pretence of a unique quota from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important to have the two quota principle admitted, one for rural areas and one for urban areas, for which legislation should eventually be amended in order for Parliament to have the last say in that respect. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the quality of the commissioners' work. It is not easy, but I recognize—and I think the commissioners will also recognize it—no one is more qualified to forge than a blacksmith. And that Parliament which is the highest institution of Canadian democracy, which is the instrument of representation of the Canadian opinion, that is exactly what we are. The member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) for instance, will never be made the member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau),

and similarly, the member for Lotbinière will never be made the member for Drummond or Bellechasse. Each one of us is different. Besides being different by our own personality and by our own political party, we are different by our mentality, by the village we represent, by the piece of country that we represent.

The problems which we have to tackle daily are not always the same. They differ from one part of the country to another. Some members solely represent a rural area and their problem is wheat or milk in the rural constituencies or textile and furniture in other urban constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, it is important, since Parliament is the best representative institution, that Parliament should not only have its say about representation, but the last word, not that I do not have confidence in the commissioners, on the contrary but the commissioners of the Redistribution Commission should be there with the same capacity as many other commissions which we have entirely set up, as consultants to prepare the work, do the research annd prepare the necessary statistics.

Mr. Speaker, because of the very size of our country, we need to have of course a standing committee responsible for studying and finding methods and making recommendations to Cabinet and Parliament in order to achieve the highest degree of representation possible; and eventually the legislators should have this report before them and take the decisions which have to be taken.

I would therefore seize this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to ask the President of the Privy Council to take this recommendation very seriously—and I believe many members share in my opinion on this point—and to introduce as soon as possible a piece of legislation that will eliminate this anachronism which is responsible for us having this debate tonight. We know very well the various areas of our country. For example, it is sheer nonsense that the town of Dosquet should be part of Frontenac. It is normal, natural that it should be part of Lotbinière, and that would have almost no effect on the quotient of representation.

It would be only normal that the legislators have the final say and make the final decision, and this under the authority of a legislation which would govern this area of representation. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we refuse to face the problem. We just have to remember the last proposal that was made, which at that time had raised a general outcry among all hon. members and in every province of Canada because of the way the quotas had been established. Mr. Speaker, we know how much wheeling and dealing it took then to get Parliament to reject that proposal. Today, we have a proposal that, in the whole, as many members have pointed out, is generally acceptable except in a few areas such as Abitibi, eastern Quebec, and for instance the loss of the constituencies of Rivière-du-Loup or Abitibi to which hon. members have addressed themselves. Mr. Speaker, it is all the more important that Parliament have its say as regards representation. I would quote one more example to show the importance of the second point I made and point out how important it is for Parliament, through a particular piece of legislation, to have its say in this matter, since it is the representative body of this country. The Abitibi region is a typical example, it covers a huge area with a population as important as that of Lotbinière, Montreal, Quebec city, Trois-Rivières or Drummond. These people are entitled to the same representation. These people have the same rights as any other citizen. They are full-fledged taxpayers. As far as I know, the people from Abitibi must pay the same taxes as in other parts of the country. Why then should they be deprived of such an effective representation in Parliament, because they are living in a huge area that is not as densely populated as downtown Montreal?

Mr. Speaker, when such criteria are used, the result is sheer nonsense. The commissioners cannot be blamed for this kind of nonsense. They are working with the tools we gave them. We should be the ones to blame. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have somehow buried our heads in the sand. As they say in English, at a given point in time: "Give me the tools and I will do the job." That is more or less what is happening now. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have the right, as members of Parliament, to allow a reduction in the representation of some regions on the grounds that they are vast territories.

The people of Abitibi are not responsible for that, neither are the people of Rivière-du-Loup. When we are referring to a change concerning Saint-Octave de Dosquet, that is a very small change indeed. Actually, it means having a particular parish in one riding rather than in another. That is a kind of problem the Commission can easily solve, without disturbing anybody. But when it comes to the representation of a whole group of people or a given territory, that is quite another matter, Mr. Speaker, and I think that at that level the Canadian Parliament must protect—I repeat protect—the rights of Canadians to a fair and equal degree of representation in Parliament from sea to sea. Whatever the language, the location in the country or the education. Therefore, the President of the Privy Council who is responsible for this should put as soon as possible a legislation before this Parliament which would give the Canadian Parliament the authority required both to establish a standing commission on representativeness in Canada and on electoral boundaries. This commission would not simply draw lines but come up with figures, in particular on the participation of the Canadian people inside these fictitious lines, so that each citizen anywhere inside these fictitious lines has the same fair representation in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, we discuss the salaries of members of Parliament. There are some exceptions so that some members from remote areas may have higher expense accounts to visit their ridings. It is a well known fact here. Why? To give a member greater facility and some equity compared to his other colleagues. If we do so and if we allow this type of exception because of the remoteness factor for some members, why not do so more especially for the citizens of these ridings? It costs nothing to Parliament. It only costs the principle of a citizen living in Malartic, in Rivière-du-Loup, in Drummondville, in Victoriaville, in Montmagny, who has the same representativeness in Parliament. It would then be up to him to choose a political option likely to give him that representativeness, but this Parliament will have at least given him the right to have his own member of Parliament in his riding, who typically represents his region. Then, Mr. Speaker, the member is more accessible and the citizen may then obtain some services and some information from him.

But if one starts out only on the basis of a quantitative numerical quota leading to fictitious lines, one ends up with extremely vast, extended territories like the riding of Abitibi which is absolutely extraordinary, in fact an aberration.

On the other hand, a riding in Montreal, for instance, with a population of 80 to 100,000 people, barely covers a few blocks. Mr. Speaker, that is important! Another factor is important and it will be my last point. In a municipality like Saint-Octave de Dosquet, everyone knows everyone else. It is an entity by itself, it constitutes a town. One knows everyone else, people help each other and join forces. People meet on the church steps and take part in the parochial life. In a municipality like Montreal, one does not even know one's next door neighbour in the same apartment building.

Mr. Speaker, many frustrations result when those small factors are not taken into consideration, as they are not actually so unimportant after all because of their human importance.

That is why I shall allow myself to conclude by expressing the wish, humbly and respectfully, that the hon. commissionners will take into account my representations, not so much about the bill to be introduced, since that is the responsibility of the President of the Privy Council, but with regard to the municipality of Saint-Octave de Dosquet, that it might meet the wishes of the people who want to be represented as they now are, within the riding of Lotbinière exactly in the same way, Mr. Speaker, as we are happy to welcome the people of Saint-Apollinaire, the municipality and the parish which naturally are part of Lotbinière.

● (2300)

Mr. J.-Roland Comtois (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acquaint this House and the members of the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Quebec with the reason why I raised an objection to the recommendations contained in the commission report tabled in this House on Friday, February 27, 1976.

But before doing so, I should like to congratulate and thank the commissioners, more particularly its chairman, Mr. Justice François Chevalier, for the attention they gave to the 17-page brief that I had the privilege to present on Tuesday, August 19, 1975, at the commission hearing in Hull, Quebec.

On the whole, the commission accepted the recommendations I had made for the area north of Montreal which is of particular concern to me, and I think that the members of this area will support my view that most of us are satisfied with the changes introduced by the commission. Now, once more, I wish to thank the commissioners for the understanding they have shown towards our area.

The rationale behind the objection I raised are the following: First, the commission did not earnestly consider the feeling of belonging to a particular area in choosing the name they gave to a specific constituency, namely Deux-Montagnes. In addition, when the commission chose the name of this riding, it did not consider well enough the importance of the number of citizens who are identified with the area for geographical, political and historical reasons, particularly the region of Blainville to which I shall refer later. The commission should also consider the importance of the two very distinct territories which make up the new riding.

The first point I should like to raise, Mr. Speaker, is a historical point concerning the area of Blainville. Before telling the story of this region, I should like to thank particularly the hon. Lionel Bertrand, who was a member of the House of Commons for 17 years, a former minister of the Quebec government under Mr. Lesage, a legislative councillor, a journalist and a historian on occasion, who provided me with background for my remarks. In 1683, the king of France granted to the illustrious soldier Sidrac DuGué de Boisbriand the seigniory of The Thousand Islands.

It is the territory presently occupied by the towns of Sainte-Thérèse, Blainville, Boisbriand, Rosemère, Lorraine, Bois-des-Filion and some parts of Saint-Augustin, Sainte-Monique and Saint-Janvier. In 1714, the Thousand Islands fief is enlarged and covers then the area known today as Saint-Eustache added to the original territory. The new fief is divided between the son in law of DuGué de Boisbriand: Jean Petit takes the part of Saint-Eustache and Charles Gaspard de Langloiserie, the part of Sainte-Thérèse, the original territory.

In 1718, Marie-Thérèse DuGué de Boisbriand, widow of Charles Gaspard de Langloiserie takes over the seigniory and she makes the first concessions in 1740. Her daughter, Suzanne de Langloiserie, marries the soldier Jean-Baptiste Céleron de Blainville. The Blainville reside in the seigniory, more precisely in the territory of the present town of Boisbriand. In 1743, the Thousand Islands seigniory becomes the Blainville seigniory.

Their daughter, Thérèse de Blainville who takes over in 1768 develops intensively the seigniory and gives her name to the parish of Sainte-Thérèse de Blainville founded in 1789 and that serves all the territory mentioned above. In 1789, Thérèse de Blainville who became Mrs. Nolan Lamarque places the seigniory in the hands of notary Joseph Hubert Lacroix who became in 1792 the first hon. member for Terrebonne then the county of Effingham. Later, he will become seignior de Blainville in 1806 and his son Janvier Domptail Lacroix succeeds him in 1818.

Briefly, this is the history of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville, of Boisbriand, of Saint-Janvier-de-Blainville and of Saint-Janvier-de-Lacroix. The parish of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville, incorporated as a municipality in 1845, covers the same territory as in the canonical sense. Thus, the municipality of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville, as years went by, gave away parts of its territory to make up the whole or part of other municipalities: Saint-Augustin (1845), Saint-Janvier (1846), the village or town of Sainte-Thérèse (1849), Sainte-Monique (1872), Sainte-Thérèse-Ouest ou Boisbriand in 1946, Rosemère in 1947, Bois-des-Filion in 1949 and Lorraine in 1960. The balance of the territory became in 1968 the town of Blainville. Thus, the towns of Sainte-Thérèse, Boisbriand, Blainville, Rosemère and Lorraine form a homogenous municipal group, united by 293 years of history, of religious and community life.

When reference is made to Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville, people immediately have in mind the area occupied by the above mentioned towns. When one hears Sainte-Thérèse, one thinks immediately of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville.

And if you say: And if someone says Blainville, we know he means Sainte-Thérèse. We include Sainte-Thérèse-Ouest, that is the town of Boisbriand, established in honour of the founder and his daughter. As far as education is concerned, we have the regional board of Blainville-Deux-Montagnes. The name Blainville applies directly to one area and Deux-Montagnes the nearly region. All the territory of greater Sainte-Thérèse including Rosemère, Lorraine and Bois-des-Fillion is serviced by the postal office of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville. For all this territory, the land register of the village and parish of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Blainville is being used and it cannot be otherwise. Mr. Speaker, all this underlines the importance of the name of Blainville in our area and in that which is being considered for this new riding. Now I would like to quote some statistics in order to stress the size of the population of both areas, namely Blainville and Deux-Montagnes.

The Blainville district covers a territory of 48 square miles and the Deux-Montagnes district covers a territory of 50 square miles, which make them almost similar. The Blainville district consists of five municipalities: Boisbriand, Lorraine, Blainville, Sainte-Thérèse and Rosemère; the Deux-Montagnes district has five municipalities: Saint-Eustache, Deux-Montagnes, Sainte-Marthe-sur-le-lac, Saint-Joseph-du-Lac and Pointe-Calumet.

If we examine the population of these two groups of municipalities in 1961, the Blainville district had a population of 25,087 while the Deux-Montagnes district had a population of 19,995. In 1971, if one examines again the statistics, one realizes that the population of the Blainville district was 43,938, that is 80 per cent more, while Deux-Montagnes has a population of 32,858 representing a 65 per cent increase.

We can see that the population of the Blainville district is slightly more important in 1971 than that of the Deux-Montagnes. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that after the 1981 census, and given the same increase that the one which has taken place between 1961 and 1971, this progression will be even a greater, due to the fact that the Mirabel project announced in 1971 is already having a considerable impact on the development of this region.

After 1981, it will be necessary to divide this new constituency in two, as a result of the population increase, and then it will be possible to name one of those constituencies Blainville and the other Deux-Montagnes. If this change were made now, as I suggested, we would settle the problem and kill two birds with one stone.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a well-established practice recognized by this House and all political parties, namely that each time a change of name of a constituency is requested by an hon. member through a private bill, the change is accepted. If the Commission agreed to the proposed change, it would eliminate the need to introduce a private bill, which would save time for this House and money for the Canadian taxpayers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am merely asking the Commission to change the name of the constituency of Deux-Montagnes to that of Blainville-Deux-Montagnes.

● (2310)

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to make a few remarks as so many of my colleagues on a matter which interests all hon. members and their constituents. I would like of course to congratulate all hon. members who have taken the floor, which clearly demonstrate their concern for their constituents, who give us their opinions on the electoral changes which are made at various times.

I would like to say right now, as many of my colleagues, that the work of the Electoral Boundaries Commission is for from easy. I would also like to congratulate the Commission for the work they have done and especially for the concern they showed at meetings, or about the comments made at public hearings.

Of course, as far as my riding is concerned, the first proposal made, I think a year and a half or two years ago, was rejected. It would have provided 74 ridings in Québec and now the Commission is submitting a second proposal which will give 75 ridings to Québec. Being from that province, I am very glad to see that we will have an additional riding; as would be the case for any other member who would see the representation of his province increased.

So, I appreciate much more the new proposal, because in the first case my riding would have been dealt in a way that would have brought comments not only from my constituents but also from the municipal authorities. So the original proposal had to be modified and, after the hearing, the Commission took into account the recommendations which had been made. I can share the concern expressed earlier by my colleague from Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois) who submitted a brief at that same hearing. It was largely been taken into account. As for most of my colleagues on the northern side, I would not say they are entirely satisfied but almost so. As far as I am concerned, I am very pleased by this very interesting improvement. Therefore, in these circumstances, I would like to thank the chairman and the members of this commission who have understook the importance and the seriousness of the recommendations made by various people.

When population figures are being considered, I would like to invite the Commission to take into account as much as possible, and I know it is not always easy, the social and economic factors when changes are to be made.

I know it is difficult to coordinate all those aspects. But it is always the same issue that keeps coming back as there are changes really difficult to accept. Tonight we heard some comments which are definitively justified. But to what extent should we, as members of this House, examine this future possibility? And if some changes are to be made according to the proposals before this House, I suppose that the Commission will be tempted to listen to the comments made tonight and to recognize the difference between an urban and a rural area. I am one of those who believe it is unthinkable to give the same figures for a rural and a urban riding. Considering all the differences, the demands are different and the number of services is also different. Therefore I think it would be unthinkable to believe, if we want to be fair to the people that the member of an urban riding should have the same number of constituents than the member of a rural riding.

I do not wish to extend this evening further as I know that my colleagues of other provinces are interested in discussing and making their comments and they will cer-

tainly be very wise comments. However, Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention, as others did, and I think it is perfectly logical, this change that unfortunately made me lose very good parishes. I should like to say that when we have worked in parishes for years we know them better and we know better their problems and the people who live there. I am very sad that because of these changes I will lose very interesting parishes that I did know very well and with which I always cooperated in a large extent. Also, I must say that I am very pleased and I welcome the new parishes that will be added to my riding and that I shall try to represent as well as possible. Finally, can the Commission readjust the boundaries to seriously account for the relationship between parishes that are even more easily related to the constituency of Joliette? But even if those parishes are in the neighbouring constituency of Berthier, I will still have the privilege of living near them. It is not always easy, of course—

Mr. Prud'homme: You cannot represent both constituencies.

Mr. La Salle: I am not saying that, Mr. Speaker the hon. member for Saint-Denis reminds me I will not represent both ridings. I am aware of that. But I am happy to see that the parishes will still be close to Joliette, which will allow me to meet some good friends among the thousands of constituents the majority of whom have put their trust in me. I regret of course to see those parishes go. Must we submit to the findings of the Commission inasmuch as it did prepare good recommendations? I hope nonetheless that, considering the comments heard this evening, the Commission or subsequent ones making potential changes will take into account valid remarks, and I am convinced that everyone who participated in tonight's debate had in mind the well-being of their fellow-Canadians.

● (2320)

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, in view of the unanimous applause versus the point I am going to make, I hope we are going to remain as unanimous as we are this evening.

Because it is so very late, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be extremely brief in presenting my case.

From the very start, the commissioners have been congratulated, and that is all very well. Still, I would like to stress the fact that I should have appreciated, even at this late hour, their presence in the galleries. I hope they were there during the day and heard the wishes expressed by the hon. members who made comments concerning the ridings they represent here in this House.

I should have hoped that the commissioners would have been here in the galleries; we know they cannot attend the sittings of the House, but they should at least have had the decency of sitting in the galleries to find out what is now going on. If that is an exercise in democracy, I agree whole-heartedly, but I really would have liked the commissioners to hear the debate on the electoral ridings.

The first point that I wanted to make concerns the report filed and read during the public hearings of September 4 last, that is the report submitted by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Laval concerning the new electoral boundaries.

The City of Laval is the second largest city in Quebec where population is concerned. The City of Laval is now asked to share its development, which has bad no equal in Canada in the last few years.

I believe that we should take for granted the fact that the population is as shown by the 1971 Census. In view of the development of Laval during the last five years, I hope that this considerable population increase will also be taken into consideration. A report was filed on September 4 last at the Court House by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Laval, and I also made representations on behalf of the City of Laval stating that the city represents a unit in itself as concerns economic and sociological problems, as well as political considerations perhaps, as the hon. member said earlier, but this I can easily brush aside. In my opinion, since we are a steadily growing city, we do not want—and I am now expressing the views of the mayor of the City of Laval, Dr. Lucien Paiement—to become some day a mere suburb of the Montreal urban community.

Mr. Speaker, you can be assured that I shall be the first to support the mayor of Laval by saying that we do not want to be incorporated in the Montreal urban community. I would like to submit again the brief tabled on September 4 last concerning the problems that this could cause eventually, and to once again submit my arguments, especially to prove that in view of the present development, the island of Laval should have three seats in the House of Commons and not two seats and a half; that is to say that one seat is now shared with the Ahuntsic riding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if no change is eventually to be made, we shall welcome all the able and willing voters of the Ahuntsic riding to fall in with the City of Laval because our ambitions are known.

● (2330)

The potential as far as urbanization is concerned is there, but we must not forget that the reason why I am trying for the last time to sensitize the commissioners about the limits of the constituency in which the city of Laval is situated, is the report submitted on September 4 last. I hope that we will learn why the report submitted at the public hearing held on September 4 last by the Laval Chamber of Commerce was not accepted.

If I have risen this evening, Mr. Speaker, it is to try for the last time, on behalf of my constituents of the city of Laval, to explain that we should have three seats in the House of Commons. But once again, if the Commission wishes to divide part of the city of Montreal, namely the constituency of Ahuntsic, we will welcome it but we do not intend, as far as I am concerned, to become part of the metropolitan area of Montreal.

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the Commission who to some extent took into account the recommendations I had made during the hearing which took place in Montreal on September 4th, 1975. It is my duty tonight to take part in this debate in order to express my point of view to the members

of the Commission which will have to make up the new federal electoral boundaries for Quebec.

I will limit my remarks to five ridings situated in the heart of the Eastern Townships, I mean the ridings of Sherbrooke, Richmond, Shefford, Saint-Hyacinthe and Drummond. I know very well that it is very difficult to bring many changes to the boundaries of the other ridings of the Eastern Townships which are already limited by the American border, as in the case of the ridings of Missisquoi and Compton.

I know very well, Mr. Speaker, the gwographic location of the five ridings as I mentioned as I know very well the impact of the variations in the electoral population of any of these ridings because, as a representative for one of these ridings, I have served in this majestic place many more years than any other of my colleagues who represent the four other ridings, and I mean my colleagues from Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), from Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier), from Drummond (Mr. Pinard), and from Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner).

While studying very closely the population problem and while taking into account the geography of each of the ridings, I noticed first, M. Speaker, that the Richmond riding had 27,429 voters less on the 1974 voting lists than the Sherbrooke riding. Although these two ridings are close to each other, they are kind of competing with each other.

If I add the number of voters on the voting lists of Richmond in 1974 and on those of Sherbrooke the same year, I get the total of 104,581 voters and when I divide this figure by 2, I get a theoretical average of 52,290 electors by riding. This means 322 voters less in each riding and it also means that the average of 52,612 voters we get when we add the number of electors in each of the five ridings of the area is divided by five to get a theoretical average.

This means that, to get a better balance of the voting population in each of the five ridings and this is where the work of the Commission is very important, we should first study the possibilities which could allow us to get a better balance right from the start.

● (2340)

I refer to populations of voters in ridings next to mine, Richmond and Sherbrooke, the two ridings in the area which already had the greatest gap between them in 1974, before this tremendous difference in the number of electors, was maintained in 1976 in the new redistribution proposed by the commission.

According to the proposal before us, the riding of Sherbrooke would have a population of at least 84,595 electors, while Richmond riding would have 65,983, which would maintain a gap of more than 20,000 within two years or at the next federal general election, due to a possible greater increase in the urban riding of Sherbrooke in comparison with the slower growth of Richmond riding during the same period.

On the electoral lists of 1974 for the riding of Sherbrooke, 66,005 voters were registered.

There were 56,801 registered voters on the 1974 electoral lists for the riding of Saint-Hyacinthe, 51,856 for the riding of Shefford, 49,826 for the riding of Drummond, and 38,576 for the riding of Richmond, for a total of 263,064 voters registered on the 1974 electoral lists for those five ridings, or an average of 52,612 voters by riding.

The riding of Sherbrooke had thus 13,383 more voters appearing on its 1974 electoral lists than the average for the ridings in the area. And the riding of Sherbrooke also had 27,429 more voters on its 1974 electoral lists than the riding of Richmond. While the riding of Saint-Hyacinthe had 4,189 more voters than the average for the four other ridings, it had nevertheless 9,199 fewer voters on its lists than the riding of Sherbrooke.

However, of the five constituencies mentioned, it seems that the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe is the one that would undergo under the proposal before us the most important geographical changes compared to 1974. For the proposal before us would remove from the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe the town of Marieville and amalgamate it with Chambly, while the towns of Saint-Hilaire and Otterburn Park as well as the parishes of Saint-Charles and Saint-Denis-sur-le-Richelieu, and the parishes of Saint-Bernard and Saint-Jude would become part of the new constituency of Verchères.

Since the commission seems to have to do a rather important shift in the population of the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe of 1974 to create the new constituency of Verchères, my proposal will take this fact into account and recommend that these changes benefit the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe in order to correct at the same time the excessively large difference in population between the constituencies of Sherbrooke and Richmond, as I mentioned at the outset of my remarks, and finally to strike a better balance between the five constituencies concerned, without for all that making too many changes in several constituencies.

Following the numerous changes proposed in the 1974 geographical map of the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe, I very humbly ask the members of the federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec to kindly consider the following proposal: Drummond would not undergo any change as proposed by the commission and would have, according to the 1971 census, a population of 69,109.

Saint-Hyacinthe would remain as proposed by the commission, excluding however the population of Acton Vale, Saint-André-d'Acton and Sainte-Christine-de-Bagot; these localities would remain in Shefford as they have always been, which would give the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe, according to the 1971 census, a population of 68,932.

Richmond, such as proposed by the commission, would get the populations of Rock Forest and of Deauville who belonged to the riding of Sherbrooke in 1974 and are now on the present boundaries of the riding of Richmond. According to the 1971 census, this would amount to a population of 71,842 for the riding of Richmond. According to the suggestion of the commission, after the municipalities of Rock Forest and Deauville are transferred to Richmond, Sherbrooke would have a population of 84,595 according to the last census.

Shefford would remain as in 1974; according to the 1971 census, it had a population of 79,083. I would greatly appreciate that the municipality of Bromont which,

according to the last census, had a population of 666 in 1971 and which became one of the main tourist resorts in North America, would remain as before in the riding of Shefford because it is 6 miles away from Granby, which is presently the most progressive industrial town on the south shore.

However it is reluctantly that I would accept decision of the commission which, according to the proposal under debate, wants the electors of Bromont to be transferred to the riding of Brome-Missisquoi, because I would not like the commission to think I am against every change it has proposed for the riding of Shefford.

I should now like, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the changes or possible increases in the population of those five ridings, which will be felt at the next federal election and might substantially change the statistics relating to the population as compared to the last census. I would therefore like to proceed riding after riding and analyze those possible shifts in the population, based on the figures of the last census and on the proposal I made earlier, which I would ask the members of the commission to examine and accept. As I suggested, the last census of 1971 gave the riding of Sherbrooke 84,595 people. However, given the increase in Sherbrooke's population since 1971, that riding will still be the one among the five which will have the greatest population. I think it should have at least 100,000 inhabitants at the next federal election.

According to my forecast and the latest 1971 census, the Shefford riding will have about 79,000 people and I contend it will rank second out of the five with a population of 85,000 when the next federal election comes up.

Also according to my forecast and the latest census, the Richmond riding will come third, if not second, with 80,000 or perhaps 85,000 population, due to the substantial increase in the number of Black Forest residents which will be felt on the next federal electoral rolls, since there are at present over 1500 family dwellings being built for the year 1976 only. The same increase is expected for the two following years, which means the Richmond riding will have a better population balance compared with the other ridings concerned, and it would also help reduce the present population discrepancy between Richmond and its closest neighbour Sherbrooke, as I pointed out in my remarks tonight. According to my forecast and the latest census, the 68,932 population of Saint-Hyacinthe will increase substantially by the next federal elections, particularly in view of the development of the towns of Douville and Sainte-Rosalie which are situated on the outskirts of Saint-Hyacinthe, which means Saint-Hyacinthe will have at least 78,000 people by the time of the next federal election.

● (2350)

Under the proposal of the commission to which I do not suggest any change, I believe that Drummond will be the last of the five ridings with a population of about 75,000. In summary, according to the last census and my own estimation, Sherbrooke which now has 84,595 residents would be home to at leats 100,000 people at the next federal election. The population of the riding of Shefford, now 78,379, would be 85,000; the population of the riding of Richmond, now 71,842, would go up from 80,000 to 85,000 or may be more; the population of Saint-Hyacinthe, now 68,932, would be 78,000 and that of Drummond, now 68,109, could reach 75,000.

Mr. Speaker, those are logical comments. They are mainly statistics, taking into account better representation for all constituencies in the area and also taking into account the five ridings which would not have any important change but would have a better balanced population, than they did in the federal election of 1974. Then we had the riding of Sherbrooke, and the riding of Richmond, with a difference of 25,000 constituents. Simply by making the minor changes I suggested tonight, we could have five ridings in the Eastern Township without altering the boundaries proposed by the commission for a better redistribution within the boundaries of those five ridings.

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very short because it is already very late. I should like simply to meditate publicly and to have the members of this House pondering with me over the problems which the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Commission for the province of Quebec must have met, as also must have the Electoral boundaries Readjustment Commissions for the other provinces. I shall address myself more specifically to the one I know best, the one for the province of Quebec. And I think that, for the sake of objectivity, we must congratulate the commissioners for carrying out their very difficult task with such gusto. I mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Commission for the province of Quebec, as undoubtedly the commissions for the other provinces, had a very hard job to do and had been given specific terms of reference by the House of Commons. The commissioners could not in any way take into account, for instance, population projections for the future. They had to base their decisions exclusively on the 1971 census. It is on the other hand what caused the problems. I am inclined to believe, after having listened carefully to representations which have been put forward since yesterday, that many members in the House were a little mislead when they asked the judges to follow criteria not allowed by the act, that is taking into consideration developments to come relating to the distribution they had performed. For example, I recall the statement made earlier by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) when he said: there are five ridings in my area, so why not have an equal number of constituents in those ridings? But the terms of reference of the commission is clear, or at least it seems clear to me.

For the commission must take into consideration geography and also entities it has to analyze. For instance, when it is said that Sherbrooke should be like the riding of Richmond, I say it is unfair to compare those two ridings like that.

As everyone knows, Sherbrooke is an urban riding, while Richmond is a rural riding. I suggest it is in agreement with the spirit of the law passed by the House to ask the commissioners to keep in mind in their discussions that a rural riding must have fewer people than an urban riding. That is provided for and they took that into account. They have submitted a report in that respect, which I find reasonable.

I must say that these are only examples. I could give many more; for instance when it is said that Rock Forest in

the province of Quebec should not be part of the riding of Shefford but of another riding.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Eastern Townships throughway, for instance, is the backbone of the Shefford riding and when using it it hardly takes twenty minutes to go from one end of the city to the other. Surely this explains that the commissioners have been able to keep Rock Forest in the Shefford riding.

I only refer to a few small examples in order to point out how difficult it is to get satisfaction. If we want to be parochial or personal about it, I would be compelled to say I am really sorry to see my riding completely dismantled and that in my short political career of 12 years, it is the third time that my riding is completely changed. Of course, this will oblige me to establish all the new necessary political relationships.

The Electoral Commission is not here to please honourable members but—and it may be a bit idealistic to speak in this way—to discharge a mandate intented to better distribute the number of seats each province must have and to take specific criteria under consideration.

I think that in Montreal, for instance, the Electoral Commission has heard representations during appeals that were held in September and it took them into account especially as regards downtown and lower town in the city of Montreal. The Commission realized that it was reasonable to have ridings with north to south rather than east to west relationship. They realized that problems created at that time were almost impossible to overcome by any one member alone. I think the Commission was very wise in recognizing that situation and agreeing to the request made to them in Montreal when they held hearings in the Court of Montreal last September.

Mr. Speaker, I would like my riding to remain unchanged as well, but it is impossible. I regret as other honourable members do, I am sure, the parts of the constituency I represent that I should normally lose should I run in the next general election and that will go to another riding.

Mr. Speaker, the commission had a duty to fulfil, and I shall conclude my remarks with what I have said earlier, that the commission had clear and specific terms of reference. They are not responsible for the error made by lawmakers in not allowing them to take into account future developments in population transfers.

This could have allowed the commission to give three constituencies to Laval Island. This would have been an excellent suggestion. But the commission remained within their terms of reference. I therefore suggest that we, as lawmakers, or our successors think of the terms of reference we will have to issue to future redistribution commissions, in order that commissioners in various provinces may base their judgments and redistributions within each province on population moves that may happen between the time of their analyses and the next election.

Mr. Speaker, such is not the case today. Therefore, I feel the commissioners would be well advised and fully justified to come down with an electoral map quite similar to the one we have been discussing today, even though each one of us may feel sad about it.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

I know my remarks are not that popular. But such is the way a member must speak in this House, even at this late hour.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say in conclusion, that I hope, as I said at the beginning and all through my comments, that in the future, Parliament, or the legislators will be very careful when a redistribution of the electoral districts will again be required and that they will make sure that the terms of reference which are given to the commissioners reflect the objectives of the House of Commons; meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I think the commissioners must be commended for the efforts they have made and those who believe that the urban ridings have more people than the rural ridings have the right to think so. I represent an urban riding myself and I would like to see as everybody else does, an equal number of people all across the province but we have to recognize the vastness of the territory covered by some rural constituencies with all the problems this implies. It is, therefore, only normal that the urban ridings of metropolitan centres such as Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver should have more people than rural ridings. The commissioners have taken this fact into consideration as the law allows them to do so, since they were allowed margin of 25 per cent above or under their quotients.

In most electoral districts which I have examined across Canada, the redistribution they propose seems very wise. All they have to do now is to be good enough to read carefully the speeches delivered by the members of each province, and see if it would not be possible, not so much as to please the members of Parliament because I think this would be a little too personal as I said at the beginning of my remarks, and I would be myself inclined to make vigorous representations so that my native parish stays within the riding that I represent.

Admittedly, these are very personal remarks and even if I do hope for it, it should not be discussed in the House. What the commission must keep in mind is to consider again, in the light of all these representations whether they are all acceptable while keeping in mind the terms of reference of the Commission which requires that it must take into account only the population figure as obtained on the day, the census was made.

The error is not theirs but Parliament's in that it keeps the gap between rural and urban ridings. Let me give you as an example the riding of Richmond versus that of Sherbrooke; it is normal for the riding of Sherbrooke to have more population than that of Richmond. That is acceptable, and can be justified with the people, because it is logical.

Mr. Speaker, I close in thanking you for your patience. I feel the commission gave us a reasonable report and, reasonable as we know its members are, they will surely consider as much as possible the representations that are being made in this House; if they can, they will present us with a map that corresponds somewhat to those wishes, but they will change nothing for the fun of changing or of pleasing, and only as a result of representations that are not personal but concerned instead with the welfare and well-being of the people we represent.

● (Midnight)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It appears that there is no more debate on the objections to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec. The House having heard these objections, it is my duty, pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to refer the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, together with copies of objections, and also a copy of the *Debates of the House of Commons* back to the commission for reconsideration thereof.

The House will now resume consideration of the objections to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Nova Scotia.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in what I call the Macbeth debate. Macbeth, as we know from reading the great play, murdered sleep.

Before I finish my remarks regarding Nova Scotia, and I will finish them very, very quickly, if I could be allowed to be out of order for about a minute—and I would not have been if I had taken part in the debate which preceded with regard to either Ontario or Quebec—I should like to say that I think the hon. members from northern Ontario really made a case to have that extra seat back. The hon. members from northern Quebec made a pretty good case as well. When there are wide open areas, there should be more generosity with regard to the number of voting bodies which have to be found in them.

When I was speaking previously in this particular debate, I said that the MacDonald electoral commission in Nova Scotia had done what I considered to be a good job, but I added, perhaps from an excess of verbosity, that I thought it had blundered in one area, and that is the area of western Nova Scotia. Actually, it was the Samuel de Champlain area before he moved on to lesser green pastures in *La Belle Province,* but Samuel de Champlain and his group originally settled on the shores of the Annapolis basin. It is on those shores that the only real dispute exists with regard to the Nova Scotia ridings today. It is a touchy situation, and probably is not helped very much by the remarks of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) in this House earlier today, or by his remarks on a previous occasion. However, I do not intend to get into that sort of situation. What I really want to do, in backing up the argument of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) that the electoral commission take another look at its work, is to suggest a place where there might be a remedy.

One thing which has impressed me about the debate so far has been that the members have been trying to help the electoral commission solve the problems, that is, that there were not just complaints, but there were the best suggestions hon. members could come up with as to how the commission might proceed to redesign boundaries. It is in that spirit that I take part in this debate.

I used the word "blunder" with regard to the divisions in western Nova Scotia; nobody asked me to, but I should like to withdraw that word. I think I was excessively verbose when I used it. Perhaps I was carried away by my own speech, and I did an injustice to people who have worked very hard and who have tried to make sense out of the decision which always takes place when seats have to be divided up in any province. Everyone in the House at least should be thankful that the commissioners have been given the job and that members of parliament no longer have to fall upon each other like cannibals, as happened in the old days when members of parliament themselves carried out redistribution rather than an independent commission.

When I was concluding my remarks the other day I suggested that if the commission were to look around for areas which could fit into different ridings, it should start at the hub of Nova Scotia, the Mount Uniacke area. I believe it is now the fastest growing area in Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) may quarrel with that, but I believe Mount Uniacke is growing faster than Shubenacadie and Bedford, Shubenacadie being in my present constituency and Bedford being in the constituency of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. He may have a faster growing area in Cole Harbour. In any event, it seems to me that if the commission were to listen to our plea, it might very well take a look at the Mount Uniacke area as something which could either fit into the valley riding—that is assuming that the valley was to lose its East Hants portion—or it could still retain the Mount Uniacke portion which would represent a fair population.

Mount Uniacke could also fit into the western Halifax seat, so if the commission is going to make changes, that is an area where a very viable area can be placed into either one of two particular ridings. As far as the valley riding losing the East Hants portion or the rest of the East Hants portion of Mount Uniacke is concerned, East Hants is more Truro orientated or more Windsor orientated, so it could go in with a riding which has either one of those towns within it. It would be more especially Truro orientated if the Shubenacadie river crossing, for which I have argued all the time I have represented East Hants in this House, were ever to be built. It seems to have fallen the victim of restraint in Nova Scotia these days, and I will be saying something about that in another debate in a few days time. However, I point out that East Hants can go either way, into a valley riding or into a Truro riding. This also gives a little bit of flexibility.

It has been my privilege in this parliament to have represented 130,000 or more people, the largest number in Atlantic Canada, with the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East hot on my trail a few hundred behind. The reason is that between the two of us we represent the growth areas of Nova Scotia, and areas that are going to continue to grow. The commission might bear this in mind. The census upon which this boundary division is taking place will be tens of thousands below what is going to exist in both of those suburban areas of Halifax and Dartmouth in even a few years time. They might very well take this into consideration if they should decide to readjust the seats.

● (0010)

My closing remark in this debate is that the 130,000 that I represent and the 130,000 that my friend, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), represents, is about 50 per cent more than any other member of this House from the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I join in this debate to lend support to the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan). I share in the observations he made earlier in this debate as well as those made by my colleague, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), with respect to certain directions the commission should take if it reconsiders the report which it has presented to us. As the hon. member for Annapolis Valley and the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants have indicated, they put in a lot of effort and gave a lot of thoughtful concern to this. I share in those views and support them.

I support the hon. member for Annapolis Valley because I was born in the Annapolis Valley. It is my home. I was born on the shores of the Annapolis basin. It was truly part, albeit one end, of the Annapolis Valley. I grew up there. I was ousted by the establishment of Cornwallis, the basically Canadian but actually Commonwealth naval training establishment during World War II.

After being ousted from that part of the country because of the full development of the naval training establishment, I went to Middleton, the home town of my grandparents. It was there I went to school and spent my formative years. Therefore, I do have some association with the Annapolis Valley. Indeed it is historic in terms of my father, grandfather, and his parents before him, although there is a little Irish mixed in there somewhere.

The Annapolis Valley has a connotation to Canadians. It has an international reputation. There is a fondness for those of us who from time to time concern ourselves with Canadian history. In the sense of English establishments, it is the oldest part of Canada.

The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants spoke about the contributions and the first development of that area by Samuel de Champlain. However, in terms of the history of the area, we speak about 100 years later than that. Whether it began in the early 1600's or the latter part of that century is not important. What is important is that the land of Évangéline, the Annapolis Valley, connotes something to everyone you talk to, be it in Canada, some other part of North America, South America, Europe, or some other part of the world. It is important historically.

It is incumbent upon us in this era when we so quickly and callously dispose of our symbols that we pause for a minute or two. I commend to the MacDonald commission this very brief sentiment. Perhaps we should once in a while take time to regret this continuous erosion of what may be intangible but nevertheless is very real when trying to find out from whence we came.

I find it very comforting in the city of my colleague and my city, although I have been across the harbour for most of my life, to walk down Spring Garden Road. I stop to look at the old courthouse. When I walk 100 feet to my right I pass the cathedra. This represents something to me.

When I walk another 50 feet and look to my right, I see the residence of the lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia. These are three important referral points.

When I am confused about where we have been and where we are headed, I find it very comforting to look at the law and the interpretation of it, that which guides and protects us. It interprets our work as legislators. That is comforting.

I find it comforting to look at the church. It is part of our heritage. It is comforting to look at the lieutenant government governor's residence. That is as much a part of my heritage as the Annapolis Valley. Hon. members may find it strange that I talk so much about the Annapolis Valley when my constituency is basically in Halifax county. I do so because it is important.

It is important to remember that the number of people we represent is not important. What is important is that we represent communities of interest. It matters not to me whether I represent 125,000, 130,000, 180,000 or 200,000. If that community of interest is common, my job is relatively simple. I could have one more person in my office at $10,000 or $15,000 a year. It would have the Chamber and the taxpayers of Canada between $150,000 and $200,000 a year.

Numbers are not important. What people require is their day in court. Whether they are right or wrong, they require representation. They need to know that when their member of parliament stands up in this place, most of the time he is representing their point of view. I point that out to Commissioner MacDonald and his fellow commissioners. All these considerations are important.

The number of members in this Chamber should not be increased but we should improve the quality of representation. God knows, my opponent will turn that comment against me and say, "Throw him out, I can do a better job." I am prepared to stand aside, so long as we do not lose sight of that principle which is important.

● (0020)

You see, Mr. Speaker, little girls in Dartmouth-Halifax East do not run around with little boys in Central Nova, because a mountain, woods, wilderness, and an entire way of life separate them. The hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) represents his constituents graciously and well. He has already taken over, in my area, all that part from Ecum Secum to Mooseland. The culture there is different, their economic background is different, but he has represented them well. Under the commission's proposal he is to take even more of my constituency. I know he will represent his new constituents well. I do not object to that.

Basically my objection is this: the area should not be broken up. The people of the area which it has been my honour to represent in this House for the last several years have always shared a common cultural, economic, and historical background. I plead, as the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) pleaded: do not break up this constituency. Do not separate it. The hon. member's remarks apply not only to the Annapolis Valley. They apply to my constituency too. It will be important for my grandchildren to know, God willing that I ever have any, and for the people in the rest of the country to know, even

in 1,000 years that, yes, in Nova Scotia there is the Annapolis Valley. It has not been broken up, not torn asunder.

God bless the hon. member for South Western Nova (Miss Campbell) who, under Mr. Justice MacDonald's proposal, will extend her sphere of influence and good service up into the area about which I am concerned. I am sure she will represent those people ably. Mr. Commissioner MacDonald and his fellow commissioners are not imposing on her an unacceptable task. It is not a task with which she cannot deal.

Miss Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Forrestall: The hon. member may speak, if she wants to. But the commission is asking her to represent people whose culture, history, and way of life are different.

The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants suggested a method for correcting numerical disparities in order to ease the strain, as it were, on our constituencies. Using the figures of six or seven years ago to establish an average today is utterly ridiculous, as our constituencies have now grown to the size of the original constituency before it was divided. I think that my constituency population is back to over the 100,000 figure, and I am sure that my colleague's constituency population is also well over the 100,000 mark. Perhaps I am wrong. Perhaps it contains slightly over 80,000 people. I do not think he objects to representing a fair number of Canadians. Indeed, I would welcome representing half a million Nova Scotians. Numbers are not important. More important are community of interest and a common heritage of history and culture.

I hope that Mr. Justice MacDonald and the commissioners will take note of our intervention. I say this to Commissioner MacDonald, who I hope will read these pages of *Hansard*: these questions are all important. I trust he will listen to me, to the hon. member for Annapolis Valley, and the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants. We say that numbers alone are not important. What is important is that people have their day in court, that people with common cultural and historical roots remain together in a constituency.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The House having considered these objections, it is my duty pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act to refer the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Nova Scotia, together with copies of the objections, and also a copy of the *Debates of the House of Commons*, back to the commission, for reconsideration thereof.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING ALBERTA

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as reported at page 12477 of *Hansard*, I made some general remarks about the principles which should guide redistribution commissions, and particularly the considerations which ought to apply to the most important people involved in all this, the people who are to be represented. All too often, as I said yesterday, they are so many ciphers, so many head of cattle enclosed within the fence, within the confines of the corral. I suggest that is totally wrong. Those who insist on playing the numbers game, who insist on one man, one vote, are also wrong. A good rule of thumb is this: there should be six urban to four rural votes, within the tolerances as laid down by the act.

I addressed the redistribution commission in the Edmonton public hearing and want to put on record most of what I said on that occasion because, in my humble estimation, it bears repeating and should be part of the record.

Bearing in mind that the present redistribution is to have effect for the next decade at least, and in actual fact will have an undoubted influence on the future shape of the Edmonton area constituencies, it is imperative that notwithstanding the population figures of the 1971 census, most active consideration be given to the trends which affected those figures—sterile in themselves—and what future development of the Edmonton area is to be.

June 1, 1971, population figures are being applied, quite erroneously by the commission, to 1975 corporate boundaries. I think this is wrong. They are not the best base on which to establish constituency boundaries. The suggested boundaries, as were those effected in the changes made in 1966-67, are based on sterile figures and are not in conformity with actual or readily foreseeable developments over the next decade.

I know that potential development was discussed and eliminated as a factor by this House, I think in a moment of abject aberration. Still I think that the position taken by the commission with regard to the city boundaries of Edmonton and Calgary as confines for the city constituencies is totally wrong. One can already see that those two boundaries, will be changed. As a matter of fact, discussions are going on now involving the adjoining municipalities, the city of Edmonton, and the provincial government, with regard to changing those boundaries. Therefore if by reason of this exercise the constituency boundaries are limited to the city boundaries and the changes being discussed are made, all this work will go down the drain. I shall make some suggestions which would take care of that situation. In any case there should not be a repetition of the fundamental errors in judgment and assessment by the Electoral Boundaries Commission in 1966-67 as far as the Edmonton metropolitan area is concerned.

● (0030)

While the legislation governing electoral boundary realignment does place an emphasis on population as the basis for contituency composition, it must be clear that the 25 per cent tolerance either way from the average population quotient was intended to be fully meaningful, as were the references in the legislation to other factors to be taken into account, for example, georgraphical division, community of interest, historical tradition and, last but not least, consideration of the citizenry as persons vitally interested in and identified with, and by, their political representative and not merely as so many ciphers to be moved about by an authority merely on the grounds of "population neutral distribution", which in itself has many variables.

Surely the public interest demands more than such a statistical neutrality, a detached neutrality all too evident in the proposals for electoral boundary redistribution as they were contained in the initial or preliminary report of the commission as it dealt with the city of Edmonton and

its environs. Strangely enough, and most pertinent at this time, those same recommendations were unchanged as a result of the representations made in the public hearings. Therefore the comments made for the public hearings are as pertinent today as they were then in September of 1975.

The proposals for redistribution in 1973 met with severe objections on a province-wide basis. Such objections, both in general and in particular, applied to the Edmonton city constituencies. They are well known to the commission since two of its members are on the present commission. Outside of a very few minor modifications, the proposals are repeated in 1975 initial report. They are subject to much the same objection in the 1976 report we are now considering.

Our colleagues in the House from all provinces have insisted that reasons must be stated. As far as the city of Edmonton is concerned, Edmonton East is eliminated as a constituency. Why? The report is silent. Areas within city boundaries are carved up and recast most drastically. Again, I ask why? The report is silent.

Edmonton Centre is turned around and made to include districts far to the west and east. The same question is put: why? No reasons are given.

A solid traditional piece of Edmonton West, comprising some 25,000 people, is tacked on to what is now called Edmonton South, with which it has no demographic connection. Again, why? Surely there must be a reason and we are entitled to have it. Preliminary reports must give reasons for change. Nevertheless, very few were given in the preliminary report, and I suggest that the present report does not include many more. Certainly none of the questions I have asked—and they are pertinent questions—have been dealt with satisfactorily. Since I was the principal protagonist for statutory change in this field, I respectfully suggest to the commission that the reasons given are not sufficient to support the changes proposed.

The reason advanced in connection with the fixing of constituency boundaries within the limits of the city of Edmonton is at best an arguable case, and there is the same thread running through the 1973 report and the 1975 report. I notice it too in the reports of some of the other commissions. I should like to know the inspiration of the idea that a city constituency must not go beyond the city boundary.

I will say at the outset with regard to this argument that the net result of the Commission's proposals has been totally the reverse. Its intention presumably was that the city should not dominate the adjoining rural area. But the commissioners have only translated it over one degree because in and around the city of Edmonton what the commission has done has been to set a constituency of Pembina with all Edmonton's dormitory suburbs. The result is that Pembina which should be, if it is to exist, a rural constituency, is dominated entirely by the urban suburbs and the rural subdivisions which pertain to the city of Edmonton.

In many ways, too, the recent changes made to the proposed constituency of Yellowhead place the emphasis on population which is urban-oriented. People who work in Edmonton, shop there, go to school there, exert a tremendous influence on the new constituency of Yellowhead. I will leave my colleagues from other parts of the city to indicate what happens with respect to other communities within the Edmonton metropolitan area and to call attention to factors which completely neutralize the reason advanced by the commission in connection with city constituencies.

I would suggest that since the commission treats Calgary and Edmonton the same way, it forgets that the Calgary city boundaries extend much further afield than those of Edmonton. They are, in effect, city and metro boundaries. Such is not the case in Edmonton which has a much larger metro pupulation just outside its corporate boundaries. Surely it is the metro area which has the greater community interest. Where do the people work, where do they shop, where do they go to school, where do they worship? That is what matters. These people should not be put in the position of the flea on the end of the dog's tail. The Edmonton metro area seats should be recast with this in mind.

I intend to recommend that the Edmonton metro area—and this is a matter of record as described in the so-called Hanson Report—should describe the perimeter boundaries for the Edmonton metro seats and that these should be six in number, two south of the Saskatchewan River and four north of the Saskatchewan River. The commission can readily draw, based on population, the dividing line in the south between what should be Edmonton-Strathcona on the west side and a new constituency which would include Sherwood Park and the Millwoods to the east. They could select whatever name they wished, but again I say I do not care for the mere descriptive terms "north", "south" and so on; there are some strong traditional names which ought to be considered.

● (0040)

On the north side we have Edmonton West. The north boundary of the three seats on the north side should be 137th Avenue, which is a natural division. We have Edmonton West, Edmonton Centre, and Edmonton East. The commissioners propose to abolish Edmonton East. Edmonton East is an old, traditional name, an old, traditional constituency that should not be abolished. Then north of 137th Avenue they could take in the town of St. Albert and the new subdivisions north of 137th Avenue, and go to the east to include Fort Saskatchewan.

There is a rural part included if one goes north to what I call the Mayo correction line, a natural division that existed for Edmonton West going back I do not know how many decades. These rural areas are filled with subdivisions of 10, 20, 30, 40 homes. The people work in the city of Edmonton and live in and around St. Albert or Fort Saskatchewan. Theirs is the interest and this is what should be considered.

Bearing in mind that constituency boundaries should be readily identifiable, that constituency boundaries should be changed where absolutely necessary, that constituency boundaries should take in people who have a community of interest, and all the demographic principles that are based on the parameter of the 25 per cent tolerance on either side, it seems to me that so far as the city of Edmonton is concerned the basic principle of the metropolitan area of Edmonton should be the guiding principle. To that extent I once again commend this idea to the commission so that it

does not perpetrate the dislocations that were proposed in 1973 and found to be so repugnant, and which have been continued on this occasion.

I must say I was surprised and disappointed, but I was not nearly so disappointed or angry as a great number of the constituents in my riding who contemplate the changes that are being proposed by the commission. Along with my colleagues in the city of Edmonton I suggest the commission re-examine the situation and repair the damages that are being proposed by the 1973 report rather than perpetuate them. Then I think we will have a far better job done than has been done to date.

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by commending the commission for its diligent work in the arduous task of redistribution. In my judgment it has attempted to be fair. It has certainly exhibited a conscientious effort to draw both urban and rural lines that seem to the commission to follow the requirements of the law. But I am concerned that the recommendations that were made at the time of the public hearings, especially those presented to the commission on behalf of several Edmonton constituencies, do not seem to have been taken seriously by the commission.

I am also concerned at the lack of reasons offered by the commission for the final maps that have been published following the public representations. I believe that if we are to do an adequate job of representing our constituencies we need to know the reasons why the commission has deemed it advisable to do such things as the following.

May I draw Your Honour's attention to the revised map which maintains the same split on the west side of the city of Edmonton both north and south of the river that was first advanced and to which we objected as far back as 1973 in the twenty-ninth parliament when this redistribution first came before us? What I am objecting to in particular, and what I am at a loss to understand is how the commission has deemed it advisable to take the southern portion of the present constituency of Edmonton West and put it in a new constituency called Edmonton South. As I look at the map of the new constituency of Edmonton South I note that if constituencies are to have as one of their criteria commonality of interest, the only commonality that I can find with Edmonton South is that it is a rich man's constituency.

I do not believe it is the purpose of democracy and good representation to have one of the five constituencies in greater Edmonton so disproportionately wealthy, with the social and economic status of areas such as Grandview, Westbrook, Laurier, Valleyview, Crestwood, Parkview, and River Bend, which are the richest areas in Edmonton. In this regard I believe the commission has done a disservice.

I sincerely hope that the commission will take the representation I am making very seriously and redraw the map so that the riding of Edmonton West goes down to the river on the south side, as at present, and the ridings on the south side of the river stay on the south side. Incidentally I think the people in the lower part of Edmonton West would be quite surprised to wake up on election morning and find that they will have to vote in a riding called Edmonton South when they do not consider that they live in the southern part of the city.

The riding of Edmonton South has an eastern boundary on the map before us that generally follows the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks to 82nd Avenue, jogs along 82nd Avenue to the west and then down 109th Street to the river. If the first recommendation that I have made, namely, that the riding of Edmonton South should terminate at the river rather than jump across it, is accepted, it follows that additional population will be gathered into it to meet the quotient contingency. Tberefore the eastern boundary ought to be moved further east, and I would strongly urge upon the commission that it consider 91st Street as the boundary on the eastern side. I do that for this additional reason. By running the eastern boundary along 99th Street and eventually into the river it would preserve the basic area of Strathcona rather than splitting it up as has now been done in the revised map I have before me.

● (0050)

I have been following the difficulties, the challenges, and the opportunities of the old Strathcona historical group. Indeed, the renovation of that part of the city has been of considerable interest in the last two or three years. I have tried to be of whatever help I could to that group as well as to the city administration in their attempt to restore the heart as well as the potential of the old Strathcona area.

What I find when I look at this map is that the federal boundary comes down the middle and divides this common area where there is a community of interest. I cannot imagine why this is, with one side of 82nd Avenue to be in the riding of Edmonton South and the other side in the riding of Edmonton Strathcona. If my proposal were followed the eastern boundary would be moved to the east and then the entire area of Strathcona, with this rich and vibrant community of interest, would remain within the one riding.

Needless to say, I am very much of the opinion that the riding I have been describing ought to be called Edmonton-Strathcona. That is the very area of the city which lays claim to the heritage vested upon it by Lord Strathcona, and indeed was the first entrance way to the modern city of Edmonton coming up the North Saskatchewan River. This is where the docks and wharves were first located.

My suggestion would mean or entail a switching in the names of the two contituencies on the south side of the city as shown in the plan we are debating. Specifically I am suggesting there ought to be a transposition of the riding. The southern riding on the west side ought to be called Edmonton-Strathcona, with its eastern boundary moved over to 9lst Street. The southern riding on the east ought to be called Edmonton-South.

I draw to your attention another very important factor which ought to be brought into these remarks. The riding called Edmonton-Strathcona on the map, about which I was speaking a moment ago, being on the eastern side, has a population listed in the report of the commission of 88,419, which includes the 1971 census figure for Millwood. The Millwood community development in 1971 was only getting off the ground with about 1,000 people, but today there are between 18,000 and 20,000 people living in Mill-

wood. That means there will be a population in Edmonton-Strathcona of 105,000. As we can see, that will already exceed the 25 per cent tolerance of the quotient allowed in Alberta, being 77,518. In other words, the map we are considering here in the House is already out of date before being adopted.

By moving the eastern boundary of the riding of Edmonton South further east, as I have indicated, it would give us a population for that riding within the tolerance of the quotient, and also give us a population in the riding of Edmonton-Strathcona within the tolerance allowed.

Those are the points I specifically wish to draw to the attention of the commission along with the representations of my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West. I find myself in total agreement with his intervention. I would ask of the commission where it is in the law that the city boundaries must form the boundaries of the constituencies? This does not in fact exist in law to my knowledge and, moreover, would not make any sense in the case of Edmonton. As I already pointed out, the area would include Sherwood Park and Saint Anne lying off the south boundary of the city, but very much a part of the urban orientation, and ought to be considered as urban communities in the urban constituencies.

If these changes were made I believe the map and the character of the ridings in Edmonton would be much more realistic and would enable members of parliament to serve their constituents better. I plead with the commission to end this silly jumping of the river before it is too late, as it totally distorts both the ridings of Edmonton West and the present riding of Edmonton-Strathcona. The changes I have urged are in the interest of allowing us to serve our constituents better.

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind the fact that many individuals wish to speak on the boundary proposals, my remarks will be brief.

I do wish to share with the House a portion of the presentation I made to the boundaries commission when it was in Edmonton. I will quote one page from the presentation I made at that time as follows:

The legislation governing electoral boundary realignment does place an emphasis on population as the basis for constituency composition, yet it must be clear that the 25% tolerance was intended to be fully meaningful. With this in mind, it should be noted that the Pembina constituency could easily reach a population of 120,000 by the time of the next election when these boundaries would be in effect.

This constituency has one of the highest growth rates of any in Alberta.

The population figures of the electoral districts are based on the 1971 decennial census. Since 1971 to the beginning of 1975, the population of the proposed Pembina constituency has increased by approximately 26,150. The population in 1971 was 70,352, based on the figures published by the commission and since that time, to the beginning of 1975, the population has increased in areas such as (1) Sherwood Park by some 11,500, (2) County of Strathcona, excluding Sherwood Park, 4,900 (3) St. Albert, 7,700 (4) Fort Saskatchewan, 1,800 and (5) Westlock, 250. This makes the present population approximately 96,502.

If these figures are projected to the time of the next election, it is conceivable that the population could be at the time in the vicinity of 120,000.

As was pointed out earlier, population does play an important role in regard to the constituency composition but other factors must also be taken into account. Surely the public interest demands more than mere statistical neutrality. Factors such as geographical divisions, community interests, historical tradition and, most importantly, the interests of the individual citizens who are to be served by their member of parliament, and the member of parliament's accessibility to serve them.

[Mr. Roche.]

I should like to commend the commissioners for their handling of this difficult task and for considering certain recommendations I presented at the time of their hearings. They did include in the constituency of Pembina certain parts of the county of Strathcona that have an historical and geographical link with the Pembina constituency.

We, as members, must recognize the difficult task the commission has in redrawing these constituency boundaries. With that in mind I should like to raise several points of concern to me.

● (0100)

There has been a certain amount of criticism levelled with regard to the geographical makeup of Pembina by several of its residents because it is a constituency comprised 50 per cent of urban individuals and 50 per cent of rural individuals. However, I feel strongly that there is not much the matter with a constituency that is comprised of a rural-urban mix, because if an individual comes to this Chamber with simply a narrow view of one segment of our society, he has no place in this Chamber. We must be more open minded. We must be able to recognize the difficulties and problems of the different individuals in our society whether they be of an urban or rural background.

Under the proposals put forward by the commission we in the Pembina constituency will lose a portion of both the rural area of our constituency and the urban area of our constituency. We will lose the area which is the city of Edmonton itself, plus the rural area in the Athabasca region and in the Barrhead region, but we will gain the town of St. Albert.

I welcome this area with open arms into our constituency. I feel that areas such as St. Albert, Sherwood Park, Fort Saskatchewan and Westlock all have similar problems. They are all rapidly growing areas on the outskirts of the city of Edmonton. I feel this will make it much easier for a member of parliament to represent these areas even though there might be a certain amount of conflict between the areas because they are èboth growing and have hopes concerning the recreational and other needs of a growing community.

While I recognize the wisdom of the comments of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) I also recognize that a constituency such as is drawn by the commission for Pembina is a valid constituency, in my eyes. One thing I do not find to be valid, however, is the passage of a bill through this House such as we had a short while ago whereby we increase the representation in this House by 18 members. I was totally against that proposal. I do not believe there is a need for an increase in the representation in this Chamber.

A member should have the capability to serve quite easily a few thousand more constituents. Rather than increase the size of the representation in this House I believe it is essential that a member be given the accommodations necessary if he is to serve those constituents. I think it would be more valuable to invest a little more money for staff members to properly help opposition members than to spend the money on extra representation in the Chamber.

While travelling to Ottawa last Sunday evening I had a chat with an individual employed by the treasury department. This person told me that a great many individuals in that department do not have enough work to satisfy their own need of accomplishment. If individuals in such a department have the feeling that they are not accomplishing something worth-while for the government, why could a few of them not be made accessible to opposition members so that they could perform their duties in a much more meaningful way, while at the same time giving us more effective government?

We have also heard much criticism from various members concerning the work the commissions have done in redrawing these boundaries. Let me remind members that it was this House which gave the commissions the power to do so, and if members do not like what they have done, all the members need do is bring forward specific legislation in this Chamber so that this Chamber dictates the boundaries of the various constituencies.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to lend my support to some of the points the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) made. The one specific recommendation is the name change of the two constituencies on the south side of Edmonton. I feel as strongly as he does that the names should be switched so that the constituency named Edmonton-Strathcona would be called Edmonton South, and vice versa in respect of the constituency of Edmonton South, because there is a great deal of historical tradition based in the constituency on the west side of the south side of Edmonton which necessitates that the name ought to be Edmonton Strathcona.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Good morning, Mr. Speaker. I suppose one should start by complimenting the commission for the very diligent and time-consuming task it has undertaken. I am sure you would agree, Mr. Speaker, after the tremendous amount of work the commissioners have put into the study, and after the many complaints they have received, that one would wonder whether Hamlet could have been written by a commission. I am sure the commissioners must feel frustrated at times while performing their task of trying to resolve what probably is an unresolvable problem. I venture to suggest that if there were a group of commissioners which could come up with perfect boundaries a miracle would be performed.

Having said that I wish to register two general points, and one specific one relating to my constituency. First, I want to underscore the remarks of those who already have adopted the position that it is the wrong direction to take to suggest that the House of Commons should increase in respect of the number of seats every time the population census indicates that Canada has grown in population numbers.

The fact of the matter is that if the number of people represented in this Chamber increases, the other related factor must remain static. I refer to the factor of time. If we get more people in this House, the days do not become more frequent in a year and the hours do not become more numerous in a day. We will still have years of 52 weeks. More people in the House of Commons would simply mean that a member would ask less questions in the question period, would speak less often in the House of Commons, and in fact would represent less frequently the constituents of his riding. I submit the larger the size of the House of Commons, the more government there would be by cabinet.

In effect this would mean, in the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), that the larger the House of Commons the more members of parliament would become nobodies. I suggest that ought not to be the trend. Perhaps at the time we are considering bringing home the constitution of this country we should consider establishing a permanent number of members of parliament so that in the years to come we do not end up in the same position of trying to expand the number of members of this House.

I suggest it might be better if we trimmed off 50 or 60 members rather than continually trying to add on. As a member who represents a constituency with a small population I suggest that the issues I consider day after day are just as numerous as those members of parliament who represent constituencies with larger populations. The only difference, I believe, is in the frequency with which we get responses to issues. But certainly everything that every other member has to handle as an issue I also have, even though the population of my constituency is small.

● (0110)

What I suggest then is that because the number of issues is not larger but only the frequency of issues is greater, the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga) struck the right chord when he said that members from larger constituencies should be granted a larger staff. I see nothing wrong with representing two hundred thousand people provided the member can still communicate with them adequately.

When we take a look at what has happened in the British House of Commons which presently has 638 members we find there what I am trying to point out, a real lack of participation by many members of parliament. Although there are those who participate actively, there is also a large number of members there who have become totally disinterested in their work for the obvious reason that they do not have sufficient opportunity to participate fully.

The second issue that I would like to raise for the consideration of this House, and perhaps as a recommendation to the commissions, is with regard to the whole area of conflict that has arisen and which will continue to arise in the future between rural and urban representation. When we consider the statement made by the Fathers of Confederation that this country should have representation by population, we must remember that the statement was made over 100 years ago when this country was nearly 90 per cent rural and the population was widely dispersed. The situation has changed of course, and continues to change rapidly.

The demographic projection for Canada for the year 2,000 is that 95 per cent of all Canadians will live in five cities, which would mean that if we continue the trend of only having representation by population, by the year 2,000, 95 per cent of the members in this Chamber will represent urban ridings from five cities. I suggest that that would be a grave mistake and it would not be in the grand interests of Canada and Canadians. I think it would be much more logical to take the view that when the Fathers of Confederation spoke about representation by population conditions were different then, and that in this day and

age we must consider the relationship of both those words, "representation" and "population".

A member of parliament cannot properly represent his constituency if he has very little contact with his people. So long as we take the view that rural constituencies can become bigger and bigger, we will only satisfy the aspect of population but we will destroy the more serious question of representation. I think that those two words must not be separated. They must be linked together, and it is folly to think only of population without focusing on whether or not it is possible for a member of parliament to visit his constituents and likewise for his constituents to have access to their member.

Remember the number of issues does not change, only the frequency of issues changes from constituencies with smaller populations to those with larger ones. Let urban members represent large constituencies. They often travel but a few blocks from one end of their riding to the other. If they have a higher rate of responses, they should be provided with larger staffs.

The third issue which I wanted to raise this morning relates to the naming of constituencies. That of course is an issue which relates specifically to the constituency in which I now reside. It has been the tradition in many of the urban centres of this country for the name of the constituency to reflect the name of the city. For example, let us consider Calgary North, Calgary Centre, Edmonton West, Edmonton Strathcona, and so forth. However, in the case of rural constituencies I think it is illogical to pick out the name of one or two centres and use those names when naming the constituency. I put forth this argument with respect to the riding which I now represent.

In my riding there are about five major towns, and when I say major I refer to those with a population of about 9,000. In total, however, I have 76 villages in my riding. In each and every one of those communities there are people with a sense of pride and identity connected very closely with their home towns. Yet in the naming of a constituency the commissioners often pick out one of the centres and claim this to be the new name of the constituency. In many parts of these constituencies ther are people who never see or visit that centre whose name was used for the constituency name. I suggest that the approach should be descriptive of the area, a name based on a geographical description of the area, or based on a genuine historical event.

As a member of parliament from the province of Alberta, in the case of a larger rural riding I would like people across Canada first to identify it as being western, and secondly as being a rural area. I would not want them to identify it with any particular town or community, because I think it is important for every farmer and rancher in that area to feel that the name given to their constituency is one which they can accept, and one with which they can easily identify, and not one which only represents a select group of people who for some reason have been favoured by having their home town chosen to represent the name of the constituency.

In the new proposal the recommendation for the area I represent was that the name of the constituency be Acadia-Camrose. The community of Acadia numbers less than 200 people in the south east corner of my constituency, and Camrose in the opposite diagonal has a population of around 9,000. In that area we would have nearly 100 villages, the transportation and communication lines would, in many instances, be southward toward Calgary, and would not even be close to the larger communities within the constituency.

One of the names which was recommended to the commissioners, and which I think would be an excellent name for this constituency was Paintearth, after Paintearth Creek which runs through the centre of the newly proposed constituency. The word Paintearth is derived from the orge pots in which the Indians used the vermilion mud to make their war paint. This has an historical significance which relates to the area. It is tied to the early history of east central Alberta and it has a ring to it which identifies if with the western prairies and the western plains in their early historical development. Other names could also be suggested such as Hand Hills, which is also located in the south eastern portion of the new constituency.

It is not my duty, nor is it my wish, to come up with a definitive name and to propose it here this evening, except to state this principle to the commissioners—and I hope they will consider it seriously—that in respect of every rural constituency in Canada an effort should be made to go to historical societies and to groups with knowledge of the area, to study the background of these areas and find a broad descriptive name for the individual region.

● (0120)

I do not think we need to impose upon any area the name of one or two towns, unless those towns make up the major shopping centre and market centre for virtually all parts of that constituency. For example, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) lives in a community where that is the case. Red Deer is the major shopping centre for virtually every part of his constituency, but it also has the major river system, the Red Deer River, running right through the middle of his constituency.

In summary, I think it should be an obligation of the commissioners to make a much more thorough study, and perhaps to make a special request to historical societies, museums, and foundations which study the histories of the various regions across Canada, to recommend names of large rural constituencies which describe them as regions according to some geographical landmark, some major historical event or some portion of their history, and which allow the constituents from each and every community within it to identify with the electoral area.

This would allow the member of parliament to explain in his early speeches how his constituency was named, and he would not be making reference to one or two villages, towns or cities which may or may not be related to the whole market area and the business which transpires within that constituency.

Those are my thoughts on this question. I offer the commissioners my best wishes in what I know is a very difficult task, but I hope they will give due consideration to the three points I have expressed here this morning.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, on behalf of my colleagues from the province of Alberta I should like to offer our thanks to the staff, the Clerks, the *Hansard* reporters, the protective staff, the

press and you, Sir, for remaining with us during the course of this debate.

Petitioners appeared at the Electoral Boundaries Commission hearing for the province of Alberta in Red Deer last September 8 asking that they remain in Red Deer constituency instead of being placed outside the then proposed east boundary of the Red Deer River. I wish to commend the members of the commission for acceding to that request, a step in the right direction. This was of utmost importance to those residents because of the lack of bridges on the Red Deer River in their area, which would more or less have isolated them. Had the recommendation to place these people in the constituency east of the Red Deer River not been withdrawn, I would have lost faith in the work of the commission.

However, I am disappointed that favourable consideration was not given to the representation made, primarily by Mrs. John Talsma of Bentley, at that hearing, to include residents of that locality in Red Deer constituency. They are accustomed to doing their business in the city of Red Deer and are familiar with the surrounding community and all the related activities and events. If the north boundary line running east along the northern boundary line of Township 41 could be extended even as far as Gull Lake, the wishes of the Bentley people would be met. This proposal is certainly worthy of further consideration, and I hope the members of the commission will take another look at this legitimate request.

Should the commission feel that this proposed boundary line cannot be extended straight east to join the west boundary of Acadia constituency, surely it could agree to the plea of residents in the Joffre and Blackfalds region on the north side of the Red Deer River in the extreme southeast corner of the proposed Wetaskiwin constituency, who also want to be within Red Deer constituency. Formerly these residents were included in Red Deer constituency; then their constituency was changed to Battle River; and now the new proposal would place them in Wetaskiwin. This is extremely unfair and unnecessary. Why should one human being treat another this way without a legitimate reason? All that is required to place these people in Red Deer riding is to move the suggested northern boundary farther north.

In the original presentation the commission yielded to the residents on the west side of the Red Deer River, allowing them to remain in Red Deer constituency and saying that the river is a natural boundary in that area. Such is not true in the Joffre and Blackfalds area because there are three bridges there by which to cross the river. While the river does form a boundary on the lower reaches of the Red Deer River, it does not in this particular section.

I want to read some of the representations submitted to me with regard to the proposed boundary changes in Red Deer constituency. The first letter is sent to the members of the House of Commons and reads as follows:

Although the federal electoral boundaries commission for Alberta decision stated that our district (in the Joffre area) should go into the Wetaskiwin riding, we urge the members of the House of Commons to listen closely to the arguments presented by Gordon Towers why our area should be in the Red Deer riding.

In the original petition presented to the Commission 98% of the voters asked that we be part of the Red Deer riding; this, in itself should be reason enough to have this area in the Red Deer riding. Some of the other reasons we request that we be in that riding is that the city of Red Deer is only 12 miles from the centre of our area and is our banking, shopping, recreation and advanced education centre thus we are more attuned to what happens in the Red Deer area than Wetaskiwin which is 50 miles away.

Thank you for you time.

This is signed by Mr. A. Brock, Pat Brock and Douglas Brock.

The next letter reads as follows:

To Whom It May Concern.

We wish to register our strong disapproval of the proposed electoral boundary change, presently located in the Battle River Constituency, whereby we would be included in the Wetaskiwin constituency.

Residing eleven miles east of Red Deer, north of the Red Deer River, it would seem much more logical that this area could be served by the member from Red Deer better, being aware of the area residents' needs.

The boundary change some years ago from the Red Deer to Battle River Constituency made representation more difficult, this proposed change to Wetaskiwin would seem to us as a further step in the wrong direction.

This is signed by Donald Graham, Colleen Graham, Alex Graham and Amy Graham.

The next letter is addressed to Mr. Gordon Towers, M.P. for Red Deer Electoral District, and reads as follows:

Would you please present on our behalf, during debate on electoral boundaries, an earnest request that this area (the twp line between 38 & 39 being an extension of Hwy 11, range 25 and that portion of 26 to Red Deer River) be included in the Red Deer Electoral District.

We feel that since the land survey system in the west is on a straight line basis, such a division of boundaries would be less confusing, more realistic and more readily determined.

Portions of this area were originally within the Red Deer Riding. In view of present day road and transportation systems, rivers are no longer considered natural obstacles to communication. Residents of this area have close association with Red Deer area residents since business, health care, education and recreation are all obtained there.

We believe that becoming electors within the Wetaskiwin Riding would make it extremely difficult to have true representation and would therefore for practical purposes be almost disenfranchisement as many would not bother to vote.

We thank you for any efforts you make in our behalf.

This is signed by Mayme Morton and John Morton.

The next letter is to Mr. Gordon Towers, Member of Parliament, Red Deer Riding, and reads as follows:

Would you please represent our interests in getting this area transferred to the Red Deer Riding?

In the past and in the future Red Deer is the centre for business, hospital, markets and education for this area.

We feel geographical boundaries are quite arbitrary and the river bridge eliminates any communication problem that could exist.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Ken & Sally Morton

Here is another one:

Dear Sir: We are writing in regards to having to go into Wetaskinwin constituency.

Most of our business is done in Red Deer.

And we feel we would have much better representation in the Red Deer constituency.

This is signed by Mrs. Betty Glover and Doug Glover.

Another letter reads:

Dear Mr. Towers:

I understand our area may be changed from the Red Deer to the Wetaskiwin constituency. To me this seems to be quite remote as there is no one there that I know. I do my business in Red Deer, we have a Red Deer phone. I hope this does not happen as it would be more inconvenient to keep in touch with our representatives.

Yours truly,

Lawrence McMillan

The next letter reads as follows:

Just a few lines to add my voice to others who want to keep the north boundary of your constituency the same as before.

My land location is N.W. 24—38—26 W 4.

Yours sincerely,

Joseph H. Young

• (0130)

Another reads:

Mr. Towers:

We, the undersigned members of this family, do hereby request that the lands upon which we reside (S½—21—38—25—4) be included in the federal Red Deer riding.

W. B. Linklater
Margeret A. Linklater
E. Bernice Linklater

The next letter reads:

Mr. Gordon Towers,

Member of Parliament,

Dear Sir:

In regard to the boundary change in the constituency of Red Deer, we would like to remain in the Red Deer riding as we live eight miles east of the city of Red Deer on the NW ¼35—38—26—W4. We do our banking and most of our business in the city of Red Deer as well as using the recreational facilities of the city of Red Deer. We feel that Red Deer is our home town and for these reasons and the fact that we live as close to Red Deer as we do, we wish to remain in Red Deer riding.

Yours truly,

Bill and Carol Armstrong

I have one more. It reads:

Dear Sir:

We are much concerned about being moved into the Wetaskiwin electoral district. We would much prefer to remain in the Red Deer district. We live about seven miles from Red Deer on the north side of the river. Our home is on the NW23—38—26—W4. We would appreciate very much anything you can do to make our request known to the present government.

Thank you

W. O. and Ruth Armstrong

That is a sample of the letters I have received from people living in that area. Surely the commission representatives will be compassionate and realistic enough to give consideration to the requests of these people. They are logical and certainly deserve consideration.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It appears there is no further debate on the objections to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Alberta.

The House having considered the objections, it is my duty pursuant to section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act to refer the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Alberta, together with a copy of the objections, and also a copy of the *Debates of the House of Commons*, back to the commission for reconsideration thereof.

[Mr. Towers.]

The House will now resume consideration of the objections to the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of British Columbia.

OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORT RESPECTING BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Campagnolo: I thank my colleagues for their warm welcome.

The distribution of population in British Columbia is, to say the least, unequal. Of the 2 ½ million people who live in the province, it is of course well known that more than two million British Columbians are crowded into the metropolis of Vancouver and its southern mainland environs. Only one tenth of the people in my home province live above the 53rd parallel. In fact the two northern ridings of Prince George-Peace River to the east and Skeena to the west have for generations been, together, fully one half of the geography of the great province of British Columbia.

As I rise in my place tonight at this late hour to make a representation to the commission, I am mindful of those who have answered to the name of "the honourable member for Skeena" before me, New Democratic and Liberal alike, who have faced as I have the overwhelming geography of a quarter of the province of British Columbia; half the coastline of the province from Katasoo-Klemtu in the south, taking in the Queen Charlotte Islands, the length of the Alaska panhandle, a broad expanse of the Yukon border, south to Vanderhoof, 70 miles west of Prince George, south again through the historic lakes district, and back once again to the coast. This area contains four provincial electoral ridings. That is the geography of a giant land with a population of under 100,000 people.

The present redistribution divides the north of the province into three parts, divided in a north-south split, which will see the birth of the new constituency, Prince George-Bulkley Valley, and the central city of some 80,000 will be served by two members of parliament, each with an extensive rural area.

In 1978 the electoral boundary of Skeena will be placed between Smithers and Telkwa which have an historic community of interest and, in fact, people often live in one community and work in the other. Smithers is spectacular. It is a small city of some 6,000 people who, through prudent management, have controlled their growth and environment and cast themselves in the role of an alpine paradise.

Although I personally do not acknowledge the validity of the argument of the Smithers Chamber of Commerce in their desire that their city be placed in the new centre riding, it is my duty as their representative to place their concern on the records of this House. It was resolved by the Smithers District Chamber of Commerce that Smithers be included in the proposed Prince George-Bulkley Valley riding rather than in Skeena, and that the western boundary of this riding correspond with the northwestern

boundary of the Bulkley-Nechako regional district. In the opinion of the Smithers Chamber of Commerce the new riding, Prince George- Bulkley Valley, would exclude the major community in the Bulkley Valley, which is Smithers.

It is generally acknowledged that Smithers is the service centre for the Bulkley valley. In fact it includes the towns and villages of Hazelton, Telkwa, Houston, Topley, Granisle and, to a certain extent, Burns Lake as being within its trading area. Major government agencies, federal and provincial, are established in Smithers and are responsible for serving the people of the communities mentioned, as well as the rural areas in between. Industries and features are all common to areas surrounding and east of Smithers, and dissimilar to areas to the west, in the opinion of the Smithers Chamber of Commerce. They state the following, and I quote:

Weather—being of the dryer, more extreme type common to interior areas which have a direct bearing on agriculture and forestry to name only two.

Topography—Smithers being the western edge of the interior or Nechako plateau consisting of more of a gradual sloping geography as compared to the mountainous areas to the west.

Agriculture—beef production mainly cow/calf operations stretch from northwest of Smithers all the way through to the Prince George area. Dairy farms are concentrated in the Bulkley valley from south of Moricetown to north of Houston. Root crops grown are similar to those grown eastward.

Industry—until recently, we have been the centre of exploration activities in the northwest central interior and this could become active again, as well we service the mining community of Granisle. Most mills are of the smaller sawmill type, with no pulp mills, using contract loggers and truckers to bring in the logs and the CNR to ship the lumber and chips. The CNR in Smithers is the divisional point for traffic east to Endako.

The forest industry which is common to Terrace, Kitimat, and Prince Rupert, is different in that the wood cut in the interior is generally smaller in diameter than that cut in the coastal areas, therefore, much different methods are used.

I have had further representations which contradict the views I have given. They are from a group of residents some 100 miles to the east of Smithers in the community of Houston. It is the desire of the Houston petitioners that their town and its environs not be included in Prince George-Bulkley Valley constituency, but that the eastern boundary of Skeena be extended to the school district 54 eastern boundary, thus placing Houston as the eastern terminus of the new western constituency of Skeena. The community of interest in wood products, transportation, communications and history is cited by Houston as reason for consideration of their request.

The constituency of Skeena is huge, with difficult transportation access and a population that is numerically vulnerable to influences from the south. As their member of parliament I have had the singular experience of seeing and traversing the whole of the area I represent.

The proposed changes placed upon the record tonight are sincerely put forward for consideration of the commission. I ask that the decade to come be fully considered in the proposed changes. The people of Canada's mid north will undoubtedly grow more numerous as years go on and ought not to be divided on the basis of the new resources they command but rather on human terms. In this, may I commend the Electoral Boundaries Commission in the exacting work they have done. As a representative of northern people I respect the work they have completed, If I elect to drive 80 miles through the mountain pass to reach Creston, I can travel north from Creston to service small communities such as Sikar, Gray Creek, Boswell, etc. and look forward to the contest in 1978 in less arduous geography as a result of their deliberations.

● (0140)

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken in the House for some time at 1.40 a.m. Initially I shall make two observations about the commission responsible for redistribution.

Some feel that because a member presents briefs to a commission and makes representation, he is politically motivated. Some think that members of parliament or prospective candidates for election merely appear before commissions to grind their axes, in the hope that the riding will be carved up to the political advantage of the applicant.

When I appeared before the commission in 1972 or 1973, with a proposal for creating a new federal riding to be known either as Trail-Penticton or Penticton-Trail, the Secretary said that 99 per cent of all representations were of a political nature. On reflection I wonder if that is so bad. After all, who is more familiar with a riding than the member of parliament representing it? He knows only too well how easy or how difficult it is to move around and service the riding, particularly if it is a rural riding. Perhaps he must drive between 100 and 150 miles to get from one end to the other. For example, if I want to visit the small community of Edgewood on the western boundary of the riding, I must travel 163 miles and make one ferry crossing.

When the commission sat in Kootenay West it made two changes, both of which concern me for different reasons. First and most dramatically, it removed Creston from Kootenay West and put it in Kootenay East. In the last 30 years we have witnessed three proposals for moving the small town of Creston out of the constituency. This will be the fourth attempt to change its political identity. This proposal is not taken lightly, as was demonstrated at the commission hearing in Nelson. It is not taken lightly by the city council, which voted unanimously to remain in Kootenay West; it is not taken lightly by the chamber of commerce, which voted unanimously to remain in Kootenay West; and it is not taken lightly by those who replied to my questionnaire. The people feel that removing the town will lead to loss of political identity and of social and economic links.

In my riding, mountains and lakes constitute natural geographic boundaries which I feel the commission failed to recognize. It failed to recognize that the eastern boundary of Kootenay West has traditionally been the western line of the Purcell Mountains or, if you will, the eastern margin of the major portion of Kootenay Lake.

Let me explain how you can go to Creston. You can choose two routes. If you go one way, you drive over the Salmo-Creston Skyway, through one of the highest mountain passes in British Columbia and scene of landslides. This year avalanches took several lives. I do not say I was in jeopardy on that road. Nonetheless it is a hazardous road in winter.

Or if I want to avoid the mountain pass, which I must do sometimes in winter because of prevailing weather conditions, I can drive to Nelson and to Balfour, and then take a trip from Trail of some 75 miles. If I am on time, I will catch the ferry; if not, I must wait for one hour. Then I must take a 40-minute ferry trip. By the way, it is the longest free ferry ride in Canada and takes you across Kootenay Lake. Then I must drive another 50 miles over winding roads before I reach Creston. Even if Creston is removed from my riding I must still service those small communities to the north of Creston. I shall be still obliged to drive over the Salmo-Creston Skyway, or take the other route via Kootenay Lake and the ferry crossing.

Sometimes in winter the Skyway is closed. Inevitably the heavy traffic which moves by way of the Balfour-Kootenay Bay ferry occasions delays of up to three or four hours. In the summer months the heavy tourist traffic using that link can also occasion delays. People like to visit the beautiful Kootenay West countryside. As I say, even if Creston is removed from Kootenay West I shall still be obliged to make this trip.

I have established close ties in Creston and I regret the mere contemplation of losing them. I enjoy working for and with those people. They are more closely linked by social and economic ties to Kootenay West than to Kootenay East, and they will be the first to tell you. Indeed I fear the loss of one of the most productive agricultural areas in British Columbia, small in square miles but high in productive capacity.

As a trade-off for removing Creston, and this is the fourth attempt, as I mentioned before, the commission will give me Christina Lake to serve. I have many friends who are resident at Christina Lake. It is an area for the retired, a beautiful summer resort community. At present about 400 people live at Christina Lake and Cascade. I shall be delighted to serve those people to the utmost of my ability. However, the commission will oblige me to make another trip over another mountain pass, a new one known as Blueberry-Paulson pass, which is not quite as dangerous as the Salmo-Creston Skyway but which receives almost as much snow. As I say one encounters the same heavy snow loads, perhaps not quite to the extent as on the Salmo-Creston Skyway, but nevertheless it is a very high mountain pass.

● (0150)

I must drive some 50 or 60 miles through completely uninhabited country, drive from Rossland to Christina Lake through two mountain passes, the Nancy Green Summit—that name will, I am sure, ring a few bells with those who read the journals—and the Blueberry-Paulson. So in losing Creston and in gaining Christina Lake I have succeeded in gaining an additional mountain pass. Bearing in mind the distances I must travel in my riding I find that this additional gain represents a very serious imposition of one more mountain pass—actually, two—over which to navigate during the winter months. I must say I do not really look forward to the prospect with a great deal of enjoyment. The compensation, of course, will be the people at the other end of that drive.

There is another concern I have for Creston. I recognise that not a great deal can really be done about it because by

[Mr. Brisco.]

act of parliament the ground rules have been established. The basis, of course, is the 1971 census which the commissioners must use as a guideline. How very unfortunate. In November of 1974 the British Columbia Research Council issued a report entitled "Population Projection". The report outlined certain statistics.

In 1974 the population of the regional district of Kootenay Boundary was 31,400. The projection for 1980 is 30,700. Conversely, in the central Kootenay area in 1974 the population was 44,600; the projection for 1980 is 47,200. In Columbia shuswap regional district the population in 1974 was 30,800. The projection for 1980 is 40,600. In East Kootenay the population in 1974 was 39,700, and the projection for 1980 is 52,400.

The first two regional districts correspond roughly to the land area of Kootenay West and will experience a growth of approximately 7.8 per cent by 1980. The second two regional districts correspond almost exactly with the new riding of Kootenay East and will experience an astounding 63.3 per cent growth by 1980. Even if we are pessimistic about future economic growth, Kootenay East will more than make up for the 5,000 or so constituents it will not get if Kootenay West keeps its present proportions, and does not include Creston. Conversely, Kootenay West, as demonstrated from the statistics, is an area of slow growth and slow development.

Therefore what will happen is that in 1980, when again we are faced with redistribution, we shall in all likelihood see the community of Creston coming back into Kootenay West after an absence of some four years. This would be the fifth political move for that community in 35 years, the fifth political trade-off, the fifth hit in the political stomach, a football that is being used to satisfy a minor statistic, a statistic which really in the long run will not have any bearing on the population density of Kootenay East.

On the basis of the burgeoning economy, the growth of the coal industry in the East Kootenays, we can continue to expect rapid expansion in the East Kootenays. Frankly, if I were debating economic development I would be inclined to observe that Kootenay West is not really anxious to accept that type of expansionary development and growth, certainly not for growth's sake.

In summary let me say I am grateful for the support I received from the municipal council of Creston, from the Chamber of Commerce and from individual constituents who have indicated to me and the commission their strong objection to being removed once more from Kootenay West.

Let me also say that should the commission in its wisdom decide that the community of Christina Lake is to be added to Kootenay West, even though it sits at the base of a natural mountainous boundary colloquially referred to as the Cascades, even though there is a 60 mile mountainous barrier, let me assure the people there that I will endeavour to represent them to the best of my ability. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity of stating the case of Kootenay West in British Columbia.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to congratulate you, the Clerk of the House, the *Hansard* staff, the three reporters in the gallery,

and two others—I cannot recall their names—for sitting through the extremely boring debate we have had to inflict on you tonight.

I must say that to wait here until two o'clock in the morning is far beyond the call of duty for anyone, as far as I am concerned. I think your members of parliament should be reprimanded for not being able to organize their time a little better in the House so that the people who have to spend many hours here can do so at a reasonable time.

I also wish to thank the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) who kindly spoke on my behalf in this House on March 11. I think him for representing the concern felt by people in my riding.

One of the main reasons for the inordinate length of this debate is that members from Ontario and Quebec managed to occupy so much of the time. We in the West are used to getting hell from the East and being ignored by the East, but it gets a little much at two o'clock in the morning to sit around and listen to all those boring speeches from Quebec and Ontario and to realize that once again the West has been screwed.

I should like to say that in general the work of the commission in British Columbia has been extremely sound. I think the commission should be congratulated by hon. members. However, there are and always will be, in this very difficult job of trying to draw boundaries on a geographic and community basis, certain things perceived by the community to be errors, and I want to deal with them briefly.

● (0200)

The first area in the province that I want to deal with is Vancouver Island. New ridings of Nanaimo-Alberni and Cowichan-Malahat are proposed. First of all, the residents of both those communities are pleased and delighted that Gabriola Island in the Nanaimo-Alberni riding is included. It is certainly in line with submissions made by various groups to the commission. However, the decision regarding the boundary line, which was to move the line between the constituencies away from the Nanaimo River to the south, is, I submit, a questionable decision.

In 1973 the proposal was to follow the Nanaimo River as the natural boundary, and it seemed in terms of the geographic and population division that this boundary made a lot of good sense. As I have said, the present redistribution moves that boundary south to a line north of Ladysmith. Interested people from both sides of the boundary and both ridings have proposed that the line be restored to the Nanaimo River following the course of the previous boundary, except for the Island of Gabriola. Therefore I ask the commission to give serious reconsideration to that boundary. My information is that this is a non-partisan submission, that it does represent the general community interest.

I turn now to somewhere closer to home in my own area. I am at a bit of a loss to understand why the three communities of Burnaby, New Westminster, and Coquitlam were not more seriously considered as three new ridings, rather than the decision that has been made.

Dealing first with the municipality of Burnaby, this municipality is a bit too large to be a single federal riding. Nevertheless what the commission has done is take the Capital Hill region and add it to the riding of North Vancouver. I must say it is very difficult for anyone with a sense of objectivity to understand what the Capital Hill area has in common with the North Shore in an economic way, a geographic way, or from the point of view of community of interest. Certainly there is no connection municipally. There is nothing whatever common between the two areas. It seems clear that there must have been a decision taken on some very special population base that could be easily corrected in attempting to create three ridings, one for Burnaby, one for New Westminster, and one for Coquitlam.

The new riding of New Westminster is limited to the south of New Westminster, and then the area of Coquitlam is expanded to the east. The difficulty with that decision is simply this, that New Westminster, as the central core of the area, the original settled area, has as its first natural suburb Burnaby, particularly the area south of Burnaby Lake. I grew up in that area. All the traditional ties for shopping, cultural activities, etc. were with the city of New Westminster. Therefore, if the municipality of Burnaby is to be chopped up, and I can understand a certain amount of chopping that has to be done, surely it is far more logical that the portion immediately to the north of New Westminster be added to the New Westminster riding rather than taking the Capital Hill area and trying to join it to a completely unrelated area.

Then as we move east to the Coquitlam area we have three communities; Port Moodie, Port Coquitlam, and the municipality of Coquitlam. I served for some nine years on the school board there, and as chairman for two years. That is a natural single community. That community cries out to be a single federal riding and has all the qualifications in terms of population, community of interest, and geographical area. It also forms a single provincial riding in its present boundaries.

Incidentally, the Chamber of Commerce of the municipality of Coquitlam, and other chambers of commerce have long supported that community as being ideal for a single federal riding. Why it was not given serious consideration I am not sure, but it does seem to me somewhat illogical that we do not start from that premise with the municipalities themselves forming natural federal boundaries. We could work from that point rather than trying to join a portion of the Coquitlam area to the Fraser Valley area where the natural geographic division is clearly the Pitt River. This certainly makes it much more difficult for people to feel a sense of community in federal matters, particularly in light of this redistribution of the lower mainland.

Having said that, I recognize that the commissioners have listened to a great many submissions on the subject. They have given these submissions serious consideration, but I am asking the commissioners to have one further look at these two areas, one on the island and the other in this area of the lower mainland, with a view to the interest of the community in terms of federal representation.

It is now 2:10 a.m., Mr. Speaker. I see no one else in the Chamber anxious to stand up and make a contribution to

this debate. I thank you, for having had the opportunity, apparently, of closing this remarkable exercise in boredom.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It appears there is no further debate on the objections to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of British Columbia. The House having considered these objections, it is my duty, pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, to refer the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, together with copies of the objections, and also a copy of the *Debates of the House of Commons,* back to the commission for reconsideration thereof. It being 2:11 a.m., this House stands adjourned until two o'clock p.m. today, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 2:11 a.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Special Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 7, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

PROPOSED REFERENCE OF TASK FORCE REPORT ON MARINE SEARCH AND RESCUE TO COMMITTEE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 which I am sure will commend itself to the government House leader. The statement today by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) on marine search and rescue activity admits that the organization is no longer entirely adequate, and this is emphasized by the increasing number of marine accidents in Canadian waters. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That the Canadian coast guard task force review be referred to a joint committee including National Defence, Transport and Fisheries representatives to make recommendations to the government of Canada on search and rescue policy.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIR CANADA

MEASURES TO PREVENT LOCK-OUT AND PROTECT RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES OF FINANCE BRANCH AT WINNIPEG—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a motion under Standing Order 43 having to do with a matter that is urgent and pressing. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent):

That this House urges the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour to take all possible steps to prevent a lock-out of Air Canada's finance branch employees at Winnipeg, and this House urges that the right of these employees to job security be recognized by Air Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED STUDY OF FUTURE DEFENCE PROGRAMS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

As Canadian banks could easily become new creditors of the Lockheed Corporation should this firm have more financial setbacks, since it already owes $700 million to 28 other banks, and as the Department of National Defence of Canada intends to invest several billion dollars in military equipment during the next ten years and we should at all costs avoid creating more misunderstandings and problems such as those we are facing because of the Lockheed Corporation, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That this House discuss now the policy of the Department of National Defence and particularly the specific and serious methods which should be used to establish the future defence programs of this department.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON METHOD OF SELECTING ESCORTS FOR WOMEN PRISONERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

In light of the fact that the wives of the directors and assistant directors of British Columbia Penitentiary and Drumheller Institution have been sworn in as peace officers to escort female prisoners to the federal women's prison in Kingston, Ontario, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco):

That this House instruct the Solicitor General to make a statement on motions as soon as possible regarding the unusual procedure used in selecting escorts for women prisoners and furthermore that the Solicitor General assure us that if these women are being used because of the

acute shortage of qualified staff, he will now see that the proper people are hired.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43 such a motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ORDER OF CANADA

AFFIRMATION OF SUPPORT FOR ORDER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion requiring unanimous consent.

Tonight His Excellency the Governor General of Canada will admit a number of Canadians to the Order of Canada. Throughout this country many individual Canadians contribute, through their own work or through public and charitable service, above and beyond the average. They do so without any thought of reward and often with the sacrifice of personal pursuits. I move:

That this House therefore affirms its support of the Order of Canada as a public recognition and expression of gratitude to these distinguished citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There being unanimous consent, it is therefore moved by the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), seconded by the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen):

That this House therefore affirms its support of the Order of Canada as a public recognition and expression of gratitude to these distinguished citizens.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

● (1410)

PENITENTIARIES

SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION OF INSTITUTION AT STURGEON IN VIEW OF OPPOSITION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that in excess of 240 property owners and residents in the vicinity of the proposed medium and maximum security prison in the municipal district of Sturgeon are opposed to the building of this institution on prime agricultural land when more marginal land is nearby and have voiced this opposition to the minister, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone):

[Mr. Reynolds.]

That the Prime Minister remove the Solicitor General from his present portfolio because of the lack of openness that the minister has shown in his dealings with the residents of Pembina by first, on October 28, 1975, stating he would not proceed with the construction of the prison if the residents were opposed and then, on February 25, 1976, by reversing his position by stating that he planned to proceed even though there was considerable objection.

Again, I insist that the Solicitor General—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member brings forward a motion for the removal of the Solicitor General. The rest seems to be debate as opposed to a motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Before such a motion may be presented pursuant to Standing Order 43 there must be unanimous agreement.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT OF FOOD INSPECTION SYSTEM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent of the House to discuss an urgent and important matter.

As the present legislation of the federal Department of Agriculture leaves the door wide open to gigantic swindles all across Canada through the use of the seal "Canada Approved" in meat classification; as the current number of food inspectors is really inadequate, which state of affairs results in paralyzing the production of law-abiding producers; and, as it is the duty of the government to protect the consumer, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That this House enjoin the government to take all necessary steps to expand the food inspection services, with a view to ensuring that such unpleasant incidents as occurred last fall, in which carrion was distributed in Quebec, do not recur.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS OF MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. Speaker: Before beginning the oral question period I know hon. members would want to join with me in calling attention to the presence in our gallery this afternoon of two distinguished visitors in the persons of the two most recently nominated, and now sworn in, Lieutenant-Governors of our provinces, the first being the Hon. Jean-Paul Jobin, Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: —and the Hon. George Porteous, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

ITEMS OF AGENDA FOR CONFERENCE WITH PREMIERS— PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MEETING

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to gallop right along.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: My question is directed to the Prime Minister. I should like to ask the Prime Minister with regard to the first ministers' meeting that is to be held in early May what items he has proposed for the agenda and whether he has in mind a private meeting at 24 Sussex Drive or whether he has suggested that at least part of the conference be open?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not mind if the Leader of the Opposition continues to gallop along, so long as he and his party continue to lose elections. That is fine.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Why don't you call the by-election?

Mr. Trudeau: The meeting is early in May, and the main item on the agenda will be energy pricing.

Mr. Clark: If the preamble was a challenge, we would be prepared to accept it in Ottawa-Carleton.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: In light of the importance of the problems before the country, and the concern that the Prime Minister has expressed that there be a nationwide debate on these problems, I would like to ask the Prime Minister why he has not proposed following the format of last year's conference at least to the extent that the first part of the meeting is open to the public and that the agenda allow discussion on the general direction of the economy.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, at all these conferences the agenda and the format, whether it be in camera or before camera is decided by the premiers and myself. I made a proposal to them on the pricing of oil and gas and, based on our previous experiences, I think we unanimously agreed that we were never likely to reach a decision on the appropriate price for oil and gas in front of television cameras and that even in camera it was not certain we would reach agreement but that we had a better chance there than in front of cameras. That is why I suggested this format. Of course, if the premiers reply that they want to have it in front of cameras, that would be acceptable to me.

Mr. Clark: Rather than leaving all the initiatives to the provinces, I wonder if the Prime Minister might canvass his fellow first ministers on the question of expanding both the time and the terms of reference of the meeting, and also canvass them on the possibility of holding at least part of that meeting in public.

Mr. Trudeau: I have already written to them making a suggestion to them. They usually feel pretty free to express their views, and if they want to have the media and observers present, I am sure they will indicate it.

ALLEGATION ONE PREMIER DESIRES PUBLIC MEETING— GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): I wonder if the Prime Minister would confirm that the only decided opinion he has received from the premiers so far has been an indication from at least one that the meeting should be open to the public and perhaps even extended beyond the one day.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I regret that I have not seen the answer from even one premier as yet. It may have arrived this morning and I will look at it. Naturally, I will be guided by the consensus which develops.

SUGGESTED EXTENSION OF THE AGENDA OF MEETING WITH PREMIERS

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Can the Prime Minister tell us whether he has canvassed the provincial premiers to extend the meeting to include such matters as the breaking in period for the controls, constitutional reforms and many of the other pressing issues which many of the premiers would wish to discuss and hopefully wish to discuss in public?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Let me remind the House that I did suggest another meeting of first ministers to be held in mid-June at which we would be looking more at the general economic matters, particularly the fiscal arrangements, equalization plans, and so on. Naturally, it is unlikely that we will take all the time, either in early May or in mid-June, discussing just the one item. I am sure that the premiers would want to bring

other concerns. Whether they will let me know in advance by way of a suggested agenda or whether we will raise the subject informally when we meet is something which will be determined by the premiers and myself.

● (1420)

I repeat at this time that I have made a suggestion to them in line with our collectively expressed hopes at the last meetings, that we would try to meet in this way. If the premiers have other views, I would gladly entertain them.

Mr. Lawrence: I wonder if the Prime Minister could at least undertake that the premiers will be canvassed as to whether there will be an open meeting or a closed meeting—and I certainly hope it will be open—and that the public at large and the members of this House would know in advance what the agenda is and the terms of that agenda.

Mr. Woolliams: Why all the secrecy?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member asks why all the secrecy. I think hon. members will understand that in the matter of 10 provincial premiers and the federal government trying to decide whether the price of oil at the wellhead in Alberta and Saskatchewan should remain at $8 or go up to some other figure, it is not likely that great amounts of public discussion will bring us any closer to a unanimous feeling. There was a meeting between the energy ministers just a few weeks ago. They spent quite some time trying to make progress toward a common position, and they were unable to do so.

Mr. Stanfield: That was in private.

Mr. Trudeau: That was in private. I doubt whether within this House or within the Tory Party there is any one feeling on what the price of energy should be. If the members of the Tory Party could open their caucuses to the public so that we would be hearing their discussions on the price of oil, perhaps they could reach unanimity, and then that would prove—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REASON FOR ALLOCATING SUCH A LARGE PROPORTION OF DEFENCE BUDGET TO PURCHASE "ORION"

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. In his recent television interview the minister acknowledged that the spending of approximately $1 billion on 18 Orion aircraft is based primarily on the assumption that they will head off a war of attrition in continental Europe by ensuring protective covering for convoys, a view of war which I would have thought disappeared in about 1945, and since most of the defence budget's allocation for new equipment for the next four or five years will go into the Orion aircraft, which the government concedes, would the minister explain briefly to the House why the government is putting all its eggs in this particular basket?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we are not putting all our eggs in this basket, but we do have very strong reasons for wanting to proceed. As I have already explained to the house, this aircraft is the most cost effective of any of the alternatives. Its purchase also provides the greatest number of industrial benefits to Canada. However, in addition to that, this aircraft meets several major objectives of this country which have been mentioned in this House for the last three or four years. First, we will be obtaining new equipment for the Canadian armed forces.

Mr. Forrestall: Is that a promise?

Mr. Richardson: We will be meeting our commitment to the NATO alliance.

Mr. Woolliams: First time.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Richardson: Most important of all, as a sovereign nation this country will be able to know what is going on in the oceans which surround Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: In his answer, the minister confirmed that he is preparing in a magnificent way for the second world war. He did not deny that the basic assumption for the purchase of the Orion aircraft is to protect convoys which are to be used only if there is a prolonged war in continental Europe which, on behalf of my party, I assert is an absolutely absurd priority. However, the white paper on defence states that our first defence priority is to maintain Canadian sovereignty. In the words of the minister on other occasions, the Orion purchase is primarily a NATO commitment. Given the amount of capital it would take up in the next three years, I should like to ask the minister how he intends to meet the number one defence priority stated by his own government, and, specifically, how we are going to provide patrols for the protection of our fisheries or for the control of pollution?

Mr. Richardson: To respond to those questions in order, let me say that our major objective is to play our part in achieving international stability, and the way we do that is by helping our NATO partners to achieve a balance of military force, a balance which for 25 or 30 years has maintained a peaceful world. That is what we are trying to do, not only by acquiring long range aircraft but by re-equipping our armed forces in other ways. We are also able to meet the other objectives of carrying out surveillance of our fishing fleets and surveillance of the north at the same time.

Mr. Broadbent: In view of the absolute absurdity of the government's position, would the minister acknowledge that the main reason for going ahead with this deal is to live up to the government's perception of Canada's obligation to purchase more equipment from the United States because of its view of our past failure in terms of the defence provision sharing agreements—the Americans simply want us to spend a little more on the equipment they have produced.

Mr. Richardson: I think the hon. member might direct some of his inquiries on the buildup of aircraft and military equipment to the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries. We have clear evidence that the Soviet Union has been building up its military strength far beyond its defence requirements. We are playing our part in NATO to help to create a balance of military force which will be strong enough to maintain peace in the world.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

ALLEGED SECRET DISCUSSIONS WITH MRS. FRANCIS WITH OFFICIALS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ALLEGED INFLUENCES ACTING AGAINST GAMES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Would the minister advise the House as the results which have come up from the secret discussions between Mrs. Francis, an official of his department, and COJO representatives and other agencies eager to give a good image of Canada and Quebec during the preparation for the games and the actual Olympic Games in Montreal?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am not aware of such discussions, secret or otherwise.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): They are so secret the minister does not know about them!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

The meeting which Mrs. Francis attended took place late in February, that means over a month ago and we still did not get any information regarding the outcome. Would the minister tell the House whether or not there is an international anti-Olympic campaign going on which might distort not only the image of Canada and Quebec in the whole world but also significantly reduce the impact of the policies carried out by various departments, federal or provincial, and which were aiming at publicizing the games and Canada?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: I will make inquires about the meeting that the hon. member suggests was held a week or a month ago. As far as Canada's image with respect to the Olympics is concerned, that will be determined by Canada because no move, to my knowledge, has been engineered in any other part of the world.

Oral Questions

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON SOME OF THE INVESTIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE TORIES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Solicitor General who has been unusually silent with regard to a number of inquiries undertaken by his department. I suggest the people of Canada should be enlightened. Can the Solicitor General inform us as to the status of the following RCMP investigations: Sky Shops, the SIU, the Olympic village, cleaning contracts, Mirabel? Can he advise the House whether any charges are pending at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not know whether the hon. member is serious in suggesting the Solicitor General should be given an opportunity to report on all those matters at the same time.

An hon. Member: Just one would do.

● (1430)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as I said many times, it is not the custom to comment in the House on police investigations while they are under way. I can say this about the Sky Shops investigation: the investigation has been completed and the evidence given to the Quebec Department of Justice for consideration relating to prosecution. All the other investigations are still under way and many witnesses are yet to be interviewed.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS IN INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I am not so much concerned about the investigations involving the minister's department. I am talking about the chaotic situation in penitentiaries in which we find a great deal of unrest, overcrowding, suicide—

An hon. Member: From which prisoners escape.

Mr. Alexander: —and questionable administrative practices. I am talking about the institutions at Archambault, Millhaven, Drumheller, about the B.C. penitentiary, Dorchester and, last but not least, Prince Albert. Is the minister aware of the very serious conditions in those institutions? Will he look into the matter? If so, when can we expect action and a report from the minister?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, these are all penitentiaries with very dangerous people inside.

Mr. Paproski: You sound more like the Prime Minister every day.

Oral Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE

MARINE SEARCH AND RESCUE—MEASURES TO ENSURE EFFICIENCY OF ORGANIZATION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport may I direct my question to the Minister of National Defence? As the Minister of Transport in the statement released at eleven o'clock this morning, made the tragic admission that the marine search and rescue organization is no longer entirely adequate; as, so far this year, ten fishermen on the east and west coasts of Canada have lost their lives; and as the special task force report will not be ready for cabinet until mid-1976, may I ask the minister what immediate steps he, as the minister responsible, is taking to ensure the maximum efficiency of the service protecting our fishermen?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, there is a division of responsibility. The Department of National Defence is responsible for the air search, the Department of Transport for the coastal or marine aspect of search and rescue. I cannot comment on the statement my colleague made this morning, because I have not seen it or talked to him.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The division of responsibility is precisely at the core of the present situation. While the minister is considering spending millions of dollars to purchase equipment from a company in the United States, could he not find a few more extra dollars with which to provide our fishermen protection until the task force report is ready?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the long-range patrol aircraft we are buying will help us know the positions of fishing fleets, which is important in search and rescue operations.

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF CONFLICTING STATEMENTS ON ADEQUACY OF MARINE SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. On April 8, 1975, 365 days ago, the minister said in this House, as reported on page 4595 of *Hansard*, that our air-sea rescue facilities were, in his view, adequate. Today, on April 7, 1976, the Minister of Transport said they are inadequate. Is the minister prepared to alter the record? Will he get it straight, please?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that I was not responding with respect to the responsibilities of the Ministry of Transport, which has a responsibility for the marine side of search and rescue. Many successful rescues have been made involving not only search from the air but by the Department of Transport as well. I was referring to the adequacy of the service in that sense.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister saying that there have been no consultations at all involving those two departments of government on this important matter? Meanwhile, we are still losing fishermen on both coasts.

[Mr. Paproski.]

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, no, I am not saying that. There have been close and continuing consultations between the Departments of Transport and National Defence on this matter.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY TO CANADIAN LAW—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO OBTAIN COMPLIANCE

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It arises from his answer to me of Monday, when he told me that in the past year some 5,516 foreign diplomats accused of breaking Canadian laws could not be charged because they invoked diplomatic immunity. As in no case could the charge be considered as harassment preventing the diplomat from discharging official responsibilities in Canada, I ask the minister, what is the government doing to prod recalcitrant governments, presently thumbing their noses at Canadian law, to ask their diplomats to abide by Canadian law and accept responsibility for their actions in Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, obviously, I am familiar with the information made available in response to the hon. member's question. Foreign diplomats in Canada are beneficiaries, so to speak, of diplomatic immunity, and our diplomats in other countries have similar privileges. I believe that diplomats resident in Canada ought to look at this general performance and determine among themselves if there is no way to conform with Canadian practice. We encourage Canadian diplomats abroad to observe the laws of their host countries and not to escape from those laws under the general blanket of immunity.

HABITAT CONFERENCE IN VANCOUVER—MEASURES TO ENSURE PAYMENT OF HOTEL BILLS BY DELEGATES

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As many delegates attending the Stockholm conference on the environment, in 1972, left Stockholm without paying their hotel and other bills, what action will the government take to make sure that delegates attending the Habitat conference in Vancouver will not leave the country before paying their hotel and other bills?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that will be a difficulty with Habitat. I think that guests in Vancouver will, with the assistance of hotel operators, pay their bills.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

DATE OF COMPLETION OF JOB CLASSIFICATION—PAYMENT OF BONUS TO BILINGUAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Postmaster General.

In the light of the situation prevailing in downtown Montreal post offices where postal employees systematically refuse to serve the general public in either official languages, could the Postmaster General inform members of the House if the classification of bilingual positions is completed, when he will proceed with the identification of bilingual positions and if employees filling these positions will be paid according to their additional linguistic aptitude?

[*English*]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, to answer the latter part of the question, it is for Treasury Board to say if workers in the Post Office or other government departments who must work in both languages will be compensated financially. The working language in the post office in Montreal has been, basically, French, to everybody's satisfaction. Slightly more than 300 jobs or positions in the Quebec region are classed as bilingual, and most were so designated when the Official Languages Act was implemented. I am glad to say that strangers, tourists, English speaking minorities in Quebec and French speaking people in places like St. Boniface and Vancouver are entitled to enter their post office and be served in their official language. I intend to see that policy carried out in the Montreal post office as well as in the St. Boniface or Vancouver post offices, and, indeed, in any other post office in Canada.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

SUGGESTED ADOPTION OF GUIDELINES FOR CONTRACT TENDERING—ASSURANCE OF PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. As the minister admitted that his department let two contracts to a company owned by a public servant and a member of his family, contrary to what he said in the House on Monday, and since the government is in the habit of awarding contracts to companies whose principal owners are unknown, will the minister set out guidelines for contract tendering in his department which will require companies, before they can be considered for contracts, to disclose who their principal owners are?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a complex question. An administrative group is looking into that precise matter.

Mr. Paproski: Oh, yes, how many horses do you have on the payroll?

Mr. Nystrom: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the Department of Public Works does not require information concerning wages paid to workers employed by firms which obtain government contracts, will the minister so frame the guidelines as to make sure that firms which obtain contracts pay their workers at least the minimum federal wage?

● (1440)

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, it is one of the terms of all of the contracts for cleaning entered into that a scale of wages recommended to us by the Department of Labour will be paid.

* * *

POST OFFICE

ALLEGATION OF THEFT IN MONTREAL OFFICE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Postmaster General. It might be regarded as supplementary to the previous question. There are reports of other troubles in the Montreal post office, including the theft of mails by supervisory personnel. Can the Postmaster General either confirm or deny those reports and what action is he taking to deal with this problem?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I have always said that there are not going to be two different measures of justice in the post office. Five supervisors in question have been suspended. I felt there was sufficient evidence in the case of at least two to proceed with criminal charges and that has already taken place.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ACCEPTABILITY OF HALL REPORT ON PENSIONS FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. It is in connection with the fact that the report of the Hon. Emmett Hall is now ready, that is the conciliation report with respect to the dispute between railway workers and management. Has the minister any indication from either side how long it will take to determine whether the conclusions of the Hon. Emmett Hall are acceptable to the protagonists in this matter?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of the question. No, there has been no reaction. I expect a reaction from the parties some time later this afternoon. I will be able to comment on it with more exactitude to the hon. member and others tomorrow.

Mr. Fraser: In view of the seriousness of this dispute to the economy of the country, can the minister advise whether there is any indication now that in the absence of acceptance by either side, both sides are prepared to continue negotiations on the basis of the conclusions reached

by the Hon. Emmett Hall? Does the minister have up-to-date information in that regard?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I can only express the hope that the report of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall will form the basis of a settlement. I think the hon. member and the House will agree that he has been an exceedingly able labour negotiator and arbitrator in the past. In terms of credibility and fairness, he stands high with both parties. That is the basis for some optimism.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

WIVES OF OFFICERS ACTING AS ESCORTS FOR FEMALE PRISONERS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. It relates to my earlier Standing Order 43 regarding the wife of the director of the British Columbia institution and the wife of the assistant director of the Drumheller institution and the fact they are acting as escorts of inmates going to Kingston penitentiary. Is the minister aware this has been going on and does he consider it a good policy for the penitentiary system?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of this particular incident. However, I am advised it is not an exceptional procedure with women inmates. Since these transfers do not take place that often, full time matrons cannot always be found to do this work and they find that other people can do it just as well.

Mr. Reynolds: Will the Solicitor General check into this to find out whether any training is being given to these wives, what their qualifications are and the number of trips they have taken in the past year?

Mr. Allmand: I will be pleased to do so, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH APPEAL COMMISSION REVISES DECISIONS OF OFFICERS

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Could the minister tell the House the criteria or circumstances that sometimes prompt the Immigration Appeal Board to review decisions previously made by Unemployment Insurance Commission officers?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would have to go into more detail than the question period will permit. However, I will be glad to give the hon. member full information on that issue and the procedures, in any exchange that we can arrange.

[Mr. Fraser.]

AIRPORTS

PICKERING—PLANS FOR USE OF LAND IN VIEW OF ABANDONMENT OF CONSTRUCTION PLANS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, I will direct my question to the Prime Minister. I will put my question to the Acting Minister of Transport. With air travel out of Toronto and Canada having plateaued and as such travel now will come under the original Ministry of Transport forecasts, will the acting minister indicate what the government plans to do with the Pickering area lands expropriated by the government and which are now presumably not needed for a further airport in that location?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I could give a vague answer, but I know the hon. member likes to deal in specifics. Therefore, I would ask the parliamentary secretary if he would answer.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly bring this question to the attention of the minister.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

FORM OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW DAIRY POLICY—REASON FOR DELAY

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In his absence, I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary. Does the Minister of Agriculture intend to make a statement on changes and revisions in the 1976-77 dairy policy in the House or will the contents of that statement be in the form of a press release, either from his office or the office of the Canadian Dairy Commission?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the dairy policy will be made within the next two or three days by the minister in or outside the House. It rests with the minister to decide how to proceed.

[*English*]

Mr. Wise: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Is the delay further evidence of the minister's inability to convince his cabinet colleagues of the need to adequately support the Canadian dairy industry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with the policy to be announced in a few days.

[*English*]

FLOODS

DATE OF COMPLETION OF STUDY OF MEASURES TO PREVENT FLOODING IN MONTREAL AREA

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Can the minister report a completion date for the study, jointly undertaken by his predecessor and the Quebec provincial government minister in 1974, to investigate what action could be taken in respect of the high water levels in the back river of Montreal and the Lake of Two Mountains to reduce the damage from the flooding which has recurred again this year?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the undertaking then taken by the Minister of the Environment was carried out. Within a few weeks I should receive an interim report and in June we will get the official report on the study made on floodings of rivers in the vicinity of Montreal.

* * *

MANPOWER

POSSIBLE RENEWAL OF LOCAL INITIATIVES PROJECTS AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

The great majority of members acknowledge the value of the Local Initiatives Program and its favourable effects on reducing unemployment during the difficult periods of the year. The Richmond constituency benefitted from this program and greatly appreciates it.

In connection with the LIP, can the minister assure the House that it will be renewed for the year 1976-77 and if so can he say whether the budget earmarked for the LIP will be as substantial as last year's?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the decision announced in the House in, I believe, December which indicated that the budget for 1976-77 will be $100 million for a program that might be adapted in some ways, but it will be essentially the same as and have the objectives of the Local Initiatives Program.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Is the minister in a position to say on what criteria or general standards the government will base the distribution of the budget earmarked for the Local Initiatives Program among the various parts of Canada?

[*English*]

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, the formula for distribution of the funds has been a matter of public record for several years. Essentially, it has increasingly been directed to areas of high unemployment. That is the intention when we develop the formula for the winter of 1976-77.

* * *

● (1450)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CAMBODIA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS—SUGGESTED WITHDRAWAL OF AID

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister, through sources in Thailand or through the United Nations, received any further information on the situation in Cambodia about which there is considerable disquiet and several questions have been asked in the House in recent weeks?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to get reliable information from Cambodia at the present time with respect to any violations of human rights that may exist. As I mentioned in reply to an earlier question, we are concerned about any violation of human rights which may take place. There is, as the hon. member may know, a sub-commission of the United Nations on discrimination and protection of minorities which is responsible for monitoring these situations, but that body takes up questions only when reports are made by individuals or groups who have direct and reliable knowledge as to the occurrence of such violations in the area.

Mr. Johnston: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Given the rejection of this country apparently by the government there and the abrupt change of head of state in Cambodia, and in view of the stories that have trickled out from Cambodia, is Canada considering withdrawing its recognition and aid to the Khmer Rouge regime as an indication of our concern?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that we do not provide any aid, humanitarian or otherwise, to that particular country.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

ISSUANCE OF NEW PERMITS TO DRILL FOR OIL ON NATIVE LAND—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It has been reported today that 68 new permits have been issued on native land in the Northwest Territories covering 12 million acres, an increase of over 375 per cent over last year's 18 permits. Would the minister confirm the report or otherwise; and further, would he advise the House why he did not—and I repeat, did not—consult with the Inuit Taparisat prior to the issue of those permits, as had apparently been promised in their presentation to cabinet on February 27 of this year?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the issuance of these permits but I will be happy, as the hon. member requests, to look into the matter and get a report.

* * *

TRADE

EFFECT OF REPEAL OF SECTION 272 OF RAILWAY ACT ON FLOUR AND GRAIN EXPORTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Has the minister studied the effect on Canada's flour and grain exports which repeal of section 272 of the Railway Act would have through passage of Bill C-87? If so, has the minister been able to come up with suggestions to overcome the harm that would occur to trade from eastern ports and to the flour milling industry?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of representations on the subject and I am doing exactly what the hon. member suggests, namely seeing what the impact will be and also having discussions with the Minister of Transport and his officials on the issue.

Mr. McCleave: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister act quickly and announce that the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Transport will not be allowed to cut the throats of the ports of Montreal, Halifax and Saint John and of the flour milling industry?

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

MERCURY POISONING IN GRASSY NARROWS AND WHITE DOG RESERVES—EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT—POSSIBILITY OF LEGAL ACTION AGAINST COMPANY

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the minister report to the House the status of unemployment in those native communities where mercury poisoning has taken place; and specifically, what initiatives is the department taking to increase employment in light of this disastrous mercury poisoning which has so devastatingly taken away jobs in native communities?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of this unemployment was created prior to the mercury poisoning and as a result of the relocation of these communities. The situation now is that we have been working with the chiefs of the Grassy Narrows and White Dog reserves in an effort to tie together some manpower training funds from my colleague's department and funds from the welfare department. We are optimistic that by working with the chiefs and councils we will be able to make a significant impact on the current unemployment situation.

Mr. Malone: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister report to the House whether the jurisdictional question with the provinces has been resolved in regard to mercury poisoning in native communities; and specifically what obligations are being entered into by the companies that caused the mercury poisoning in respect of compensation to the native peoples?

Mr. Buchanan: In reply to the first question, Mr. Speaker, basically we are endeavouring to work directly with the native peoples. We have a co-ordinator for our department who is endeavouring to work with them and assist them in the creation of jobs. So far as the legal obligations of the company are concerned, I am afraid the situation is much more difficult. We have offered to assist the band in taking the company to court. However, there does not seem to be a desire on their part to pursue that course.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GARRISON DIVERSION—POSSIBILITY OF STRUCTURAL CHANGES

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question either to the Minister of the Environment or the Secretary of State for External Affairs; I am not sure into which category my question will fall. Since it is in connection with the Garrison diversion project in the state of Minnesota, perhaps it might be addressed to the Minister of the Environment. Have there been discussions between Canadian and United States officials on possible changes, structural or otherwise, to the actual physical building of the Garrison diversion project? If so, can the minister report to the House what these changes are?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I have met the United States ambassador and I will eventually meet the person responsible for environment in Washington to discuss all these problems.

Mr. Murta: A supplementary question. Might I ask the Minister of the Environment whether, following his discussions with his counterpart in the United States, he would agree to make a statement in the House to inform the Canadian people, especially people in Manitoba, exactly what the government is intent on doing so far as that project is concerned?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether a statement in the House is the best procedure, but I have no objection to making public any agreement that we reach together.

IMMIGRATION

ALLEGATION OF TAX SECURITY AT TORONTO AIRPORT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It relates to reports describing security in immigration at Toronto International Airport as shoddy and inadequate, similar to the report that the joint committee made on immigration security and that it should be beefed up. What steps are being taken to examine the allegations that have been made about the Toronto International Airport, and what corrective measures have already been put into place by the minister prior to the pre-Olympic influx?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I read the allegations in the article, and in regard to the reference to immigration, partly because it covered many facets, I think I would have to say that some of the information was apparently based on a report of some former staff or people who were understandably a bit disgruntled because they had no future there. Most of the information is really quite inaccurate.

One cannot claim any perfect screen because of the number of visitors that cross our border, and the hon. member is fully aware of that; but I am satisfied that we do have a good system there. The situation has been thoroughly checked out by my department, and while it cannot possibly be failsafe, under the circumstances I am satisfied it is reasonably good. We are constantly looking at ways of improving it.

* * *

● (1500)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ADEQUACY OF TRAINING AND NUMBERS OF PERSONNEL DOING SECURITY WORKS AT AIRPORTS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my supplementary question, eminating from the same report, to the Solicitor General. Is he satisfied that RCMP personnel at the Toronto and other international airports, who have had only very limited training, are sufficiently trained and sufficiently numerous to handle the increasing numbers of passengers we can expect during the Olympic? Is security satisfactory to his way of thinking?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that they are properly trained but I would have to look into the question of whether we have sufficient numbers. I have not been briefed on that recently but I will inquire. You are talking about Toronto?

Mr. Epp: All international airports.

Mr. Allmand: All international airports; I will check on that.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. YEWCHUK—POSITION OF MEDICAL DOCTORS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SITTING ON HEALTH COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A few days ago the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) raised a question of privilege in respect of which several members made contributions. It has been indicated that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) would like to reply.

Mrs. Simma Holt (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on April 1 in this House, as reported at page 12358 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) demanded that I apologize for what he described as an attempt:

> —to impute motives to certain Conservative members of parliament by implying that they had a particular pecuniary self-interest to protect, thereby attempting to undermine their credibility as members of parliament and prejudice their right to speak freely in accordance with their conscience before the standing committee.

Those were the words and interpretation of the hon. member for Athabasca, Mr. Speaker. They were not my words.

He demanded an apology in respect of two matters that do not relate to anything I said or did. His first was based on his own misinterpretation of what I said, and the second in respect of a CTV program in which I was neither involved nor did I inspire, by Eric Malling, a reporter I did not know until just yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: I met him because the hon. member raised this point. I regret that I missed the exchange which occurred here last Thursday, Mr. Speaker. But even more, I regret that the important business of the nation was once more interrupted by the opposition for what, if all the facts had been told, is a picayune matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Nobody believes you.

Mrs. Holt: Why are you making so much noise? Are you scared?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: I regret that the debate here was blown out of all proportion by an incomplete and, what I consider to be, a misleading report surrounding comments with which I introduced my questioning of the Canadian Medical Association in the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, on March 25.

Incidentally the statute of limitations must enter this as it has taken the hon. member a long time to find out he was hurt. However, I feel an answer is expected of me and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if my ego were delicate, and if I put my ego above the affairs and problems of Canada, I would stand here and demand three apologies, one for the suggestion by the hon. members who sat opposite me at the committee table that because we had no doctors on the

government side of the table we were less competent to serve our constituents. It was that remark that caused me to reply in the way the hon. member complained of here. He started it!

An hon. Member: So there!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: I could ask for an apology for the attack on me while I was absent from this House, implying I was—

An hon. Member: No one is going to attack you, Simma.

Mrs. Holt: You are afraid and you are cowards, too. You accused me of being a coward, implying—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Holt: The hon. member implied—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Learn how to behave.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The purpose of the intervention by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway is to verify what may have been left in doubt about some of the aspects of the question of privilege, as I understand it. I have some doubt as to whether there is a question of privilege up to now, but I am getting a bit worried that though there may not be one now, we may be getting into one soon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice in the transcript that they gave everybody on their own side a chance to speak against me, but they cannot face my words and my reply now.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: My second ground for an apology would be that this passage implied I was afraid to be here to face the hon. member. An hon. member is quoted as having said:

She knew it was coming up and that is why she is not here.

My goodness, I fear no man!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: But the reverse isn't true.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: I fear no man, certainly none of those on the opposite side, however much I might admire a few—but very few.

My third ground for apology could be that I resent very much your being told, Mr. Speaker, or any other member, that I implied conflict of interest when a member's professional background is used to aid him or her in the huge, onerous, and very responsible job we have been assigned in this House.

Certainly I do not demand an apology for any one of those. And I do not expect that you could rule that an apology from me is warranted in view of what actually was said and the remark from hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party that inspired my second remark of which the hon. member complained, that the government members of the committee were not doctors and therefore were not qualified to participate in the committee. The hon. member who complained so bitterly to you, or one who sat beside him, did not bother to tell you that it was this interjection that inspired a retort that obviously he did not expect and did not like, and which caused him to stand here and demand that the entire House stop its business so he and the doctors on the Progressive Conservative side of the House could receive an apology.

An hon. Member: At $219 a minute.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: You know the quotation, Mr. Speaker, so I will not repeat it, but he forgot to tell you that their interjection was: "Where are your doctors on the government side of the House?" They said: "Where are your doctors", to which I responded, and I think quite properly, that it would be better that people who receive service and pay for service start asking a few questions, and that we on the government side in committee were well qualified to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Holt: It was also inaccurate to claim, as was reported in *Hansard*, that I had the last word. While I frequently do get the last word, and I rather like it, I did not in this case.

Referring to the statement that I suggested a conflict of interest when a member uses his or her expertise to advantage here, that is very wrong and damaging to all of us. On the contrary, I feel it is most important that this House be represented by all professions, industrial, commercial, and working segments of society to achieve a true House of the common people, and that the expertise of each person from a cross-section of the entire Canadian constituency be well used in the House. In this way the people can be best represented.

The special knowledge and value of each person in this House are of inestimable value to Canada. I never suggested there was conflict of interest in the use of the expertise each of us—

An hon. Member: Give her two cents and let her finish.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: You are being chicken, you know.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Speaker, they are being chicken. I never suggested there was conflict of interest in the use of the expertise each of us has gained in our businesses or professional life. It was the hon. member for Athabasca's own

projection and conception; it was never mine. In fact the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard), one of the doctors on the opposite side of the committee, was praised very highly by me for his great contribution, based on his medical experience and his years of experience here. He understood the spirit of Bill C-68, which others apparently did not. They, the others on the opposite side, supported the CMA brief very strongly when the CMA officials cried "poor", and pretended to be the martyr of government cutback,—the slapped child of a father's frustration—not deserving the slap, but being nearest when dad's anger explodes at the dinner table.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: I pointed out—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the previous occasion I interrupted the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) in the midst of an exposé of all the virtues which ought to be possessed by those who want to serve the public in this House. All of it is a very valuable exposition of the attributes which each of us may offer to the constituents at large here, but again I say that while that reasoning is very valid and very important in fact the question at issue is a narrow question of privilege. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) has been most helpful in intervening to explain the nature of her remarks, but I would want, as I did in respect of the hon. member for Lambton-Kent, to call her to attention simply to get back to the basic point of procedure or privilege which is involved, and perhaps conclude her remarks.

Mrs. Holt: I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that at no time during this hearing—and I think this is a matter for your consideration and ruling on this point of privilege and request for an apology—did the member rise on privilege at committee and ask the chairman of the committee for an apology. It was just cross-talk over the table. It took the hon. member a whole week to find out his tender feelings were hurt and come before you, Mr. Speaker, to ask for an apology. I think it is improper and, in the language of the school ground—which I believe those opposite best understand since they often behave as though they are in the school ground—I would suggest that a member who is thin skinned should not use spitballs, because he could get them right back.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) on the same question of privilege.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I would just like simply to object to the hon. member's suggestion that the job of a government backbencher is huge and complex.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hope hon. members will understand that I wish to give this matter some further consideration. There are a number of very interesting and somewhat conflicting precedents, but I think one thing comes through again, which is the obvious difficulty of attempting to rule from here in any way on the proceedings that have taken place in the standing committees.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is one which will not require a ruling from Your Honour. Since the first Monday following the Christmas recess a number of questions to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) have been dealt with in this House in respect of the inadequacy of search and rescue procedures in Canada. Each round of questioning would always follow some tragedy at sea, either on the west coast or on the east coast. This has become a serious topic of this session.

Today the Minister of Transport issued a very important statement outside the House. The statement was delivered to my office at 11 a.m. today. However, the minister did not show the House the common decency of coming to the House, standing in his place, and being accountable to this House for what he said outside the House. That, I submit, is contempt, and is a complete contradiction of our parliamentary system of responsible government.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Tenth report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs—Mr. Robinson.

[*Translation*]

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

Ninth report, in both official languages, of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders—Mr. Loiselle (Saint-Henri).

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse on a point of order.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, it is a very short point of order. At the beginning of these proceedings, the House adopted a motion concerning the Order of Canada and some Canadians will receive this order tonight. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that among the personalities who will receive this order will be the Hon. W. A. C. Bennett, who was premier of British Columbia for 20 years. It is therefore a well deserved honour for this great Canadian and I wanted to bring this to the attention of the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) on a point of order.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add the wishes of my party to those expressed by the hon. member for the Social Credit Party in respect of the honour being bestowed on our former premier of British Columbia this evening.

Order Paper Questions

LOBBY REGISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO REGULATE LOBBYISTS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-432, entituled "An Act to register lobbyists".

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the registration of lobbyists, and a declaration by them stating in whose interest they are working. It imposes a fine and disqualification from lobbying for those convicted of evading these provisions.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,772 and 4,616.

[*Text*]

EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Question No. 3,772—**Mrs. Appolloni:**

1. How many people designated as handicapped are employed in the Public Service?

2. In which departments are they employed and how many are there in each?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. It is not possible to determine the exact number of persons designated as handicapped who are employed in the federal Public Service. Identification of handicaps is voluntary and therefore no records are maintained. However, we can say that in February 1975, 420 handicapped people who have so identified themselves were employed as civil servants in the National Capital Region. In September 1975, Hon. Robert Andras, Minister of Manpower and Immigration announced a joint study with the Public Service Commission to promote the hiring of handicapped in the federal Public Service. In four regions, Montreal, Vancouver, Toronto and the National Capital, demonstration projects have been established. The procedure is: handicapped persons searching for employment register at the Canada Manpower Centre or the Public Service Commission; four departments in each region are participating in this study by listing jobs with the regional counsellors assigned to the study; each time a vacancy has to be filled in one of the four employer departments, the registration files are inspected in order to refer as many handicapped as possible. The candidates must be ready for employment. Thus his or her experiences will help to identify artificial barriers to employment at the end of the study. This participation is requested from the individual but no investigation of the handicap is involved and any discussions are voluntary and entirely confidential. Such discussions will aid the counsellor in finding a job which suits the candidate and will avoid the frustration which would arise if the candidate was referred to an unsuitable job.

2. The following Departments have given the number of employees designates as handicapped in accordance with the terms of the Public Service Commission Staffing Manual—Chapter VI. They have also included those employees who have parking privileges because of disabilities. Other Departments, not listed, have no information available since it is not contained in their departmental personnel records (see Part 1). Communications, 4; Consumer and Corporate Affairs, 33; Energy, Mines and Resources, 52; National Energy Board, 2; Environment, 10; External Affairs, 17; Canadian International Development Agency, 7; Industry, Trade and Commerce, 3; Justice, 1; Labour Canada, 48; Manpower and Immigration, 38; Revenue Canada, 507; Post Office, Headquarters, Ottawa, 4; Public Works, 97; Public Archives, 1; National Library, 1; National Film Board, 1; Public Service Commission, 8; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 11; Canadian Penitentiary Service, 11; Transport Canada, 8; Veterans Affairs, 18.

[Mr. Reynolds.]

● (0000)

REQUEST FOR FUNDS BY SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF THE HERITAGE OF CANADA

Question No. 4,616—**Mr. Brisco:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,602, has the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development made any further disbursements of funds to the Society for the Study of the Heritage of Canada on behalf of the Heritage Stoney Wilderness Centre since June 4, 1974?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No payments have been made directly to the Society for the Study of the Heritage of Canada since June 1974.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 3,261 and 4,927 could be made orders for returns these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

TREASURY BOARD CIRCULAR NO. 1973-88

Question No. 3,261—**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. What was the effective date of Treasury Board Circular No. 1973-88?

2. Since that date, in how many competitions have the provisions of paragraph 32 of the Circular been applied?

3. How many of the competitions in which paragraph 32 was applied were (a) within the National Capital Region, (b) within the Province of Quebec, (c) in the rest of Canada, (d) for positions carrying an annual salary of (i) $10,000 or less, (ii) between $10,000 and $20,000, (iii) in excess of $20,000?

4. With whom does the power of decision rest in applying the provisions of paragraph 32 to a staff competition?

5. What, if any, provisions exist for (a) internal review of any such decisions, (b) appeal against any such decision by employees?

Return tabled.

NEW IMMIGRANTS

Question No. 4,927—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since January 1970, how many new immigrants were (a) hired as professionals, (b) hired as non-professionals, (c) given non-specialized jobs, (d) unemployed in (i) rural, (ii) semi-rural areas and what was their ethnic origin?

2. What percentage of immigrants decided to settle in rural and semi-rural areas in (a) Canada, (b) each province?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

● (1520)

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notice of motion for the production of papers No. 68?

[*Text*]

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO FRANCE OPTING OUT OF NATO

Motion No. 68—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, minutes of meetings, letters and telegrams relating to Canada's $11 million claim against the Government of France as a result of the opting out by France of the NATO military alliance and the eviction of participating units in 1966.

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the information requested is confidential. Its publication would be prejudicial to the conduct of the international relations of Canada and to the current negotiations. I therefore regret to be obliged to ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Marshall: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate. Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude my comments of last Wednesday in connection with the gun control aspects of this particular bill by reiterating the main features as I see them, and as they have been enunciated in the bill.

First, the bill basically will involve the addition of a licensing system for all persons who now possess or will possess firearms in the future.

Second, there will be a stronger definition of prohibited and restricted weapons.

Third, there will be strengthened penalties for related activities such as importing, possessing, and handling.

Fourth, there will be a strengthening of the permit provisions for businesses which deal in weapons.

Fifth, there will be higher maximum sentences where offensive weapons are involved.

Sixth, the provisions relating to police seizure will be extended in order to enable our security forces to seize without warrant where it is in the interest of safety.

Seventh, there are broad avenues of appeal to any person who feels discriminated against in the course of carrying out this legislation.

Eighth, the measures will be phased in over a three year period, particularly referring to the licensing provisions.

I would like to move on next to that aspect of Bill C-83 which deals with crime detection and electronic surveillance, otherwise referred to as the wiretapping provisions. At present there is a restricted list of offences to which this particular provision can be applied, but the courts will now be empowered under Bill C-83 to grant authorization to interrupt communications for all indictable offences. The problem at the present time is that the list is really too restrictive to permit appropriate surveillance at times when the public interest would be better served by permitting the courts to grant permits in such cases.

I think there is perhaps a legitimate concern being expressed in connection with the apparent elimination of some safeguards of the rights of individuals who come under this bill in its present form, and this aspect, I suggest, is bound to receive considerable discussion in committee. I am referring to the provision which states that evidence derived directly or indirectly will be admissible evidence when the lead has come from an illegal wiretap. The illegal wiretap itself will still be inadmissible under Bill C-83. However, at present anything that is

derived directly or indirectly from illegal wiretaps is also inadmissible.

I think there is also some concern over the aspect of the requirement to notify persons under surveillance. I find the provisions whereby this would be repealed to be somewhat difficult to accept, and I am hopeful that there will be a great deal of discussion of this matter when the bill goes to committee.

The next aspect of the bill that I would like to talk about is that relating to dangerous offenders. At present there are two existing categories of offenders known as habitual criminals and dangerous sexual offenders. These two categories will be replaced by one category known as dangerous offenders. The classification of dangerous offenders will have to be made before sentence is passed, whereas at present I understand that these other two categories can actually be named any time after three months following sentence. There are also broad avenues of appeal still open to anybody who is labelled in this way.

One concern with this dangerous offender clause, and another item that I hope will receive considerable discussion in committee, is the anomaly that may be introduced under the indeterminate sentences rather than using a sentence of a fixed number of years, and this anomaly arises in that under the indeterminate sentence provision parole review will be carried out after three years, and each two years after that. One could end up with an indeterminate sentence as a dangerous offender and be subject to earlier parole provisions than in the case of a fixed sentence of say, 15 years, whereas at present it is my understanding that parole can only be considered after five years. I believe that a Senate committee has already discussed minimum sentences of ten years for dangerous offenders, and I hope that might be looked at again a little more carefully during the committee stage.

The next aspect of the bill that I would like to discuss relates to special crime inquiries. This is mainly intended to deal with the growth in organized crime that we are recognizing in Canadian society. The normal police investigation powers are often not sufficient in this area. A recent example has been Quebec's special inquiry into organized crime which has been shown to be an effective alternative method of investigation. When Bill C-83 was introduced, the legal status of Quebec's crime probe was being challenged. The fact that the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that crime probes come within provincial jurisdiction may necessitate some review of these sanctions in Bill C-83. These questions will have to be considered carefully in committee. I think that the important point is that there is an endeavour on the part of the government through Bill C-83 to move into the area of organized crime and to give it special attention.

A concern has been expressed to me which I will mention because I think it is perhaps somewhat farfetched, nevertheless it could lead to some misunderstanding. It relates to the attempt within the bill to define organized crime. It has been suggested that at present it is defined, I believe, as planned and organized by a number of persons acting in concert. There is some suggestion that this could lead to the ridiculous situation where a group of teenagers could be involved in a minor crime, such as robbing hub caps or other incidental items, and this would be deemed to be organized crime. Obviously this is not the intention, but I hope that in committee there might be some endeavour to find a better definition of organized crime, or perhaps leave the term as it is defined at present.

The next point that I would like to speak about in connection with the bill relates to the parole provisions. Perhaps the most important aspect here is the matter of earned remissions. There will be no more statutory remissions, meaning in effect no more automatic decreases in the period of a sentence. Early release will have to be earned by an inmate under the provisions of Bill C-83.

I think that attention should be drawn to the reorganization and make up of the parole board, which will be increased to 26 full time people from the present nine full time members and ten ad hoc members.

The other aspect which I think is of interest to people in various communities is the determination to include regional parole groups and the fact that indeed the regional people will be involved, in the case of a life sentence, on the actual parole board, with full voting rights. In other words, the community will always be represented in these major cases, and I think this is most important.

Reasons will also have to be given for the decisions of the parole board, and it will be made somewhat easier for inmates to appear at hearings. If parole is broken under the provisions of Bill C-83, there will no longer be a need to go before a magistrate in order to get the inmate back into prison, and the maximum penalties for escape or attempted escape will be increased from five years to ten years.

In finalizing my comments on the bill I should like to say that it is important to note that there are a number of administrative provisions which are also intended to be implemented which will assist in making our penal system more effective. I will enumerate them in summary form. First, there will be a clearing house of information established on police programs which should help in prevention, identification, and related matters. Second, there will be developed better training programs in community relations and preventive policing. Third, there will be a development and dissemination of model programs. Fourth, crime prevention through environmental designs, studies, etc. Will be undertaken, and sixth and last, there will be victimization surveys, which are studies to determine the incidence of crime, the effect on victims, etc.

● (1530)

All in all, these administrative changes and the entire legislation under Bill C-83 are really aimed at giving greater protection to society while maintaining a fair criminal justice system.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on Bill C-83, the government's so-called peace and security legislation. I do so because of the intense concern created by this bill throughout my constituency and throughout Canada. On June 10 of this year I will celebrate 19 years of service in the Canadian House of Commons, and during this period of time, to the best of my recollection, I cannot recall any previous bill which generated so much correspondence and almost violent reaction from the people I am elected to serve.

We on this side of the House have carefully examined this legislation, and we along with our constituents, have come to the conclusion that it is bad legislation. It is legislation which has been hastily drawn up, improperly drafted, and thrown into the legislative hopper as a divisionary tactic in order to take people's minds off the real and threatening problems of the day, namely, the state of the economy brought about by the mismanagement of the government. It is for this reason that our justice critic, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who made an outstanding speech on this bill, moved the following motion:

> Bill C-83 . . . be not now read a second time but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of considering a more proper legislative division thereof.

This motion was not moved without considerable thought being given to its substance by the hon. member and by all members of this party. I support the motion, and in view of the importance of the subject matter, I urge the cabinet—and in fact I urge the supporters of the government—to give serious consideration to this proposal.

Quite frankly, I did not think it would be necessary for me to speak on this bill. I say this because of the hundreds of letters I received from my constituents opposing the measure, letters which were endorsed and forwarded to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Upon checking with my colleagues I found that they too have received hundreds, and in some cases, thousands of letters, and in checking with friends across the way who are supporters of the government I found that they too have received hundreds of letters in opposition to this bill.

In light of this strong opposition any normal government would have altered course, changed direction and in fact would have withdrawn the bill in order to amend and improve its wording. But I submit that we are not dealing with a normal government; in fact, we are dealing with a very abnormal one. We are dealing with a government which says one thing and does another. We are dealing with a government which made a mockery of our prices and incomes policy during the 1974 election campaign and which later turned around and introduced a monster to the Canadian working man and businessman.

We are dealing with a government which claims the working man cannot receive any more than 8 per cent of an increase in salary under its Anti-Inflation Board regulations, while it increases its own spending this year by something like 18 per cent. The rules laid down by the Anti-Inflation Board apparently apply to everyone but the government.

We are dealing with a government which condones, for example, aggression in Africa by Cuban communist troops, while we indirectly support the Castro regime by direct grants under CIDA, outright gifts of money, as well as loans over something like 30 years at 3 per cent. Who would not like a deal like that? But it is not available to everyone.

We are dealing with a government which has made a mockery of justice in Canada by finding it acceptable for ministers of the Crown to telephone judges in an effort to arrange suitable decisions and to make sure, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) said in the House, that they understand the facts and that they do their duty.

The crime is not only misconduct, but even more damaging is the fact that the government, on the surface at least, implies that it has done no wrong. In Canada we have a double standard of justice, one for the rich and privileged, and one for all the rest of us. No state can long survive under this kind of hypocrisy.

As I stated earlier, hundreds of letters opposing Bill C-83 have been received in my office. Many letters are different, but through each one runs a similar and familiar thread. The people I represent can well remember—as I do—living under the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, living under the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker, as well as under the Right Hon. Lester Pearson. It would be unfair to say to this House that they loved these men, but I submit they did not hate them. I have a feeling they were universally respected by most of my constituents. However, this is something I cannot say about the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). As a result of his four letter words inside and outside this House, his address over the New Year with regard to the need for changing our society, his economic policies and wasteful bureaucracy, and his gun control legislation, I submit that the thread which runs through my mail about the Prime Minister is one of distrust and fear.

They ask point blank: why does this man want to seize my gun collection, and when is he planning to declare that the entire nation is faced with an armed insurrection and that the state must step in with its armed forces to take control? These are only a few of the fears which are expressed to me, but they are, nonetheless, genuine and sincere, and they are questions which I cannot answer. They are not only reflected in the correspondence I receive, but they are also reflected in the headlines of the newspapers of our nation. I have in my hand the *Chronicle-Herald* of March 25, and the headline reads: "Gun Law Could Lead to Police State Action." The story reads in part as follows:

> "Police state" confiscation of all privately owned firearms "could happen here" under the peace and security package of legislation proposed by the federal government, Murray Covert, a director of the Kings County Wildlife Association, said at a meeting of the association.

I will not read into the record all which is stated in this release. It is damning enough of the government. However, there is one paragraph which concerns me greatly. Mr. Covert also said:

> "No country in the world that has compulsory gun registration for more than 5 years has not followed with gun confiscation."

Let us look carefully at Bill C-83. It contains 73 pages, 39 of which deal with one matter, namely, gun control. There are five distinct changes in the law in this bill, but only one brings in a special new law on gun control. In other words, 39 pages out of 73 deal with the new law on gun control, which may well explain the fear of my constituents over the attitude of the Prime Minister and the government.

I said earlier that basically this is bad legislation because the minister, when introducing 29 pages of new law, deliberately mixed it up with other amendments. In Nova Scotia we would say to him that he is deliberately and intentionally fogging the issue. In my opinion we should have a

separate debate on gun control and another entirely different debate on the patchwork of amendments to the Criminal Code. This would give an opportunity to every hon. member of this House to express his views according to the dictates of his heart and his conscience.

Even the title is misleading when it states that this is an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violence and other crimes. The minister knows, and surely supporters of the government must know and realize that this is fiction, not really fact.

The record of the government when it comes to controlling crime is as faulty as its record in the economic field. When the Liberal government came into power in 1962 there were something like 217 reported murders. In 1963 it was up to 315. By 1971 the number of murders increased to 426. In 1972 there were 479 murders, and in 1974 there were something like 545 reported murders. In spite of this damaging and, I submit, frightening record, the newspapers of this country carry the propaganda put out by the government that violent crime is on the decrease. What hypocrisy and what nonsense!

Kidnapping, violence, rape, assault, murder and hijacking have occurred day after day until the government had to take some action, even at the expense of its credibility. This bill was the visible result, but I say to the minister that it will do nothing to help solve the causes of crime any more than the Anti-Inflation Board is helping to solve the problems of inflation.

Violent crimes are creating a climate of fear in our growing cities. Faced with economic problems, an expensive taxation policy and spending programs which have eroded the purchasing power of the Canadian dollar, many people, young and old, are looking with fear to the future. In some cases, not knowing where to turn and feeling like a dog chasing its tail, they turn to the great deceiver, alcohol or, worse, to the excessive use of drugs. These actions may turn them on, to use a current phrase, but it also turns them off such things as the production line, the full enjoyment of life, and the sanity line. It is while in a state of temporary instability and insanity that crimes of passion and violence are committed, and because the government created the economic pressures leading up to this state, it must share a heavy responsibility for our present high crime rate. I realize there is a need for proper laws and for proper law enforcement, but crime breeds in our overcrowded cities, in our urban slums and wherever there are injustice and excessive poverty.

● (1540)

The government has made a mockery of its own claims to establish a just society. It has built up a burden of debt with its mishandling of the Canadian economy which has made it difficult, if not impossible, for young and old alike to enjoy a reasonable, normal, happy way of life.

In order to make a major assault on crime, it is necessary to attack the despair and the denial of human opportunity on which crime breeds. We must deal with the underlying causes of crime—poverty, drug abuse, alcoholism, lack of opportunities, unemployment, to name a few of the factors which lead to a higher crime rate.

We live in a land of bountiful resources; we have more wheat than we can eat and more fish than we can catch. In order to tap those resources and provide new opportunities for our people we must rearrange present government programs and spending priorities. We must give hope where now there is only despair. We must make sure that the law is respected, and this cannot be done by creating injustice for the poor while protecting the rich and privileged.

The law will be obeyed only when it is respected, but I fear that Bill C-83 as it is presently written will not be acceptable to the majority of Canadians. I say this because of the many anomalies contained in it. For example, the government has never taken the trouble in all its studies on gun control to determine the cost of administering this legislation, nor do we know the number of bureaucrats required to license all the guns in Canada or to issue permits for restricted weapons as well as the certificates required to obtain ammunition.

All this will be costly and will require yet another army of civil servants. Yet this is the government which claims it is exercising restraint on the one hand, while it establishes an open ended, high cost program on the other. We should at least be given an estimate now of the number of people the program will require, as well as its cost to the Canadian taxpayer, before we are asked to vote on this legislation. I say this as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee: the blind approval of too many pigs in a poke has led to the present financial chaos in Canada and somewhere there must be an accounting, a levelling off, a common sense approach to government or we face economic collapse.

As I said earlier, this is bad legislation. There are so many provisions in Bill C-83 which are improper or poorly drafted that it is impossible to cite all of them in one speech. For example, look at proposed Section 87(2) on page 5 and Section 106.2(5) on page 24. These provisions seem to require that every owner of a restricted weapon must have his registration altered every time he moves his home or place of business, otherwise he commits an offence and is subject to a penalty of up to five years' imprisonment. Surely this is an overly severe threat to a man who may simply forget to have his registration altered when he moves.

Clause 88(1), clause 106.1 and clause 45 of the bill when taken together provide for the licensing of owners of rifles and shotguns, establishing penalties if such persons do not obtain such a licence. This is a feature of the bill to which I must raise strong objections. It will require some two million Canadian citizens who own rifles or shotguns to apply for a licence to continue that ownership and in so doing to fill out an application form—not yet described—and to get two guarantors of as yet unstated status. It will also require that they subject themselves to the discretion of a local firearms registrar, who in turn will be subject to guidelines to be laid down by order in council at some future date. For all this the gun owner must pay a fee in an amount not yet stated.

I believe the benefits of this great bureaucratic operation will be so insignificant that they will not begin to justify the effort. Active criminals will certainly not apply for a licence and, anticipating the requirements of the regulations yet to be published, I ask: where will the line be drawn in approving or rejecting an application in the face

of a record of alcoholism, criminality, or mental illness? Consider all the variations in degree that will have to be taken into account. Because of its complexities alone the operation will tend to become either autocratic or else unfair or meaningless.

As for the proposition that killings with long guns would be reduced by this licensing system, it should be remembered that the majority of such killings are committed by persons who would have no trouble getting a licence because before the event they were considered normal citizens. Others likely to be involved in such killings and who are an identifiable threat could be taken care of by different provisions of the criminal law. As for the man who is a threat because he is partially insane or is intermittently unstable and violent, action could be taken to seize all his firearms under section 105, which wisely would be strengthened by this new bill.

I also believe that the qualifications of hunters and marksmen should be left to the provinces where they would be linked to the administration of the game laws and officially recognized gun clubs. Some provinces already have such a program in operation. Others are moving in that direction. I submit this system would not require any great new bureaucratic machine. Qualification would be based on competence and on knowledge of all gun laws and, with its adoption, a card certifying membership in an approved marksmen's club, a hunters' safety course pass certificate, or a hunting licence could be established as authorization for the sale and purchase of a firearm or ammunition.

I belong to a gun club in Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, and I am certain the members of our club would be happy to undertake this additional responsibility. Some of the provinces already have such a program in operation and others are moving in that direction. Such a system would not necessitate any big, new bureaucratic machine. The qualification would be based on competence, and at the end of the instruction period a certificate could be issued which, on presentation, would authorize the purchase of firearms or ammunition. This would be a logical course to pursue as well as an economical one, something which seems beyond the comprehension of the government.

Clause 99(2) brings into question the delicate matter of a gun owner's responsibility for safe handling and storage. What is meant by the words "careless storage", and how will the courts interpret this proposed section? It seems to me that gun owners may well be exposed to harsh penalties under this unless it is applied with great care.

Clause 100 prescribes the rules governing the manufacturing, repairing, reporting of losses, advertising, etc. of firearms and restricted weapons by dealers and gunsmiths. I submit that it is impossible to judge the relevance or value of the different features of this clause without having the regulations and the directions, to be issued by the commissioner, which apply thereto. The maximum penalties faced by violators is listed at five years, which seems too severe when considering the persons likely to be involved.

While listing my concerns over this bill I cannot help but wonder why some thought was not given to authorizing a court to impose an order of prohibition on any person charged with or convicted of any violent crime while such a person is out on bail or under suspended sentence. Such an amendment would have been directed at dangerous or habitual criminals who often return to violent crime immediately after they are placed on bail or suspended sentence.

● (1550)

In conclusion I cannot help questioning the manner in which the government drafted, submitted, and now proposes to ram this legislation through parliament. I say this as a main feature of the bill would impose a licensing requirement on some two million Canadians without first providing for meaningful consultation with interested groups. By closing off debate on the bill the government has in effect silenced the voices of many democratically elected representatives of the people in such a way that many law-abiding Canadians will be given no real opportunity for understanding this legislation, or for responding. In the final analysis, few resent the necessity of obtaining a licence to own and carry firearms, just as most do not resent the necessity of buying a licence to drive a car. Basically this is another form of tax on your way of life, and another restriction of freedom.

We already have good gun laws on the books. The present laws, which I submit are adequate for Canada, should be implemented. Further, the bill misleads in that it claims to provide "better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent... crime." It would be pleasant if this were true. Unfortunately the bank robber and killer will still have access to guns, legally or illegally, and the hoped for protection to be provided by this bill will be merely an illusion.

Mr. F. A. Philbrook (Halton): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 is the government's immediate response to the people's current concern over increased crime and violence. It is many things, but it is not everything, and it is important that we all know that. It is a sincere and courageous attempt by our federal government to tighten up the law and order system and to help Canadian society to cope better with crime and violence. It involves legislation on gun controls, bail, parole, sentencing, release from prison, wiretapping, the management of dangerous offenders and, most important of all, the improved prevention of crime. It is essential in its own right, aside from any other considerations, but it is not a sop to ease the way for abolition of capital punishment.

Bill C-83 does not include capital punishment, because that is the subject of another related bill, Bill C-84, to be debated in the near future. There will be a separate debate and vote on capital punishment, to satisfy Canadian concern that it has been handled fairly, clearly, thoroughly, and responsibly. It is an unusual and highly controversial aspect of our justice system, whichever way it is resolved. Both bills C-84 and C-83 must be resolved on their own merits. I look forward personally to participating in debate on these bills.

Bill C-83 also does not involve certain other areas of crime or current concern to Canadians. There are other federal programs to deal with organized crime, drug offences, and criminal use of firearms. Some crimes like traffic violations and gambling are beyond federal jurisdiction and are the direct responsibility of provincial and

other levels of government. Bill C-83 is a large and complex package of amendments and will require a major re-educational process, not only for the public but for legislators and officials themselves. We will not be served well by superficial, slipshod, biased or otherwise irresponsible reporting on the subject. There are many components therefore to be covered in depth, and not enough time in one speech to do so. Thus I, like many others in the House, will choose to concentrate on one of the areas of greatest interest and importance, gun controls.

The bail system has already been tightened up in recent months and will be tightened further, while attempting to safeguard the rights of the innocent citizen, especially the poor and submissive. Parole procedures will be tightened, to protect the public and to make sure that people are not free to cause further problems when they should still be confined. Although there is an 80 per cent success rate on parole, and an even greater 99 per cent success rate on temporary passes, sensational cases are reported in the media, and the public is concerned. The Parole Board and correctional staffs will be strengthened and, under the new act, those convicted will have to earn time off.

Wiretapping, or electronic surveillance, is regarded as necessary by our police forces to protect us from the evils of organized crime and will be strengthened; but along with these concessions the public must at the same time be safeguarded from any possibility of becoming the victims of these science fiction techniques.

The bill will seek to make it more difficult for organized crime to "launder" money acquired through illegal activities. It will protect the public from habitual, violent, sexual or otherwise dangerous offenders, even those who would inflict severe psychological danger rather than just physical harm on others, while protecting the rights of the accused so that the law cannot be turned against the innocent. It will change the procedure in rape trials, to offer more protection to the victim. However important detection and correction may be, crime prevention is still paramount in the realities of our present society, even though the ideal is a crime-free world. Prevention policy will include better information exchanges, crisis training, and new police programs.

The government also proposes more research on the social environment of communities and organizations which lead to crime and, last but not least, more consideration for the victims of crime. This is a very comprehensive package of justice reforms, if not a total reform of criminal law.

Let me say a word on gun controls. Running through all of these government efforts to improve crime control is the obvious theme of balancing effectiveness with protection of the rights and freedoms of individual citizens. Gun control legislation represents a particularly interesting challenge. Probably no other area of public concern these days enjoys such a strong measure of public support. Yet there is a small but very active and vocal minority who claim to use firearms for legitimate purposes such as hunting, target shooting, and collecting, and complain that new gun controls would constitute unfair and unreasonable restrictions on their activities and individual rights. It has not been lost on the Canadian people that such sentiments are also strongly prevalent on the other side of the border,

[Mr. Philbrook.]

where the right to have and use guns is apparently firmly imbedded in the American constitution.

National and other public polls in Canada have consistently indicated that over 80 per cent of the respondents favoured tighter gun controls. My own personal poll of Halton riding returned a figure of 84 per cent; although, as with the remainder of the questionnaire, only 10 per cent of the constituents bothered to answer.

The Ottawa *Citizen* in its lead editorial on March 30, 1976, stated that gun controls belong in the new peace and security package. The *Globe and Mail* of Toronto, not always a supporter of federal government policy, made several pointed comments in its March 1, 1976, lead editorial, "Reducing the Gun Menace", which I shall now read. I quote:

> Guns are for killing. Let's get that straight and eliminate any talk about people being entitled to use a gun unless shown to be untrustworthy. That puts the emphasis in the wrong place. A person who wants to use a gun—just like a person who wants to drive a car—ought to establish first that he is trustworthy. He ought to have a licence.
>
> That's the approach adopted by federal Justice Minister Ron Basford in his new gun legislation and he is to be applauded for it.
>
> Mr. Basford is faced with two problems: the use of guns by criminals and the use of guns by non-criminals who, through carelessness in use or storage, contribute to the injury of others.
>
> He has dealt with the criminal use of guns basically by increasing penalties. Licensing plays no part in this area. In all but two cases, he would at least double the maximum sentences that could be imposed. Summary conviction (petty) offences for which the penalty usually is set at a maximum of six months in jail, a $500 fine or both, would carry an alternative penalty under indictable procedures (used for more serious charges) of up to two years in jail. Where the maximum sentence currently is two years in jail, Mr. Basford proposes five. And where it is five years, he proposes ten.
>
> For the use of an offensive weapon—a gun, a knife, karate sticks—in the course of a crime, Mr. Basford would have a special penalty: a minimum sentence to be served in jail ranging from one to 14 years and which would have to be served consecutively to any other sentence.
>
> In stiffening penalties directed at criminals, Mr. Basford will have wide and justified support.

● (1600)

> However, his licensing provisions will stir controversy among sportsmen and gun enthusiasts who seem to take it as a personal affront that they will be asked to pass a test and obtain a licence for the use of long guns. If they were to pause for a moment and realize that, as with car licences, the procedure is designed to offer minimum protection against the few who are careless, they would realize how slight their support is likely to be.
>
> Everyone using a firearm of any sort—a pistol, a rifle, a shotgun—would have to be licensed. Everyone owning a restricted weapon—basically guns such as handguns that can be concealed—would have to obtain an ownership registration. And everyone who wanted to carry a handgun with him would need a special permit.
>
> Here is an area for real concern. Mr. Basford has not narrowed enough the reasons for which a handgun can be owned and carried about. He leaves intact the provisions that permit owning handguns as part of a lawful profession—meaning that security guards could still walk through our streets like cowboys—and he would leave a broad discretion in the Criminal Code as to who could own a handgun "to protect life" (although, to his credit, he would remove the right to own a handgun "to protect property").
>
> There would be a broad discretion to refuse registration for a handgun or permission to carry it around, and there would be power to pass regulations governing registration and permits.
>
> Nevertheless, it should be clearly written into the law that ownership and carrying of handguns will not be permitted unless it is clearly established that the police are unable to provide necessary protection. That goes for security guards and that goes for private indidivuals. It

should just about eliminate the need for private ownership of handguns for protection.

That just about says it all, and the *Globe and Mail* to its credit leaves no doubt where it stands, just about where most of us Canadians stand, for increased public safety from firearms.

In February, 1976, the National Firearms Safety Association came out publicly, urging Canadians to support what it calls the government's positive and responsible actions in moves toward gun control. It said that it was pleased with the firearms provisions of the federal peace and security bill, that Canadians would have to buy licences after proving they were fit to have guns and ammunition, that anyone owning or selling rifles and shotguns could be held responsible if carelessness led to their use in crime. It and the Canadian Wildlife Federation have taken a firm stand in favour of a competency test to ensure a person knows how to use a firearm.

The Ontario Attorney General said in an interview that the federal legislation follows in principle what the province was prepared to introduce in the coming session. He added that gun control would upset groups such as hunters, but that we cannot let any special group dictate against the wishes of the public in general.

Mr. Jack Pickett, past-president of the Liberal party in Alberta, recently wrote to assure his support for the peace and security package including the gun control, bail, and abolition of capital punishment provisions, in spite of the fact that he had previously and publicly supported capital punishment. He had in fact presented a motion to that effect at the 1975 Liberal convention. I believe that the government is coming to grips with crime in our society, he stated in a wire to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), and is tightening up the bail laws. As for gun controls, he continued, surely the ownership of firearms must carry certain responsibilities. He further noted that a federal Conservative MP recently found an 81.5 per cent response in favour of tighter gun controls, and only 16.4 per cent against, in a poll he had taken.

Yet a *Globe and Mail* reporter, Jonathan Manthrope, in late March, 1976, was able to report gun controls a hotter issue than hanging, with about 360 letters per week arriving, most of them against the legislation, compared to only 200 a week on capital punishment, and few on other aspects of the bill such as parole and sentencing.

Paradoxically, he said, organizations characterized as the gun lobby and against all controls have said the bill is not tough enough in many areas, that it will do nothing to stop the negligent or criminal use of firearms. They are apparently perturbed that many of the gun control provisions are ill-defined, that the bill will give too much arbitrary power to local firearm registrars, and that there will not be a standard system across the country. Special concern has been expressed over the provision that makes a gun owner liable to criminal negligence if his firearm is left in an insecure place and taken and misused by someone else. They complain that the bill does not define what is meant by secure, that different judges might hand down different decisions.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is why it is so urgent for parliament to approve this bill in principle by putting an end to second reading and sending it to committee where it can receive a full public hearing and debate. Surely in its present size it presents enough detail, and further amendments and improvements will be made at the next stage of its passage through parliament.

Also there are a number of misconceptions about the bill. The first is that it requires registration of all firearms—but not so, only the person will require to be licensed by the local firearms registrar. The second is that the decision of the registrar will be final—not so, there will be an appeal system in the courts.

The government has clearly opted, says Orland French of the Ottawa *Citizen*, for controls on people, not guns, to stop the spread of firearms. It has frankly rejected gun registration in favour of stronger controls on licensing of gun users, owners, dealers, and manufacturers, to screen out potential misusers of guns, and restrict the general availability of firearms. At the same time the government is sincerely trying to avoid harrassing sportsmen, and to meet with the approval of hunting groups and rifle clubs. Is that not fair?

Applicants for restricted weapons such as handguns will be required to justify the need for such a weapon before a certificate is granted. However, the bill's provisions place the emphasis squarely on the criminal element where it belongs—higher maximum sentences from a mandatory minimum sentence of one year up to 14 years for the use of a gun while committing an indictable offence, running consecutively to any other sentence.

Every possessor of firearms will need a licence, good for five years, issued only if the licensing officer is satisfied there is nothing in the applicant's background to make him unfit to possess a weapon. Is that too much to ask?

Local registrars and licensing officers will be located in convenient places throughout the country, and their decisions will be subject to appeal in the courts. Is that not democratic? In general I think that the provisions of this bill are fairly reasonable and deserve to go to committee.

It seems there are still some people in this country who complain. Mr. William Jones, president of Firearms and Responsible Ownership, stated that the new gun control legislation is a Madison Avenue con job. It is perhaps appropriate that he chose a cynical American term, considering the prevalent situation in the U.S.A. regarding guns and crime. Such name-calling has been used before by critics toward responsible government programs—our anti-inflation program for example—and we all know how successful that plan is already, even at this early stage.

To his credit Mr. Jones has tried to take the middle ground with our government, has tried to keep the extremists of both types out. Together we have done that, but there is a place for flexibility in a program, for avoiding fixed details that can be better developed as we gain experience with a new program.

In many instances the critics have not bothered to make themselves familiar with the bill and are complaining of some problems which do not exist, suggesting things which are already included. On the other hand our serious problems are not just those which have happened but also those which could happen, for example with regard to fully automatic weapons.

Last year the cries were more shrill, more absolute—no gun controls at all! Fortunately they are fewer this year, more reasonable and responsible, more conciliatory. Discussion is possible with more gun-owners, and when the bill is explained they are prepared to keep working with us on the new measures, or at least not to be so hostile and antagonistic. However, there are still a few extremists around, and goodness knows if they will ever change. One of my constituents announced publicly that there was no relation between guns and crime; that people should have the right to defend themselves, their families and their property with firearms and not have to rely on the police; that our government is simply trying to turn Canada into a communist totalitarian dictatorship with these attempts at law reform; that the bill is an extension of high taxation even though that higher taxation has been used mainly to help needy people; that liberty and freedom are in danger of giving way to slavery; that capital punishment is the magic answer to our problems.

I do not understand this type of raving, and I doubt if most Canadians do, even most gun enthusiasts. These paranoid pronouncements sound like a harkening back to the days of the American wild west, or at least the worst of modern American society. They stand guilty of their own accusations, a lust to exert their own form of power and intimidation over the rest of society, and I personally stand ready as a non-violent, non-weapon wielding citizen to fight them to the end.

In the name of humanity and civilization, Mr. Speaker, let us get this peace and security bill into committee where it belongs, right away, and let the Canadian people as a whole decide how they wish to put in order their own serious public affairs, hopefully with the responsible support of any minority interest involved.

● (1610)

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in this debate. It is unfortunate that the government has seen fit drastically to limit discussion of this important measure. I am delighted to hear that the previous speaker, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Philbrook), believes that there should be a full examination of the bill in committee, and I hope that the government will relent to a degree and allow this to take place.

My concern with the legislation at the outset has to do with the very title of the bill, which I think is some kind of unsophisticated attempt to mask the issues before us in this legislation and in the bill to follow. I do not know to whom we should give credit for manufacturing this new term "peace and security", or what particular benefit there is to the government, or to anybody else for that matter, in making use of that term. I know that the sort of law and order syndrome, which has been getting an increasing amount of credibility from a number of quarters, seems to be attracted by this kind of terminology, and perhaps it softens or diverts the actual intent of the legislation before us.

When President Nixon was in power he liked to resort to using such terms as "peace and security" and "peace and tranquility". His successor in office, President Ford, has been addicted to the same phrases. If my hon. friends in the Liberal party have succumbed to the same kind of psychology, then that is most unfortunate. To me this kind of catch phrase is at best meaningless jargon. I assume that by "peace and security" what the government really means is the criminal justice system, or crime and punishment, or an attempt to deal with the continuum that relates to people who commit offences against society and the system we use for dealing with such people. It is a bit of a fad these days to adopt this sort of approach to things that are somewhat unpleasant or difficult to face.

I note that those who deal with the subject of death do not refer any more to a funeral parlour but to a slumber room. Presumably there is something much more attractive about a concept that is fictitious or made up. The dearly beloved has not really died; he or she is only fast asleep! Presumably for the government there is something more attractive about talking about peace and security rather than about crime and punishment and social protection.

I am making this point, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is symptomatic of the basic problem with this legislation. I believe that by publishing all this material and these two legislative proposals the government is engaging in a kind of legislative sleight-of-hand. It is working a kind of illusion, somewhat in the manner of the traditional magician, only the government pretends to be taking serious action to deal with situations that it has already concluded do in fact exist.

Having listened to the words of the minister who opened this debate it seems to me that there is a very large element of pandering, if you like, to a number of myths about crime, its evidence, and its control in our society. I am going to comment on that later in my remarks, but at the outset let me just say that one of the real problems with the legislation before us today is that the very theme itself that the government has adopted in this legislation is open to great question.

In his opening remarks on this bill on March 8 the minister had this to say, presumably with the full endorsement of the government. I am reading from page 11578 of *Hansard*, the second column:

> —I see three paramount responsibilities which must guide me in formulating, recommending and implementing criminal justice policies. First, I must remain ever-conscious of a number of fundamental values recognized in our legal system upon which our society, as a civilized one, rests and must continue to rest. These bear repeating from time to time. They are: the dignity and worth of the human person; the right of an individual to the enjoyment of life, liberty, security and property; the full protection of the law; the rule of law and due process of law; the independence of the judiciary; the avoidance of cruel and unusual punishment; the protection of the rights of an accused or convicted person; the moral values of our society; the peace and security of the community.

It is only that final part of the sentence that is really grappled with in this legislation, and then only obliquely. We would do ourselves very grave harm if we suggested in the context of the legislative proposals that are before us that we will satisfy the framework that the minister himself set out in opening the debate on this bill.

In basic form the minister suggested there were two things that were the intent of this proposal; first was the safety and security of the law abiding; secondly, the legal rights and dignity of those charged with offences. The unfortunate part of it is, having read the legislation and

listened to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) presenting the bill, that I do not think he has effectively grappled with either of the two stated intents which he himself said were the sum and substance of the bill.

As I indicated a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the basic problems with the legislation is that it is founded upon a false premise. The minister recognizes throughout his speech—and it is certainly implied in the legislation and accompanying press releases—that our criminal justice system is not working satisfactorily. I do not think I am overstating what he said or what other members of his party have said in this debate.

Having said that, in broad terms his solution is more of what he has already indicated is not working. It may sound like a rather vast over-simplification or generalization of the position adopted by the government on this bill, and may I also say adopted in the bill that will follow it having to do with capital punishment; but I think the government in some ways is its own worst enemy in trying to grapple with crime and punishment in our modern society.

I think the government has adopted a kind of Alice in Wonderland approach in this bill. Let me illustrate one aspect that struck me very forcefully as I prepared myself to take part in this debate. I have in front of me a document prepared by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) in March, 1975, entitled "The Prevention and Control of Violent Crime in Canada: Some Comments on Violent Crime, Capital Punishment and other Related Issues". On page 2, in the second paragraph, the Solicitor General said this:

> Let us look at the facts. Existing data indicates that there has been no disproportionate increase in the number of violent crimes.

● (1620)

So he won't think I am taking it out of context I will go on and read the next sentence:

> The proportion of violent offences to all Criminal Code offences has remained relatively constant at around 10 per cent per annum over the period of 1966-73, as the attached Table 1 shows.

The Solicitor General told us very clearly in this first report which was published a year ago that there had been no disproportionate increase in violent crime over almost the previous decade. However, when the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General brought forth their so-called peace and security package we find in the blue booklet that accompanied it, in the introduction, and let me quote two sentences from it:

> Rising crime rates, including rates of violent crime, are bringing home to Canadians that changes in the criminal law and in the administration of criminal justice are needed if the best possible protection is to be afforded to the public.

A little further on in the second paragraph, talking about various measures the government is introducing, it states:

> They are designed to come to grips with the increasing incidence of crime in Canadian society and to meet the need the public feels for a greater measure of protection.

How does the public or any individual square the seemingly contradictory position adopted on the one hand by the Solicitor General last year in the document he released on violent crime and this year by the joint document issued by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice? This is only one small indication of the kind of uncertainty, indeed confusion that exists in respect of the government as to what in fact it is facing. If it is confused in understanding the problem as profound, what is even more disturbing is its solution, because it seems to me in looking at this legislation with regard to offenders the solution is primarily more, or longer, or simply general indeterminate sentencing.

Surely if anything has been studied to death in this country since the Archambault Report in the last 30's, or the Fauteaux Report in the late 50's, it is sentencing per se, and it has been indicated that sentencing, particularly given the nature of the institutions with which we have to work in this country, is at a dead end.

There is no more sorry record of government administration in dealing with prisoners than the federal penitentiary system that operates in this country. So the solution that is looked upon as the great salvation for peace and security in dealing with the criminal offender in our society is in fact this dead end street, and there is, if you want to put it this way, a kind of intellectual bankruptcy in the criminal justice system when it comes to dealing with offenders.

Secondly, the solution for detecting crimes, which is also what the government wants to deal with, and which is a matter of some concern to the general public, is a greater invasion of individual privacy. I know the government has talked about the kind of safeguards that exist with respect to the code and the protection of the rules for judges' applications, and one thing and another, but I do not think it takes very much analysis to realize that the government is trying to introduce into this parliament what it would not produce in the last parliament because parliament would not accept that extent of invasion of privacy. If the government thinks it has won its case in the one report published by the Solicitor General, a report which is lacking for the most part in any direct information in respect of this particular question, it is very sorely mistaken.

I wonder, therefore, why we have had such a great deal of huffing and puffing by the government in bringing forth this kind of legislative proposal. Seriously, I would ask the Minister of Justice, if he were here, or the Solicitor General, who is here, if they can tell us before this debate concludes on second reading where in any country, in any experience in any society, the action of invasion of privacy or more extended sentencing in federal institutions is the solution to violent or increasing criminal rates in our society? Certainly they have not indicated this in any documentation or speeches that have been produced to date.

I find this kind of a custody-conscious bill a reflection of the most limited kind of thinking. In fact, I have too much respect for both the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General to believe that those particular Liberal gentlemen would, of their own persuasion, have arrived at this kind of paucity of thought in respect of the matters we are faced with in this bill.

I do not want to get into a lot of details on this bill because we will do that in committee, but the suggestion that the answer in dealing with those who escape with increasing frequency from federal institutions is to totally close off their remission time and, even more important, to double the sentence from five to ten years, seems to me to be totally hopeless and unworkable. I would like to know from those who work with these offenders or inmates in

our federal institutions how they will look upon this kind of proposal as being workable in their own situation. Again, one can only assume that these ministers have indeed been extremely poorly advised.

An hon. Member: That's not right.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I hope the minister has time to study the bill, because that is the way I read it. If that is not the case I would be delighted to have that clarified at the committee. Perhaps the hon. minister would agree with me that there is in this bill an automatic doubling from five to ten years.

Mr. Allmand: It is possible, but that is the maximum.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): That is the maximum, but I wonder why it is put in there. I do not think you change the laws just for the fun of doing it. I hope you do not.

Mr. Allmand: There is no automatic loss of remission.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): That is one thing that can certainly be clarified in committee, and I am very glad to hear that. I am disturbed by the import. I would ask the minister seriously, and I refer to what I said earlier, why there is this sleight of hand creating these illusions? Why say it is not automatic but is just raising the limit; for what reason? I think the sleight of hand the minister is engaged in is very dangerous and I am going to tell him a little later why I think so.

I have been impressed, and I hope the ministers have been as well, by the information coming forward from the Law Reform Commission. I do not like to use this term because it is not quite fair in describing the Law Reform Commission, but it seems to me that the government has created a kind of monster. The government makes a move in one direction to take what I consider a reactionary and non-productive posture in respect of our criminal justice system, while the Law Reform Commission moves in another direction and suggests that we look seriously at what we have been doing with our criminal justice system in the last 25 to 30 years.

The Law Reform Commission tells us in its recent report that we have one of the most punishment-oriented systems in the western world. Surely the Solicitor General cannot be happy with that situation.

Mr. Allmand: The Law Reform Commission approved of the program a few weeks ago.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am not sure which program the minister is referring to.

Mr. Allmand: The Chairman was asked about it at the justice committee a few weeks ago and he said he approved of this program.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I will read the testimony later, but at this time I can only judge by the report the Commission has put forward.

The government seems to be taking a punitive approach, increasing sentences of offenders, as the proper solution, whereas the Law Reform Commission tells us that the only countries which have been having success and improvement in reforming the criminal justice system have been those going in exactly the opposite direction. I will say a word or two about that in a second.

It is my belief that the basis of the problem here is that the legislative proposal is founded on false premises. I think I have some understanding why this is, and I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not here because I do not like to be challenging some of the things he has said in his speech without giving him some opportunity to respond.

The operative word the minister uses in introducing this legislation is an interesting one. It is not one I expected to hear from the mouth of the Minister of Justice. I might have expected to hear it from somebody in my profession, which is the clergy, because we like to use this word "concern". It is a good sort of theological word which implies some sort of moral suasion or commitment.

The Minister of Justice, who is responsible for the administration of justice in this country, talks about getting at this problem which has been a matter of public concern, and I am really using the words he used in his speech, "of public concern." I am concerned about this word "concern", because this is not a precise term. It is rather a reflection of a feeling, an anxiety or a fear.

It had been my hope that the minister, in introducing this legislation, would have brought forward a bill that responded to factual situations and not to some kind of ill-defined concern, anxiety or fear that individual people in small numbers or in large numbers may have. We know that in the volatile times in which we live anxieties can be generated very quickly, sometimes founded on legitimate issues but at other times falsely perceived and falsely understood. I do not think it is good enough for the Minister of Justice or any other person to say that this kind of peace and security measure in large part responds to "concerns."

● (1630)

I was very much disturbed while reading the document entitled "The Highlights of the Peace and Security Program". In certain instances it talks about dealing with the kind of concerns that people have. I cannot find the part here which I wish to quote. In the introductory part it talks about public concerns. It talks about the impression that certain violent crimes have over-all on the appreciation of society of how the criminal justice system works. I do wish to quote, however, from a recent article which I would commend to the ministers.

Two gentlemen, Waller and Chan, in an article entitled "Prison Use; A Canadian and International Comparison", compared trends in the use of prisons in various countries from 1910 to 1970. There is a market fluctuation, and they state:

> We should point out that these dates appear to refute the hypothesis that the use of imprisonment remains constant over time.

Tying this in with the Law Reform Commission's stand about the misuse of the criminal law, it has been noted historically that countries in times of social unease tend to pass laws which encroach more and more on the liberty of the individual. That is, the arm of the law reaches farther into the background of actions leading to an actual crime.

There are some elements in this particular bill which, to me, very gravely jeopardize traditional civil rights in this country. For one thing there are one or two instances at least, and there may be more after some study, where this bill seems to anticipate guilt. I point to the request by the government for increased invasion of privacy through electronic eavesdropping, but more particularly through this whole business of being able—and I am dealing only with one aspect of the gun control aspect because this matter has been covered fully by a number of other speakers—of being able to seize without warrant. I refer to this particular proposed section 103(1) which mentions that a peace officer may seize, without warrant or without reasonable grounds, a firearm.

Even in the case of the removal of the serial number from a gun the individual would be placed in the position of having to prove he did not alter, deface or remove the serial number on a restricted weapon. This seems to turn around completely the traditonal rule of an individual being innocent before proven guilty. I ask the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General to be more specific about the concerns that motivated the introduction of Bill C-83. I ask this because unless we have a clear picture of exactly what we are attempting to deal with by this legislation I think parliament and the general public are placed in an impossible position of trying to devise appropriate legislation. I ask this because it seems to me there are at least five major questions that have not been dealt with by this bill. I wish to mention them quickly.

First of all a primary preoccupation of this bill seems to be with the question of violence. I have already indicated, by one quotation at least, that the government itself is not sure whether violence is on the increase or is remaining about the same. Regardless of whether or not it is increasing we are not told in any substantial terms what are the causes of this violence. Where is it occurring with greater frequency? What are we really dealing with when we attempt in this very limited bill to grapple with the subject of violence in our society? Quite frankly, I think it is not only superficial but a non-productive facing of the issue with regard to this particular legislation.

I think we must—and this should be the job of the Solicitor General or of the Minister of Justice—come to terms with the greater and greater acceptability of violence often in our society. There is no doubt that in our time in many instances violence has become an acceptable tool of conflict resolution. This message certainly is repeated *ad nauseam*. It is exposed dramatically in the mass media. It is very much the message we have in the dealings nations have with each other, or very often in the confrontation which exists between large corporations and institutions in our society.

I wonder if we are not being a little ludicrous when we make out that violence is not acceptable in one fairly limited sphere and yet give it very great prominence and acceptability in a number of others. I do not think we really understand yet what we mean by dealing with violence in our society.

Second, because of the direction to establish a crime commission and because of the request for the greater freedom with regard to wiretapping, there is the attempt on the part of the government to deal with what it calls serious and organized crime. Again to me that, at the outset, seems to be a kind of a limited view of the automatic acceptance that everybody knows what we and the government are talking about in respect of organized crime.

What is organized or large-scale crime in our society today? It is not some kind of a general activity that is carried on by people who are not part and parcel of various elements of our society. Organized crime today, which is a large multibillion dollar enterprise, a trans-nation activity, has links with many aspects of our economy and society.

The very fact of the growth of the bureaucracies and institutions ensures that crime becomes much more institutionalized and organized. I wonder whether we have thought of the implications for our own situation in respect of the recent revelations which have occurred in the United States in which it has been discovered that a major agency of the United States government, the Central Intelligence Agency, was in fact employing members of the Mafia to execute and carry on some of its espionage practices and undercover work because they were much better equipped for this sort of thing. What does this mean to us today—the fact that there can be an actual link-up between an agency or a public body such as the CIA and the Mafia?

When we talk about organized crime I think the minister will have to tell us a good deal more about the oppressive or sweeping powers that are being requested without any clear understanding of how they will affect the individual in society and society as a whole.

Third, I really do not think we have properly defined or attempted to define what is crime, or what today is the actual definition of crime. I think it is appropriate and kind of ironic that at the very time we are discussing this bill the Law Reform Commission should have introduced one of its recent reports called "Our Criminal Law", in which it sets out the need for a new definition of what in fact are criminal acts. It calls for a criminal code which clearly defines its aim of protecting, maintaining, and reinforcing the few basic rights which are recognized by all. It recommends in fact that the code be uncluttered with many offences which could be classified as regulatory offences, with appropriate lesser penalties. The commission sees this as an effective way to make better and more socially educational use of the courts and to lessen the loads in our over used prisons.

● (1640)

In the conclusions of the Report of the Law Reform Commission on our criminal law are listed four criteria for the offences which should be considered under criminal law and regulatory sanctions. I will not quote these because they are available to members. I believe that we must come to grips with the true nature of criminal offences in the kind of pluralistic society in which we live today.

Fourth, there has not been recognition of the problems that exist within our judicial process, the true nature of the relationship of the police-court system to the average citizen. Surely we have to grapple with this effectively and try to produce solutions to protect the rights of individuals

and to ensure that they are not further damaged in these legislative proposals.

Fifth and finally, because it is a subject that has interested me for many years, I do not see here any recognition of the fact that our prison system has failed utterly to be either a source of security and protection for society generally or a protection of the legitimate rights of the individuals who are from time to time incarcerated.

In many ways—and this has not been admitted by the government—certain aspects of our criminal justice system are a disgrace. In fact the government has reacted to myths; it has tried, by its own understanding of public opinion, which has been in some cases badly informed, to deal only with the effects of violent crime in our society. It has provided a kind of band-aid solution. I think there has been a total failure to grapple with the basic causes and not come up with workable suggestions and solutions in this Chamber. Incredibly, instead we have legislation before us which, in my opinion. largely reinforces in a number of instances false concerns and anxieties. May I say that it will make it much more difficult to solve these problems in the future and ultimately more dangerous and more insecure for the public at large.

I believe that the government has the responsibility to give leadership. We are going through a system of social change. We have to think clearly and freshly about how we will clarify criminal actions and deal with offenders in our society, but we are certainly not going to do it with this bill.

I think the government has responded with a rather naive document offering the illusion or the veneer of a solution, with only short-term benefits to itself but a very real long-term cost to our country in human and social terms.

I hope very sincerely that when this debate is concluded on second reading and the bill goes to committee a serious attempt will be made by all members to present the government with a much better package out of committee than has been sent to it.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I agree with a good deal of what the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) has said, but I think I come to a different conclusion from him. I think there are some good things in the bill and I think it should be given second reading. Then, I think, it should be amended. I do not think it is helpful to throw out the whole thing.

Three of my colleagues, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), and the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), have spoken on second reading of this bill. I agree with what they have said and I want to add only a few points.

First of all, I want to deal with the form of the bill. This bill is a hodge podge of different provisions. In fact, it is about six different bills all rolled into one. It contains 72 pages. I wonder why those who draft our legislation seem completely incapable of ever being concise or precise. These lengthy and elaborate provisions which appear in all the legislation that comes before us are not a source of clarity but a source of confusion, and from the point of view of form I think this bill is an example of what I would call a monstrosity of verbiage.

My general view of the bill can best be described in the same way as the curate described the egg provided for him at the vicar's breakfast table. He was asked what he thought of it and he said "sir, it is good in parts." I think that this is a fair description of this bill. We have made it clear that, because it has some good parts which are necessary, we think it should be supported on second reading, and we will do our best to have it amended and indeed some parts of it deleted.

I agree with the hon. member for Egmont—I will say it quite briefly—that the title of "peace and security" is a very pretentious title for this bill. It may make some contribution to peace and security, but it is perfectly obvious that alone it will be totally inadequate for that purpose. There is no easy way to achieve peace and security. It involves striking at the causes of criminal activity and it involves striking at the causes of violence. Indeed, it means an awful lot more than just making the penalties more severe. I suppose there is a case for severity sometimes in the field of criminal law, but it is an absolute delusion, and one much too widely shared, that somehow or other you are reducing crime by making sentences more severe as a general rule. It does not work that way.

I think that the hon. member for New Westminster was absolutely right when he said that a real effort to tackle the problems of narcotics—which are a direct cause of a large amount of criminal offences in this country—is called for in order to have peace and security. I think we need a much greater effort to achieve social justice, particularly as it applies to our native population who have been deprived in our society of their own way of life, and who have sometimes tended to lose human dignity and have become involved in petty crimes involving jail sentences, perhaps because they cannot afford to pay the fines that might be imposed. One of the greatest things which this House could do for peace and security would be to insist on justice in respect of aboriginal claims to land and an early settlement of these claims before the Indian land is handed over for development in a way which destroys our native society. If we did that sort of thing we would have a lot more peace and security.

In order to obtain peace and security we need a thorough review and revision of our criminal law. It is timely that the Law Reform Commission—and the hon. member for Egmont has referred to this already—recently issued a report on criminal law which called for no less than the reshaping of criminal law. Acceptance of the philosophy of that report in words and action will do more to provide peace and security than the present legislation.

One of the most effective ways to deter the commission of criminal acts is to have effective means of detection and enforcement of the law. Deterrents are useless unless people have a fairly good understanding of the fact that they are likely to be applied to their cases if they are caught.

There has been no real revision of our Criminal Code for many years. About ten years ago there was a revision but it was superficial in nature; it did not go to the roots of the problem.

● (1650)

According to the Law Reform Commission report, the removal from the code of offences not considered wrongful enough to warrant intervention of the criminal law, acts whose wrongness is controversial, and acts which deal merely with property matters deserve special consideration. A test as to what should be a real crime is said to be that which does serious harm to other people or seriously contravenes our values so as to be harmful to society. I am convinced that if we could cut down the number of crimes and enforce the law adequately, we would be making a real contribution to this question. I am afraid we are not really doing that by this piece of legislation.

The report goes on to say that if all those questions are answered affirmatively, we should then ask should the act be prohibited as a criminal offence within the Criminal Code? As the hon. member for Egmont said, the report goes on to suggest that many offences should be dealt with by regulations, can be perfectly satisfactorily dealt with that way and need not be made part of the criminal law or involve criminal records at all. If the criminal law were so amended, the burden on the police and the courts could subsequently be reduced, and efficient enforcement would be advanced.

I now want to deal with some of the terms of the bill. Probably the most important of these is the gun control legislation. Like many other hon. members of the House I have received a good deal of mail on this subject, particularly from those who belong to gun clubs and similar organizations, and I may say most of it came in the same form. All the letters are obviously form letters which have been sent. I do not know whether other hon. members have had the same experience.

Mr. Korchinski: No.

Mr. Brewin: It is sometimes suggested that to require a person to obtain a licence to possess a weapon is an infringement of civil liberties. I certainly do not see it as such. I have taken a good deal of interest in the question of civil liberties during my career, both before and after I was elected to this place, but I have never believed it wrong to say to a person that if he is going to use a dangerous thing, he should show that he is capable of using it, and that he should be licensed to do so. We do that with regard to cars. A car is a dangerous thing. We licence them, and everyone accepts that. Why, in the name of fortune, is not a gun a dangerous thing? We know very well that it is a dangerous thing.

The document produced by the government called "Highlights of the Peace and Security Program" points out that, of the number of murders committed, the number of murders committed with firearms increased from 178 in 1970 to 272 in 1974. It is no sacrifice of our civil liberties to try tc prevent this toll as a result of unwarranted and dangerous use of guns. Guns are the most common murder weapons and claim almost half of all murder victims. Therefore I see no reason for anyone to be so self-centred and so selfish as to object to having to get a licence and to show that he has been trained to use a gun and is competent to use it. I think this should be in the code, and I hope it will be put into the code.

As I understand it, subject to regulation, licences have to be obtained for a five year period. A new licence need not be obtained every year. If a licence is refused by the registrar, there is a right of appeal. I hope the committee will try to make sure that the appeal process is quick and inexpensive because I do not think people should be put to a great deal of expense in dealing with these matters.

There is a special problem for native people and others whose livelihood depends on the use of guns. This should be discussed with the native groups, with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and with others who are concerned. I do not think such people whose livelihood is very meagre should have to pay fees, but I do believe that fees should be set out in the code. I do not have a gun; I do not anticipate having a gun; but if I did I would like to know what I have to pay by way of an act of parliament rather than having some regulation raising the gun permit fee whenever somebody felt disposed to do so. We should take the responsibility of setting out the amount of the fee, and it would help to satisfy people who are interested in this gun legislation that it is reasonable.

There is provision for two guarantors. I state here a purely personal opinion, but I am extremely doubtful about the value of having two guarantors. I do not care exactly who they are. They are asked only to say that they know of nothing which would render a person unfit to have a licence. I do not know how that is to be enforced or what sanction there is. I suspect this will turn out to be a vain provision and just a nuisance, but perhaps the committee will look into this to find some good reason for this provision.

I was alarmed at first by the proposal that a police officer without a warrant should have the power to go and search for, seize, and take away a gun from someone when it is felt that there is a danger, and there is not time to obtain the otherwise required warrant. However, I have reconsidered my view on that because I believe there are circumstances which can exist whereby life is at stake. There may be a domestic squabble in which someone might be under the influence. Two neighbours may get into one of those bitter fights about boundaries between properties. When these situations exist and when someone is threatening to use a gun, I do not think there is time to go and obtain legal forms. In those circumstances I think police officers would be justified in seizing guns.

I hope there will be expeditious means for an owner to get his gun back if he can satisfy a court that there is no danger involved in his having the weapon. The question of search will have to be examined by the committee, but in the circumstances I think the safety and sanctity of human life stand above any possible interference with a person's civil liberties in that respect.

There are many other items with regard to the gun control provisions which will require careful scrutiny. Those who are interested in this field should make their representations to the committee which will, no doubt, weigh carefully what they say and report to parliament any changes which may be required. However, taking it on balance, I do not think we should seek to defeat this bill because I believe some measure of gun control is overdue and required at the present time.

There is another part of this legislation which I repudiate entirely, and that is that part which deals with electronic surveillance, as it is called, or as it is known to simpler people, wiretapping. Just a year or so ago there was legislation on this subject. We discussed it thoroughly, and the justice committee discussed it thoroughly. We brought in legislation, which was rejected at first by the Senate, but then the Senate finally accepted it. I do not know why we have to change that; and the changes are in the wrong direction.

What is wiretapping? Wiretapping is a particularly offensive invasion of private rights. Its value is extremely dubious. I have a quotation here from Ramsey Clark, a former U.S. attorney general. In testimony to the justice and legal affairs committee of the U.S. Congress in 1973 he said, "Wiretapping was not used between 1966 and 1969, yet indictments against members of organized crime tripled."

He concluded that wiretapping is a wasteful and inefficient means of investigation and is not, moreover, effective against organized crime. He went on to say, "Wiretapping destroys the professionalism of investigators. Electronic surveillance encourages, not investigation, but just sitting and waiting for something to happen."

● (1700)

I can understand that the police like to have these gadgets. We all have a weakness for gadgets in this part of the world and I do not blame the police for wanting to have wiretapping available to them. Indeed we have conceded a limited right to conduct such operations after proper authorization. What I do not like in the least is the suggestion that we take out of the legislation the clause which says that if evidence has been obtained illegally it cannot be used in court.

I cannot understand the purpose of making something illegal and then allowing it to be used as part of a legal process. Nor can I understand the objection to notice after the event. I believe notice has to be given in 60 days and that it is possible to obtain an extension for another 90 days. This makes 180 days, and if by that time an investigation has not been completed, it ought to have been; there is no need to keep an investigation going on forever. If somebody is wiretapping me I want to know about it, and I want to be able to fight it because it is a serious invasion of privacy.

We are living in a world where there are too many invasions of privacy. What we should be doing here is trying to extend the right of privacy, not curtail it. In one corner we have the police, and in the other we find the people who believe in fundamental rights and liberties. While I personally respect the police I think they have gone much too far in their idea that they can tell us precisely what we should do in this area as members of parliament. We have our own responsibility, and I hope we discharge it in such a way as not to extend the practice of bugging or wiretapping or electronic surveillance in general.

I wish to deal now with the section of the bill which has to do with special criminal inquiries. Some are dubious as to the value of such inquiries, but I think they might serve a useful purpose if there is a fairly prevalent crime which is infecting some area of society and in regard to which the facts ought to be brought out without the necessity of charges being laid. There are, however, grave dangers involved in such a procedure.

I myself had an opportunity to be counsel before the commission on crime in the province of Ontario. The hearings were well attended by the press. There was a most extraordinary collection of witnesses, mostly people with criminal backgrounds, backgrounds of organized crime. They talked a lingo which was hard to understand. But one thing was not hard to understand; they thought nothing of making the most slanderous statements in the witness box about people who were not there, people who did not have a chance to speak for themselves. And the press would rush to print those statements because they had been made in the course of a commission of inquiry and presumably were privileged.

I say the people who conduct these inquiries should be given the power to tell the press or anyone else. "You can listen to this but you must not publish anything which is defamatory to individuals without at least their having an opportunity to answer any charges which might be made." This would be one way of avoiding trial by use of headlines, something we do not need in this country. I hope an amendment will be made to this clause in an effort to ensure that safeguards are established against such a possibility.

I conclude as I began by saying that some of this legislation is useful and some of it is deplorable, but in order to get the useful part we should at least send it to the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, the bill we are now studying and whose title refers to "peace and security" will, I think, bring something altogether different from peace and security, unless it means peace and security for the criminals and not peace and security for the silent majority of all honest Canadians.

When the minister introduced the bill, he opened the written remarks accompanying it by saying that he wanted to protect the rights and dignity of those accused of infractions. This unfortunately means, Mr. Speaker, that from now on we will have to show a lot of concern and comprehension for the accused. Bill C-83 will probably have dire consequences for the majority of honest Canadians and it is very reassuring for the minority who lives apart from them. This bill has been introduced as an omnibus bill in order to make us swallow totally inacceptable things along with others which could be palatable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal particularly with two aspects of this bill. First, I think that the registration of firearms will automatically lead to the confiscation of these arms as was the case in all countries which have voted a similar legislation. This would be a downright violation of the rights of the honest people, forbidding them to indulge in certain activities during their leisure time such as marksmanship competitions and hunting. But what is more important is that the citizens would be left in a state of total insecurity and could not protect themselves from the outlaws, the criminals and all the crooks of the country. Mr. Speaker, when firearms are confiscated, only outlaws keep theirs.

● (1710)

In time of war or political upheaval, anywhere in the world, the registration of weapons has always ended in confiscation, leaving the people at large unarmed and helpless. The unarmed citizen easily becomes a victim of anarchy, tyranny and totalitarianism. History has provided us with a good many examples.

In Cuba, Batista proceeded also with the registration of weapons in order, said he, to prevent Castro from having them for his guerrilla warfare. Only the loyal Cubans at the time did register their weapons, while Castro's revolutionaries never cared to register theirs, as any other revolutionaries are doing in the world. Today, Castro is in possession of all the weapons, because he confiscated them all after Batista had them registered. The Cuban people are at the present time defenseless and at the mercy of Castro's dictatorship.

Then, it is easy to say for the leftist and communistic propaganda, to say that Cubans are peaceful people. People who are unarmed and defenseless are at the mercy of any tyranny: there is no choice but to be peaceful. We only need to remember what happened in Hungary a few years ago. Hitler once said: The biggest mistake we could make would be to allow citizens of various origins to carry arms, for history is there to show that all conquerors who allowed their native subjects to be armed have prepared their own defeat.

In 1938, Hitler had turned Germany into a totalitarian state and had confiscated all firearms. Only the members of the Nazi Party could own firearms. France, Norway, the Netherlands and Denmark were countries where firearms had to be registered before World War II. As the Nazi armies penetrated further into Europe, they confiscated the weapons registration records in the invaded countries, took over the weapons and thus reduced the possibility of resistance accordingly.

If the opposition disarms, that is all well and good. If it refuses to do so, then we ourselves must do it, as Joseph Stalin said in 1927. For a long time now, th communist strategy throughout the world has been to clamor for disarmament for the sake of a pseudo-détente policy, while they, the communists, accelerate the arming of their troops, for it is quite easy to take over the control of a disarmed nation.

In Europe, the Czechoslovaks laid down their arms while Rumania, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary and several other countries were readily disarmed, firearms being registered and easily confiscated without alarming anyone. In China, the registration of weapons has resulted in the disarmament of the Chinese people, which preceded the reign of terror. Chinese people have been tortured and executed, and today, after having been "broken" in the blood of millions of Chinese, they have come to be respectful of their great leader Mao who, in his spirit of democratic competition, has never called a general election because all citizens must adore him.

Northern Ireland is another tragic illustration of a situation resulting from the registration of the weapons which were confiscated by the government. The *Presbyterian Journal* of February 9, 1972, quoting an Irish newspaper, wrote this: "The government has withdrawn all licensed guns in the province and the police has called on all the owners of weapons and ordered them to surrender their guns." With all their weapons registered and confiscated the population is helpless against the attacks of the IRA. Tyrants never could nor dared invade a country whose population was armed.

In 1939-40, a country with only 4 million people among whom were crack shots who had been trained through a long dedication to sports had foreseen the communist takeover. That country was Finland which managed to stand up to and humiliate the powerful army of Russia with its 170 million people.

In 1940, while the German armies were on the other side of the channel, England begged for Canadian and U.S. weaponry to equip its homeguard, as arm control by the British government had left the British utterly disarmed and unable to protect their families, homes and homeland. It is then that the Canadians and Americans, who were very concerned and had weapons available, offered them to the British who needed them desperately. Switzerland is another country which has placed its security and future into the hands of honest and well armed citizens. That country has not as yet been invaded nor brought into subjection.

Here in Canada, they want to put the destiny of Canadians between the hands of a dishonest and armed minority, against the interest of the honest and disarmed majority. The two nations with the highest percentage of gun owners in the world are Israel and Switzerland and yet they have the lowest homicide rates in the world.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that the argument that guns should be taken away from people to avoid accidents is perfectly stupid and unjustified. How many people know that 5 per cent of the Russian population are real communists? How can 5 per cent of the population control the other 95 per cent? Simple: the 5 per cent control all the arms, leaving the rest slaves and unarmed.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will allow the civil servants who will be hired to implement this legislation to perpetrate legally the worst abuses of power, while being protected by the law derived from this bill. Therefore, I wish to draw Your Honour's attention to clause 105(z) page 17 of the bill; which states:

> Where, with respect to any person, a peace officer is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that it is not desirable in the interests of the safety of that person, or of other persons, that that person should have in his possession, custody or control any firearm . . . the peace officer may without warrant search for and seize any firearm or other offensive weapon or any ammunition or explosive substance in the possession, custody or control of that person.

This clause, Mr. Speaker, gives any peace officer the powers to do anything to anybody. It gives a discretionary power to the police and will enable any peace officer to discriminate against anybody. This clause states: Where a peace officer is satisfied, which means he may seize without warrant. The word "satisfied" enables any officer to be justified in taking—deliberately or otherwise—any kind of reprehensible and discriminatory action under the mantle of legality. When the peace officer has reasonable grounds for believing, says the bill; it means that a police officer may always argue that he has grounds for taking legal steps, even the most reprehensible ones, deliberate or not.

Mr. Speaker, how can anyone not think for a moment of a Mr. Desrochers, a provincial Liberal organizer in Quebec, just before a provincial election, when his party might run the risk of being defeated by the opposition, whether it be the Parti Québécois or otherwise? He might easily react to such a threat, with his usual keen mind by a well organized strategy, using Liberal policemen in the Quebec Police Force or in various other police corps to ensure that two days before the poll, federal or provincial, police officers seize firearms without warrant almost simultaneously. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, without warrant they proceed to seize various firearms belonging to Pequists, Crediters or opponents most in the public eye in their localities, after the police itself has set the stage, a sort of repetition of the American Watergate, in order that before the election throughout Quebec they can recreate in some other way a climate of fears and panic as was the case in the last provincial election and making believe that Pequists or opponents were prepared to enter into an armed rebellion on election day.

● (1720)

Similar schemes could easily be devised by Liberals or others for the purpose of destroying opponents by resorting to every possible form of power abuse sanctioned under this bill. When one knows how the American CIA proceeds, Mr. Speaker, one can suppose that such initiatives could also take place here in Canada.

And then we hear from former officer Robert Samson that the RCMP could have organized thefts to seize some papers! This bill will allow all abuses of authority that used to be made illegally and blamed on thieves even though they had been done by members of the RCMP, as Robert Samson indicated recently.

From now on, all abuses of authority will be allowed. We have only to recall that not even six years ago, after the FLQ troubles, certain people did not hesitate to recommend that the federal government use weapons when the weak and delicate Bourassa government was supposed to be overthrown, as some people wanted us to believe. Mr. Speaker, by registering weapons, it will be easy to invoke a so-called political crisis, whether it is organized, anticipated or unforeseen, so as to confiscate weapons throughout Quebec or any other province and prevent Quebecers from defending themselves against eventual abuses of authority and force them to remain under the rule of the federal government, which could be itself at the bottom of all these abuses of authority. We have unfortunately seen this happen in many countries.

We therefore prefer to endanger the innocent and honest majority because we are afraid to attack the criminals, who are for the most part very well organized, and whom we want to re-habilitate, according to the Attorney General, but until they are rehabilitated, if this can be done, honest people are at their mercy. Apparently we want to fight crime because of this increase in the crime rate, but this legislation will pith the criminals against unarmed people since throughout the world, the registration of weapons has always led to their being confiscated. We may say that this is demagogy, Mr. Speaker, but the registration of weapons has always led to their being confiscated.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Why do we have such a legislation while Quebec has already better gun control than any other area of Canada? We should imitate Quebec instead of making it suffer the consequences of a legislation issued from the fact that it is too easy to obtain and handle weapons in other provinces. Why make Quebec pay for the errors made in other provinces where it was much too easy to get arms? Quebec should be imitated in this regard because until now everything there has been going fine when it comes to that since in Quebec there is an extremely severe control over gun licensing. Even Granby Chief of Police Joseph Couture, a man of considerable experience and integrity, has had to wait for over four weeks to get his permit to carry a gun, for a very extensive investigation was carried out before he could get it. Even he could not elude the severe control we have in Quebec.

That is an example, Mr. Speaker, among so many others I could quote and which proves that in Quebec this matter is not taken lightly when dealers and sellers of various arms are subject to rules and an extremely strict control. Rod and gun clubs are not controlled or administered by stupid or irresponsible people because in those clubs members are taught the art of using and handling arms before a permit is recommended for a member. Why want to impose a legislation that does not meet at all the desires of all responsible and knowledgeable people who want to use arms every day in a responsible way?

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an insult to responsible people, particularly those in Quebec who until now have behaved like responsible people about such dangerous arms because we do not have only those things to deplore across Quebec, as some seem to want to suggest in this House. The only argument that is made up is that accidents must be prevented. That argument is the cover concealing other purposes that will not or cannot be told. I am not afraid to see arms in the hands of those in charge of all rod and gun clubs; I am not afraid to see arms in the hands of responsible individuals who are subject like all policemen or rod and gun club members to a very strict control administered by people responsible to members or municipal authorities or subject to a control like the one we have in Quebec.

I am really afraid to see the majority of honest people defenceless in front of a minority of irresponsible criminals. If a professional, architect, doctor, lawyer, notary or father of a family of 15 children or any individual owning property sees his property endangered by any criminal or by an individual who prefers to live off the work of others rather than his own and who decided himself to share the assets of that damned capitalism by attaking any of those assets, how it is possible for honest and law-abiding owners to protect themselves from notorious or potential criminals? They have arms and are the first to disobey the law on the registration of weapons because irresponsible people and criminals do not care about the law, the property of others and they will also not care about the legislation being now considered on the registration of arms. How will honest people be able to protect themselves, how will the millions of individuals who live far from police services be able to protect themselves against criminals who will have easy and unprotected preys at their mercy?

I would want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, on statements made by experienced authorities on the subject

and not technocrats or civil servants who will eventually have to deal with this legislation, who acquired the experience in sociology inspired by marxist papers in favour of greater freedom for criminals. And I would like here to quote, for example, from remarks by—

[*English*]

—Chief Inspector Colin Greenwood of the West Yorkshire Constabulary, England. He said:

> Fifty years of gun control have been useless in stemming the tide of gun related crime. Since 1963 the rate of armed crime in England has risen a staggering 400 per cent. . . .
>
> Guns were always available to any criminal who chose to use them. Firearms controls do not appear to have stopped this class of criminal from obtaining a gun when he thought he could use one . . .
>
> The odds against him being caught may be something like seven or ten to one in his favour. When the death penalty is applied, he is not prepared to accept seven or ten to one odds on a chance of being hanged. Capital punishment and violent crime seem to be tied together in some form. . . .
>
> No matter how one approaches the figures, one is forced to the rather startling conclusion that the use of firearms in crime was very much less than when there were no controls of any sort and when anyone, convicted criminal or lunatic, could buy any type of firearms without restriction.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I believe in submissions from experienced individuals but not from people who spent years in schools and do not have the knowledge of our policemen responsible for protecting mostly honest Canadians. And as representative of a constituency of this extensive country I think that our first responsibility is to protect the great majority of honest people who make up our Canadian society. It is not with a greater liberalization that we will control criminals, obtain more respect for our country and our property because the country would be left at the mercy of extremists and revolutionists as elsewhere in the world.

This occurred elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, when firearms were registered. In all the countries of the world were firearms were registered, 25 years afterwards, they were seized and the honest people were left at the mercy of idiots, lunatics and criminals.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to be able to address myself to Bill C-83. My intention primarily in the debate today is to talk specifically about the gun control aspects of this legislation. I do not intend to deal with equally significant and important aspects of the bill at this time which touch upon crime inquiries, detection and electronic surveillance, dangerous offenders, habitual criminals, and strengthening measures to ensure adequate custody and safer techniques for the release of inmates, and other broad questions of crime prevention.

● (1730)

The gun control aspect of this bill has provoked an enormous amount of controversy in society and I feel that at this stage of the debate, in view of the limitation of time, I would prefer to deal specifically with this particular aspect of the legislation.

The first point I want to make is more a semantic one, a matter of window dressing. Bill C-83 on its front page calls the legislation "An Act to provide for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime". It seems to me that that description of the contents of the bill is very offensive to those who are law-abiding citizens and who are about to be controlled in terms of their use of firearms. It would seem to me much better to refer to the bill along the following lines: "An Act to amend the Criminal Code through (1), provisions for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, and (2), provisions to control the use of firearms in Canada." That at least would not carry with it the implication that the control of firearms was directly related to the perpetrators of violent and other crime in Canada. I think this has created a rather unhealthy approach to the matter on the part of those who feel legitimately aggrieved by some of the provisions in Bill C-83.

The next point I would make has to do with the use of time allocation, in other words, House rule 75C, to limit second reading debate. As all members know, we have had some days now on second reading, but this allocation of time, limiting further debate to four days, is something I basically support providing it is the mechanism that will bring the matter before the committee where the public and those who have real need for input will be given a longer period of time to make their views known.

In the debate which took place on the use of Standing Order 75C, opposition members drew the attention of the House to the fact that there were no guarantees given that there would be adequate time in Committee. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), whose speech I listened to in the debate, indicated that this was one of the motivating forces behind the allocation of time. I certainly hope that the House, and particularly the committee at committee stage, will give adequate time to allow the citizens of this country and groups concerned with the various aspects of the bill opportunity to make a meaningful input, and that the committee itself will very carefully consider the representations that have been made and will be made.

I think all hon. members know—certainly I do as a result of my experience in the House since 1968—that whenever parliament tries to amend the Criminal Code it evokes a great deal of controversy. The gun control aspects of this bill have generated a great deal of debate with the public and an enormous amount of heat and, I think, emotion. The members of the committee in particular must listen very carefully to the views expressed by Canadians on this important subject. They must not reject criticism of the bill simply because it is expressed with emotion and passion. They must listen to all arguments and address themselves to the legitimate points that are being expressed in many instances. In this way both committee and the House will be able to make amendments and improve the legislation that is before us.

To illustrate the kind of views that exist in the community, I have received a great deal of correspondence and had a number of meetings with my constituents on this subject. I want to quote briefly from one group that wrote to me representing the Cannington Gun Club just outside my riding, in Cannington, Ontario. It is a rather lengthy letter so I shall just quote a couple of excerpts from it:

Persons such as convicted perpetrators of violent crimes, the committed insane persons, proven drug addicts, and such persons who threaten peace and property of the majority should be forbidden to own firearms. However, these persons must be specifically listed in the legislation.

I think that illustrates the point that gun clubs, sporting groups and so on, are not so violently opposed to gun controls of all kinds that they do not recognize the legitimate concern of society when such firearms are put in the hands of those who clearly will not be using them responsibly, people whom we might suspect will use them in a fit of passion or emotion. These groups have raised a number of legitimate objections to the bill. I am not going to go through them in the context of the correspondence, but may I simply say that those who have raised objections to certain aspects of the bill are not all kooks. They have many legitimate concerns and we have to listen to those concerns.

There is, of course, a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding as to the nature of the gun control aspects of the legislation. Let me briefly outline my understanding of the primary thrust of this aspect of the bill. First, Bill C-83, in my view, will have little if any impact on criminals using guns. But this is not the primary thrust of the bill at all. It is quite evident that those who have firearms illegally are not going to rush out and try to register them; they will probably continue to possess guns and will have to be dealt with in the traditional way and, I hope, a stepped up means of surveillance will take guns out of their hands.

As I say, in my view this bill is not primarily directed toward that aspect of the matter; the bill is directed at law-abiding citizens, basically to ensure three things. The first is the licensing of gun users so that those who have histories of violence, who perhaps are drug users or have been convicted of criminal offences in which firearms have been involved, or those who are mentally incapable of adequately looking after firearms, will not be allowed to have such weapons. I think that is fair enough and I do not think anyone in society would really object to that at all.

Secondly, this law provides for a requirement by those who do posses firearms to ensure adequate storage in the handling of those firearms, so they will not fall into the hands of people who should not have them, or so they do not fall into the hands of those who in a highly emotional state would use them without thinking. If they were locked up this would give people an opportunity for second thought, so that they might perhaps not commit a crime of violence. These are people with no history of violence at all.

About a year or a year and a half ago in my own riding a number of murders, of a common law wife and, I think, three children were committed by one person who got into alcohol, went out and grabbed a gun. If the gun had been adequately stored and the ammunition locked away, there would have been time for second sober thought and this murder might not have been committed. The recent crimes in schools in Toronto and in Ottawa might to some extent have been averted if firearms had not been so quickly and readily available in homes. I think it important that we address ourselves to this question. Those who improperly or inappropriately store firearms will have the obligation upon them in law not to do so in the future. I think this will help avoid some of the crimes of violence that do occur on the spur of the moment.

● (1740)

The third thrust is to prohibit the possession of certain types of weapons. Basically I have no objection to such thrusts. I primarily support them and I think that all reasonable people would do so as well. However, there are some legitimate concerns being expressed by Canadian people as to how this should best be done. I will now address myself to those concerns which need to be carefully considered, and amendments may be required at the committee stage to overcome the inherent difficulties in the presently proposed legislation.

There is the basic concern that this measure provides too much arbitrary power in the hands of the Governor in Council, and is subject to possible abuse in the administration of the law by either licensing officials or law enforcement officers. I think that concern is legitimate. It is not only legitimate in connection with this bill but in connection with all bills that parliaments pass.

On another bill of a similar nature, Bill C-58, I spoke very strongly, as I have in respect of other matters, about the delegation of powers through regulation and so on rather than having them specifically spelled out within a bill dealt with by parliament. Many people in Canada feel that same concern, and I should like to see this bill tidied up to some extent to remove, wherever possible, that arbitrariness which may exist through the Governor in Council or through enforcement agencies, spelling this out a little better and more carefully than this bill does. I think that is a legitimate concern and a matter the committee must address itself to in order to rectify this problem. Obviously we should attempt wherever possible to contain within the law sufficient safeguards to ensure that these concerns are in fact unwarranted.

Concern has also been expressed about the availability of licensing after the law is passed. We must ensure that the rights of our citizens are protected, and that the presumption is that a person should have the right to own a gun unless there is a specific and demonstrable reason why he should be prohibited from doing so. If there is a demonstrable reason, I think all reasonable people would agree.

Many people have guns for various reasons, collecting, legitimate sporting activities, and so on. They feel they run the risk of having their rights denied by an arbitrary enforcement of this law. We have to look at that side of the question and satisfy ourselves that the concerns they have expressed are either unwarranted or, if warranted, that corrective action is taken.

There is also a concern expressed about the bureaucratic institution of records in respect of ammunition sales. Every bureaucratic aspect of this bill should be looked at very carefully. The licensing procedures, I am sure, can be achieved in a simple way without the involvement of an enormous bureaucracy. However, knowing the tendency of government and the tendencies of civil servants who are very much inclined from time to time to feather bed and to provide new and better jobs for themselves, this may well create a kind of bureaucratic nightmare about which many of our citizens are expressing a legitimate concern. At the committee stage we should look at this question and at this

basic tendency of government to move in that direction so as to ensure under the law that this will not happen and that the people in our society will not be forced into that bureaucratic jungle which may be totally unnecessary.

The next point is with regard to the need for proper and adequate storage of guns. People have expressed the concern that they could be found criminally responsible even if they have adopted reasonable precaution in the storage of their guns. I do not think this concern, as I read the law, is a legitimate one, but I respect those who express that view, and I am quite prepared to listen further to these arguments. I think the committee should do the same thing to ensure that in fact we are not creating a condition whereby innocent people are to be made criminals because of something they did not do.

I am not in any way making a plea that we should amend the law in such a way that there is no responsibility for the safekeeping and storage of weapons and ammunition, because that is important. I do believe, however, that we have to approach this question with reason, to ensure that innocent people are not made the victims of our intentions in this regard.

Concern is also expressed in respect of storage in relation to the distinction between urban and rural environments. It seems to me quite clear that in an isolated case, for instance, of a trapper in the north where there is not a house within 50 miles, it would be unreasonable not to allow that trapper living alone within his home to keep his rifle in the house without locking it up. I see nothing wrong with that. The same situation does not prevail if you live in Toronto, Ottawa, Vancouver, or some other area that has some urbanization. The committee ought to look at this question and the distinction that exists in reality between the storage of guns in an urban setting, in a semi-urban setting, and in a remote or rural setting.

We may be able to make an adjustment by amendment to this law that would take into account these realities of a big nation such as Canada so we do not impose totally unnecessary controls on people. We want controls where they are needed, but surely it is in nobody's interest to impose artificial controls when everybody would agree that such is evidently not required.

Concern is also expressed about the arbitrary power extended to enforcement officers in connection with storage procedures to take the weapons out of people's homes. I agree that our enforcement agencies should have the right, if they have reasonable ground to believe that a crime may be committed or that a person is unstable at a given moment in time, to go in and remove a weapon that might be used in a criminal activity, whether it be suicide, the murdering of children or wives, or whatever.

The real problem is how do we know that this legitimate need under the law will not be arbitrarily exercised by enforcement agencies against individuals whom they may not happen to like or want to harass in one way or another? I do not know how to settle that problem, but it is a problem. It is a concern felt by a society that has a great deal of distrust of law-enforcement agencies and of governments themselves.

It is on the basis of that distrust that people are moving now to question whether anybody will do anything right if we give them powers under the law. I respect that concern and feel the committee should look at this question to find out if there is any more satisfactory way to guarantee that that kind of power will not be exercised in an arbitrary way.

Perhaps one thing the committee ought to think about in this connection is that when enforcement officers arbitrarily use this power when it is not warranted, and when there is not reasonable ground, there ought to be some method by which the aggrieved persons can take action against the agency involved. That is one thought that may be useful.

Gun collectors have also expressed a concern. Perhaps here we need an amendment so that it is possible for gun collectors to have a special gun collector's licence allowing them to own and perhaps use prohibited weapons under adequate and proper control. It seems to me there is very little useful purpose to be served by this prohibition in respect of persons who may have $10,000, or even $100,000 worth of guns in their homes. We have all kinds of collectors; some collect antique cars, some guns, and some stamps. There is nothing inherently illegal or improper about doing that. I think we should consider those who have been engaged in this legitimate activity prior to exactment of this law so that perhaps they might be licensed in a special way. They have no record of misuse. They have been responsible for a number of years. I think there might be a special clause, perhaps a grandfather clause or what you will, that would address itself to those who really are law-abiding citizens in this country and who do not feel they are doing anything to affect adversely the rights of any other citizen.

● (1750)

The committee must ensure that no law-abiding citizens should have their possessions confiscated without compensation. I think this is a quite legitimate concern. It is one thing to confiscate something someone has and possesses illegally, but it is another thing to make the possession of something illegal that was not previously illegal, in respect of weapons or whatever the goods are, and confiscate them from a person without compensation. Surely there are basic rights in respect of property.

We as a parliament must address ourselves to the recognition of those rights. Let us not arbitrarily confiscate property, which people had a right to have, without compensation. Surely it is not expecting too much from a parliament which proposes a law and would pass that law in the broad public interest, to turn around and, after taking things from people in the public interest, have the public foot the bill for that confiscation.

Another point is that the committee must also carefully look at those provisions relating to the use of guns by those under 18 years of age to make sure that parents and others who want to train their children in the art or sport of hunting, skeet shooting, or whatever, would be entitled to do that without too much bureaucratic entanglement. The question also has been raised respecting two guarantors on a gun licence application. Who are those persons? Will it be possible to get a gun licence in the future?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And the liability too.

Mr. Cafik: As the hon. member mentions, there is also the liability involved. Does the liability revolve upon the guarantor? This is a question we must deal with in the law and not in the regulations so that the people concerned about this will be able to know what we are dealing with in parliament and will have an opportunity to express themselves against or in favour of the law we are proposing.

The last point I want to make is in respect of the old question of how deeply government should become involved in our personal lives. I think this is an old question and one which gives us all difficulty.

I am inclined to believe that the government should make as few laws as possible and should always have a clear and demonstrable reason for imposing itself on the social system through law. When abuses occur there is a public interest at stake, but clearly we must accept our responsibility when we deal with the question of passing laws and regulations. In respect of gun control, I believe this is an area to which we must address ourselves and where we must intervene to some extent, but I would hope that our intervention would be to the minimum so that we would maximize the guarantees and minimize the bureaucracy and disruption that such regulations and laws will impose on society.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): And they should be related to the prevention of crime.

Mr. Cafik: Clearly no one likes government involvement, but the government does have a responsibility in this area to ensure that those who are mentally disturbed and incapable of adequately using firearms, those who have been guilty of violent offences in the past and also those who have been guilty of criminal offences including the use of firearms, should not be allowed a licence. That is understandable. Clearly we must also ensure that firearms are properly and adequately stored and that there is some responsibility on the owner for doing so.

In pursuing these legitimate objectives let us not become lost in this whole bureaucratic entanglement. Let us carefully, as a committee, look at this whole question. Let us look at some of the points I have raised, and at some I have not raised because of the limitation of time. We must genuinely address ourselves to these concerns. I think the most damaging thing that could happen to us as members of parliament and to the committee would be to approach Bill C-83 at the committee stage with a presumption that all those who oppose this legislation are inherently wrong. That would be a denial of their right to involve themselves in this area. I think all of us, even those who oppose this, would agree that we have a right to move in this direction. We want to ensure that what we do is productive and not counter-productive.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this committee will have a very important responsibility. It must have the time to deliberate carefully. It must listen to representations from all sides. It must presume good will on the part of those who appear before the committee. By doing that and by listening as well as speaking, I think we will end up with very good progressive gun control legislation of which we can be proud, and by which those who have rights and who want to be respected as citizens of Canada will not feel aggrieved. In this way we will not create additional alienation within our society.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) will be recognized when the debate resumes. It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 8, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED REORGANIZATION OF SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provision of Standing Order 43 to ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the serious loss of men and ships on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts in recent years, and in view of the admission of the Minister of National Defence that on the Pacific coast Canada does not have an air-rescue capability after dark, and the statement of the Minister of Transport yesterday that "It has become evident that... the marine search and rescue organization is no longer entirely adequate", I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That the House urges the Prime Minister to order a restructuring of the search and rescue organization under a single agency responsible to one minister, and that immediate steps be taken to procure adequate facilities and equipment for air and marine search and rescue operations on a 24-hour a day basis.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43 such a motion can only be put if there is unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIR CANADA

REQUEST COMPANY STOP CONTRACTING OUT FINANCE WORK—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a motion under Standing Order 43 having to do with a matter that is urgent and pressing. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Portage (Mr. Masniuk):

That this House directs the Minister of Transport to direct Air Canada to stop contracting out finance work in Winnipeg, Vancouver, Toronto and Ottawa in preparation for a lockout of Air Canada employees at the finance branch in Winnipeg and that the Minister of Labour personally intervene in the three-year labour dispute.

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

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST THAT NEW DAIRY POLICY PROVIDE FOR MILK PRICE SUPPORT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provision of Standing Order 43 on a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

Since the dairy policy for the year 1976-77 has not yet been announced, industrial milk producers are greatly worried, and it is therefore urgent that the government reassure producers concerning the income levels they may expect for the current year. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

That this House recommend to cabinet to make available to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) the funds necessary to allow the Canadian Dairy Commission to maintain milk prices at a level permitting an increase in income equal to that in other sectors of the economy.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

SUGGESTED TAKING OF UNDESERVED CREDIT FOR PRICE REDUCTIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have this written out today. Given that the recent decline in the rate of inflation in the consumer price index has been caused by declines in the prices of imported goods and of farm prices over which the Anti-Inflation Board has no jurisdiction and that the flexibility of retail prices in reaction to these wholesale farm prices is the same now as it was before the institution of the program, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

Northern Affairs

That this House congratulate the public relations officers of the Anti-Inflation Board for the adroit manner in which they have inappropriately taken credit for the board for contributing to these price reductions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

REQUEST THAT ACT BE REPEALED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move an important and urgent motion.

Given the continuing difficulties that arise between the Electoral Boundaries Commissions for the provinces and members of parliament, since also the experience of implementing the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act appears to be inefficient, and since above all the principle of this act is directly contrary to the interests of Quebecers and French Canadians in view of our ever decreasing percentage of representation in this Parliament, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard):

That this House recommend to the government the repeal of the present act and the preparation of another more adequate and more appropriate.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

PROPOSED DELAY IN GRANTING PERMITS TO DRILL IN BEAUFORT SEA PENDING COMMITTEE STUDY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 and ask for unanimous consent to a most reasoned motion. In view of the fact the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development made an announcement recently that the decision to grant or withhold a permit for off-shore drilling in the Beaufort Sea will be delayed for a short period, and in view of the expenditure of approximately $150 million by Dome Petroleum in anticipation of a final permit due to the premature announcement of approval in principle by the government in March, 1974, and in view of the preliminary environmental studies, both private and public, which indicate a potential environmental disaster from such activities, I move, seconded by the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth):

First, that no decision be taken to grant drill permits until the matter has been specifically referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development for study and report to the House, and second, that all correspondence between Dome and the government and all legal opinions regarding the government's financial liability for moneys already spent by Dome be tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY ON DRINKING WATER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

Since our drinking water is an ocean of industrial waste and may be harmful to the health of all Canadians and since, on account of that fact, there are many cases of poisoning each year, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs initiate an immediate inquiry on the problem of the quality of water which is definitely very poor in Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec, and report to the House on the steps to take to solve this problem which is endangering the health of all Canadians.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion may not be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—ROLE OF OFFICIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT IN GRANTING LEASE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce with regard to the so called Sky Shops affair and related matters. Can the minister indicate briefly to the House what role members of his senior staff played in this matter, whether these roles were carried out with his knowledge and authorization, and what action he has taken to ensure that the RCMP have access to all relevant information with regard to these activities, if any?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is referring to my responsibilities during my tenure as minister of transport, because of course there is no relationship in terms of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. My answer to the latter part of his question is that I was asked by the RCMP whether I would object if they looked at the files which are on file, I think with Public Archives. I gave them full access to them. Beyond that I have no official knowledge. I have, however, been informed informally that there was an exchange of correspondence between the executive assistant of the Minister of the Environment and my executive assistant. But what disposition was made of that beyond that point, I have no personal knowledge at present.

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—ROLE OF OFFICIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT IN GRANTING LEASE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of the Environment whether he can clarify the role his staff played with regard to the Sky Shops affair, and whether unauthorized acts and signatures were arranged without his knowledge? Can he say anything to parliament at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Within whatever limitations might be placed on that question in the question period I do not know whether any minister could ever describe, in the terms asked, the role played by him or his staff in terms of an affair. It seems to me rather expansive. I think the hon. member will have to be more specific.

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—KNOWLEDGE OF PRIME MINISTER OF THE ROLE OF OFFICIALS IN GRANTING LEASE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can ask a question of the Prime Minister. Can the right hon. gentleman indicate that he has been fully briefed on the role of the offices of these two former ministers of DREE and Transport in this matter, and can he assure this House unequivocally that there have been no improprieties in executive or administrative functions relating to the Sky Shops matters arising out of the actions of these two ministers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not asked to be fully briefed. I understand that the mounted police are conducting an investigation and that they have submitted a report to the attorney general of the province of Quebec. That is the extent of my knowledge.

Mr. MacKay: If I understand the right hon. gentleman correctly, he is telling the House that he has not been fully briefed and has no knowledge of any of the affairs which have been obliquely referred to by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and he knows nothing of any improprieties in administrative functions which have taken place in those two offices, the office of the former minister of DREE and the former minister of transport.

Mr. Trudeau: No, that is a misunderstanding. What I am saying is that I have no knowledge of the file which has been given by the mounted police to the Quebec attorney general as a basis for any legal action. I do not know what material was given and whether there were or were not recommendations. Of course, I have talked about this matter to the Minister of the Environment and other ministers.

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION ON FILE TURNED OVER TO QUEBEC

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I hope the Prime Minister will apprise himself of the circumstances relating to this matter. This is indeed a very serious situation.

I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Justice. Will the minister advise the House whether he has been in touch with the attorney general for the province of Quebec or the chief prosecutor there to ascertain what progress is being made or what decision has been made with respect to the file turned over to the province's justice department involving Sky Shops and other investigations?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, no, I have not, because the RCMP is properly reporting to the provincial authorities in this matter. As far as I am aware there are no so-called federal offences involved, and therefore the RCMP would not report to me on the matter.

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—SUGGESTION SOLICITOR GENERAL ENSURE NO DELAY IN ACTING ON FILE TURNED OVER TO QUEBEC

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Since the Solicitor General has indicated that the file with respect to the Sky Shops investigation has been completed, and since, apparently, it has been in the possession of the department of justice for the province of Quebec for some time, will the minister assure the House that he will monitor the situation so that there will be no appearance of political expediency in any delays which may take place in dealing with this matter?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I cannot admit that this file has been in the hands of the provincial government for some time. It is my understand-

ing that it was only transmitted to the provincial government in the last week or two. I do not know the exact time, but it was recent. On the other hand, and in answer to the second question, I think it might be improper for me to approach the provincial attorney general and put any kind of pressure on him either to take proceedings or not to take proceedings. That is his responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PLANS FOR CARRYING OUT PRIMARY DEFENCE ROLE IN VIEW OF EXPENDITURE ON THE ORION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Yesterday the minister acknowledged that the government will proceed to spend $1 billion on 18 aircraft on the absurd assumption that such aircraft will help head off a protracted land war in Europe. I should like to ask the minister how the government plans now—having committed all that money for the next few years in that direction—to meet its primary defence position as stated in the white paper on defence, namely, the protection of Canadian sovereignty, and most specifically I am thinking of the commitment to protect Canadian shorelines for Canadian fishermen in the years ahead.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I replied to the hon. member that the aircraft we are purchasing will in fact help us protect Canadian sovereignty. Beyond that we do have other funds available to carry out the other programs, for instance, to keep the tracker aircraft, which are our coastal surveillance aircraft, flying. We have the funds, despite the large expenditure for the long range patrol aircraft.

● (1420)

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister suggesting that the kind of complex, expensive equipment that will be put in the Orions if the government goes ahead with its decision is the kind that is appropriate for the surveillance of our coastal waters that will be required if the government proceeds, for example, with the 200 mile fishing limit, as it indicated it would? Is the minister saying that we have to spend $1 billion on 18 aircraft to fulfil that kind of role?

Mr. Richardson: No, Mr. Speaker, I am definitely not saying that. The primary role of a long range patrol aircraft is an anti-submarine role, but it also has capabilities that will assist in the surveillance of our coasts and of the north.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF GREATER EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BY PURCHASE OF DASH-7R

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister would acknowledge that the Orion aircraft will not have anything to do at all with the protection of sovereignty; the minister knows that. With reference to an answer that the minister gave yesterday about the long range employment possibilities to Canada that would accrue from the Orion decision, may I ask him the following question. Would he not admit that by purchasing the appropriate number of Dash-7R aircraft, whose air frames are produced in Canada and whose engines are also produced in Canada, and by re-equipping the appropriate number of Argus aircraft, the minister would not only get more aircraft that would fulfil the job with which he is concerned, but would produce more Canadian jobs at considerably less expense to Canadian taxpayers?

[Mr. Allmand.]

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, those options have been examined carefully, not only with regard to military capability but also with regard to industrial benefits. As I have stated, the industrial benefits to Canada are greater with the Lockheed purchase than they would be with the purchase of the Dash-7 or the refitting of the Argus. Further, the Dash-7 is not a long range patrol aircraft. It has not got the range to do the job, and it would take at least seven or eight Dash-7's to do the work that two Orions could perform.

* * *

[Translation]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

INQUIRY AS TO WHETHER MINISTER STUDIED TESTIMONY OF JUSTICE LAMER AT INQUIRY BEFORE APPOINTMENT AS LAW REFORM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Justice.

Without revealing the content of the testimony of Mr. Justice Antonio Lamer at the inquiry on organized crime, can the Minister of Justice tell the House today, as a follow-up to my questions of March 24 and 31, whether he took personal knowledge of the said testimony before giving Mr. Justice Lamer such an important responsibility as the one of presiding over the Law Reform Commission?

[English]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker. I understand that matter was examined by the deputy at the time of the original question.

* * *

[Translation]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBILITY OF INVESTIGATING FRIENDS OF JUSTICE LAMER BEFORE APPOINTMENT AS LAW REFORM COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I would rather ask a supplementary of the Solicitor General since it seems to me I will never get anything out of the Minister of Justice. The Solicitor General was there a moment ago. I would appreciate it if he could go back to his seat.

Did the minister ask the RCMP to make an investigation on Mr. Justice Antonio Lamer as is usually done before making an important appointment, and is the minister aware of the deep friendship that existed between Mr. Justice Lamer and tavern keeper Jean-Jacques Côté who publicly testified before the commission on organized crime and against whom criminal action has been taken?

[*English*]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with those allegations but no investigation was made, to my knowledge, by the RCMP.

* * *

AIRPORTS

SKY SHOPS AT MIRABEL—REASON SKY SHOPS GIVEN POINTS FOR ADVERTISING WHILE OTHER TENDERERS RECEIVED NO POINTS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which is supplementary to that posed by the hon. member for Central Nova. It relates to the recent developments concerning the awarding of government contracts and arises particularly from the summary of tendering procedures for the Mirabel duty free shop which the minister outlined in this House some time ago. Can the minister explain why in his department's attempt to justify the awarding of the duty free concession to Sky Shops, not one of the eight bidders other than Sky Shops were given any points in the evaluation criteria for advertising, while Sky Shops received the maximum, a total of five points in this category? How can the minister reconcile this evaluation in the face of the charges now outstanding relating to false and misleading advertising against Sky Shops?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in addition to the fact that that matter is before the courts, it is unfortunate to try to link the question of the advertising contained in the bid and the advertising referred to in the last part of the question. The actual analysis of bids is an extremely complex matter. It could be better dealt with this afternoon when the estimates of the Department of Transport are before the committee, rather than trying to deal with it this way in the House without the material before us.

Mr. Mazankowski: In as much as this is the only evaluation criteria, which is specifically advertising, out of a total of 13 other specific items where every single tenderer received some points, Sky Shops drew the maximum number of five while other bidders did not receive any points for advertising, does the minister not consider this somewhat strange? Does he not consider that there is just a wee bit of suspicion with regard to the evaluation of this total contract? Will the minister now come clean and tell the House why Sky Shops did get the contract?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the examination and the question of the bids was in the hands of an evaluation committee. The minister has come clean by putting the evaluation summary and process before the House in answer to earlier questions. It is there. If certain of the bidders did not put in any information at all about a certain program or proposal as part of their bid, they may not get any points for that. However, that is a matter that really depends on looking back at the bidding process at the time. The material is all available to the hon. member. He should not accuse anyone of not coming clean.

SKY SHOPS AT MIRABEL—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF ADVERTISING PROGRAM

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's answer, is he prepared to table this super-duper advertising program which Sky Shops produced to the Ministry of Transport in as much as 99 per cent of the purchases in the duty free concession shops are impulse buying and there is not a heck of a lot of advertising that has to be done? Will the minister table that super-duper contract?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be glad to look at that. Members who have been watching what has been tabled probably are not able to keep up with all the material. They know that I am co-operative and I will see what I can do about this.

* * *

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF LIMITING SPENDING INCREASE TO TEN PER CENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. In working out his budget which he will be presenting in May, is the minister planning to limit the increase in government spending during the next fiscal year to the range of 10½ per cent which was achieved by the Ontario government in its budget which was presented just two days ago and by so doing save the Canadian taxpayers around $2 billion in the next fiscal year?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, any changes in the budgetary system, either with regard to revenue or expenditure, are most intelligently left until the budget statement itself.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Knowing the Prime Minister's desire to see the universe unfold as it should, would he care to comment on Dr. Gallup's indication of how the universe is going to unfold during the next two years?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to think this one over.

Oral Questions

PENITENTIARIES

PRINCE ALBERT—REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CONDITIONS IN INSTITUTION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. It has to do with the sit-down in Prince Albert Penitentiary. The cause of the sit-down is, of course, still very serious. The prison as a whole has been in a state of deep frustration in recent days. There has been no criticism of the director or assistant director of the penitentiary or, indeed, of the custodial staff. The reason for the sit-down is the fact that an overwhelming percentage of those in the prison are young people, natives or Métis and there are no effective programs for them. Would he, in order to guard against any repetition of what has taken place, have an independent inquiry made, presided over, say, by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, to the end that those in penitentiaries will come to the conclusion, and properly so, that any injustices which they claim exist will be removed thereby assuring a degree of peace in the penitentiary which will not be followed again by what has happened in the last ten days—two suicides among the inmates.

● (1430)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I was advised just before the question period began that the sit-down strike at Prince Albert Penitentiary had been settled and that everybody is back in their places without any violence or trouble. The reason given for the sit-down strike was the inadequacy of medical services in the penitentiary. This is being investigated. With respect to the matters mentioned by the right hon. member, the high proportion of native people in our penitentiaries, we recognise this problem. Last year we held a federal-provincial conference on this subject at which five or six major native organizations were represented. We have established follow-up procedures and progress is being made. But it remains a serious problem as pointed out by the right hon. member.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The question I placed before the minister was this: in order to remove the deep resentment which has apparently developed regarding alleged wrongs, possibly unjustified, will he not, to secure peace in that institution, permit an independent investigation by a judge such as I have suggested?

Mr. Allmand: I do not think that is necessary at the present time. As I say, we have been in touch with the native groups. We have established a committee to deal with this problem. The committee is made up of a leader of the native groups, the Métis and the Indians; we are making progress in dealing with this problem and I do not think a commission of the kind suggested is necessary now.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You would not say that if you knew the conditions there.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF MR. FERGUSON'S LETTER OF RESIGNATION FROM MARKETING COUNCIL—REFUSAL OF ONTARIO MINISTER TO SIGN CEMA AGREEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of press reports that Ralph Ferguson resigned as Vice-Chairman of the National Farm Products Marketing Council because he was dissatisfied with the application of the CEMA quota system limiting production in Ontario, and that he tendered his resignation in a letter to the minister outlining his disagreement with the CEMA system, I ask the minister whether he will table Mr. Ferguson's letter for the information of the House and the public? In addition, will he inform us whether it is correct that the Ontario minister of agriculture has refused to sign the 1976 quota allocation agreement with that agency and, if that is the case, what plans he has, in consequence, for that egg marketing agency?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Ferguson did submit his resignation and I have accepted it. As I said to an hon. member from the other side of the House who asked me last week, he submitted his resignation last year and I asked him to stay on one year longer; he wanted to return to his farm. He did make several suggestions in the letter that a certain province was not living up to the agreement.

Some hon. Members: Table the letter!

Mr. Whelan: I do not have to table the letter because it was a confidential letter written to me by a member of the Council.

Mr. Hees: You have to table it because you have referred to it.

Mr. Whelan: I do not have to table it until I obtain the concurrence of the person who wrote the letter and follow the correct procedure. He made accusations in the letter about the allocation of the quota. These accusations have been made known to the Council and it is up to the Council to investigate and try to work the matter out. As far as the minister of agriculture in the Province of Ontario is concerned, if they do not want CEMA I do not force CEMA on anyone. If they don't want it and don't want to live up to the agreements, they are the ones who will destroy CEMA, not me.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order. The minister has referred to the contents of a letter which he now refuses to table.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Without going into detail with respect to the precedents, the minister is, of course, obliged to table a document if he has referred to it in the course of debate and advances an argument accordingly; if he initiates a reference to a document he ought to be obliged to table it. However, this certainly has never been held to apply to a situation in which a minister has simply been asked a question about a document and given an answer.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR DELAY OF DECISION ON APPLICATION OF OIL COMPANIES FOR A PRICE INCREASE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. It arises from the application to the Anti-Inflation Board by such poverty-stricken oil companies as Imperial Oil and Gulf Oil for permission to increase their product prices. The Board has said it may make a decision this week. In view of the fact that the increase, if granted, would be in addition to any increase in the wellhead price expected in July, and since these companies control production, refining and distribution outlets, for which reason their various operations should be treated as those of a single corporate entity, may I ask the minister if he will request the Anti-Inflation Board to postpone any decision with respect to the application for a price increase until the wellhead price has been set either by federal-provincial agreement or unilaterally by the federal government under the provisions of the Petroleum Administration Act?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I was advised before coming into the House that the Board had made a decision on this particular application. I am seeking further information as to the details. The point made by the hon. member, one which I have already taken elsewhere, is that until a decision is taken in the negotiations with regard to the basic price of crude oil, any increase should be postponed. I will advocate that such a course of action be followed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since the Consumer Price Index covering fuels and utilities has risen more sharply than the index respecting any other item—17.5 per cent during the past 12 months—and in view of the fact that the wellhead price increase in July, which is expected to be in the neighbourhood of $1.50 per barrel, will add $50 to the cost of home heating for the average family and $35 to the cost of operating one car, I should like to ask the minister whether he does not think the time has come to stop these predators who, under the excuse of the energy shortage, are gouging Canadian consumers while at the same time enjoying the highest profit margins in their history?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member has expressed an interesting point of view, and one which I will reflect upon.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF GUIDELINES TO TREAT ALL OPERATIONS OF OIL COMPANIES AS SINGLE ENTITY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since the oil companies control most of the oil production, the pipelines, the refineries and the distribution outlets, may I ask the minister if he is prepared to amend the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board so that the operation of the oil companies may be treated as a single corporate entity rather than allowing them to increase the prices of their products before any announcement has been made or agreement reached with respect to the wellhead price? The minister says that the decision has already been made. I would ask the minister whether he is prepared to amend the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines so that this sort of thing cannot continue in the future?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, parliament has, for example, entrusted the surveillance of the tariffs on pipelines to the National Energy Board and the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that their jurisdiction be annulled and placed under the single board is perhaps one which might be reflected upon. Given the relatively slow pace of the anti-inflation legislation in the House up to this point, I am not certain that this could be achieved quickly.

* * *

● (1440)

HEALTH

ASSURANCE OF VACCINE FOR SWINE FLU—REASON FOR PREFERENCE FOR IMPORTING VACCINE

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the reported further outbreak of swine 'flu in Virginia and its probable spread and consequences, I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether there has been any firm commitment from manufacturers that we will have the required amount of vaccine for the immunization of Canadian people, not only for the qualified categories, but for all those qualifying on doctor's certificates?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, negotiations are going on with various foreign sources at the present time. It would be premature to make an announcement in that respect.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister when he can make this statement and whether he has been in touch with the laboratory in Montreal, which can produce up to 300,000 doses, or with the Connaught Laboratory in Toronto, which could set up the machinery very quickly, and speed is of the essence?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, we have been constantly in touch with the two laboratories concerned and with other sources.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated a preference for importing vaccine rather than producing it in this country. I wonder whether he can give us briefly the reason for that? Is it because the imported vaccine is less costly, or is there some other reason?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons; first of all, costs; second, the capacity to produce the vaccines by the time when we will need them; and third, the safety itself of the vaccines which could be in jeopardy if production in some cases were to be started from scratch.

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the minister seems to be saying that Canada cannot produce good vaccine.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Yewchuk: Can the minister give us the figures, in so far as the foreign vaccine is less costly?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lalonde: Obviously, if the hon. member was unable to understand the first part of my reply, I doubt that he could understand the second.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED DISCUSSION OF SHARED-COST PROGRAMS WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Referring to the last federal-provincial conference of finance ministers, and bearing in mind the proposals made for fiscal arrangements that could be of interest to all provinces, and considering that future proposals dealing with cost-sharing programs could quickly do away with those advantages, would the minister, under those circumstances, be willing to accept the proposal of his Quebec counterpart who would like those discussions to include, in the future a package proposal, more specifically fiscal arrangements and cost-sharing proposals so that the provinces might know exactly what the federal government has in mind?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of discussing the policy concerning equalization and cost-sharing programs. However, I must point out that the provincial premiers did suggest dividing the two subjects and having a discussion on cost-sharing programs with the premiers and another on different issues such as fiscal arrangements with the ministers of finance. I am quite prepared to begin a joint discussion on these matters.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTH KOREA—POSSIBLE PURCHASE OF SOLID FUEL ROCKET MOTORS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and relates to the proposed sale of a CANDU reactor and nuclear assistance to South Korea. Will the minister inform the House whether the government was aware that an application had been made by the government of South Korea, with a subsequent sale to that government by the Lockheed Corporation of its equipment for the manufacture of solid fuel for rocket motors, and whether there has been any discussion with the government about that sale?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that solid propellant virtually has only two purposes, either for use in defensive or offensive missiles or rockets for boosting satellites into space, and since there is little likelihood of a space program in South Korea, has the minister checked with the State Department in respect of this sale, and in particular has he knowledge of the protest this week of 119 Congressmen and Senators regarding the growing deterioration in respect of human rights and oppression of the Park régime? Does he feel that the agreements that have in fact been signed with Canada will stand up over time, protecting us from a situation developing similar to that in India?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, that is a very large question. I thought the hon. member's interest in the subject was dominated by the question of Lockheed. His supplementary question indicates he has other interests, including the danger of nuclear proliferation. I do recall that the particular transaction in respect of rockets was discussed at an earlier stage. At that time we had concluded that there was no particular danger arising either from the possibility of the sale or its integration with any military system in the Republic of Korea. I would be glad to refresh my memory on that particular transaction. The hon. member will recall that the Republic of Korea has dropped its intention, earlier expressed, to acquire a fuel reprocessing plant, in which absence it will not be possible for the Republic of Korea to create a fuel cycle or enter into any type of weapons or explosives program.

* * *

TRADE

ALLEGATION SOUTH KOREA WILL PAY FOR REACTOR WITH TEXTILES

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce confirm or deny a statement contained in a report commissioned by the United States Energy Resources Development Agency to the effect that a significant part of the payment to be made by the South Korean government for the CANDU reactor it is purchasing will be in the form of textiles?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question, and I believe the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources did as well. I have not seen that particular document the hon. member refers to, but I would be gald to look at it. To the best of my knowledge there is no commitment or arrangement as to any special consideration for South Korea in terms of textile imports.

* * *

THE MINISTRY

EFFECT ON SALARIES ACT OF FAILURE TO APPOINT MINISTER OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that there has been no appointment to the post of Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, how

does the President of the Privy Council propose to resolve problems arising from the provisions of the Salaries Act?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the question is based on a false assumption.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, if there is to be an announcement almost immediately, which is quite possible, it would be very nice if it were made in the House. Given that, contrary to the provisions of Section 25 of the Government Reorganization Act of 1970, there are now more parliamentary secretaries than full ministers listed under Section 4 of the Salaries Act, at least in so far as we know at this moment, can the President of the Privy Council tell us which parliamentary secretary is or was not receiving a salary during the hiatus since the resignation of the hon. member for Papineau, and who will have to pay the money back?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not catch all the words of the question, but I think the hon. gentleman might note that there will be an announcement this afternoon regarding a new minister of consumer affairs.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CUBA—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AGREEMENT COVERING AIRCRAFT AND TRAINING OF PILOTS

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister and relates to the agreement with Cuba last week by Air Canada covering DC-8 aircraft and the training of Cuban pilots, which the Prime Minister said on March 31 had been modified by the government. Will he now table the terms of that agreement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Air Canada comes under the Minister of Transport and I do not believe it is customary for him to table contracts with any Crown corporation, but with his usual tolerance and openmindedness I am sure he will look into this question.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Will he undertake to inform the House of the terms of the agreement regarding the number of aircraft and the training of pilots?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I was not listening to the first part of the question, but, if it referred to the arrangement between Air Canada and Cuba, I will certainly determine whether there is any problem in that regard as far as Air Canada is concerned. I will certainly try to get that information for the hon. member.

● (1450)

CUBA—PLACE AND DATE OF MINISTERS' PROTEST AGAINST PRESENCE OF TROOPS IN ANGOLA

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Replying to a question from the hon. member for South Shore on March 31, the Prime Minister stated the Secretary of State for External Affairs had publicly protested the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Would the minister give the place and date of these protests and make the texts available to the House?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Well, Mr. Speaker, the month was January. The date escapes me for the moment. The place was Jerusalem.

* * *

FINANCE

REASON PROJECTIONS FOR INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT ARE NOT COMPARABLE WITH THOSE OF UNITED STATES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Bearing in mind that this administration when it suits its purpose likes to blame international forces, especially those in the United States, for its economic failures, can the minister explain to the House why his projections of inflation in 1976 are now one half as much again as those revealed by the Treasury Department of the United States and why Canadian forecasts of unemployment are one per cent higher than the United States and yet Canadian real growth is expected to be almost 2 per cent lower than in the United States.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. gentleman that the United States went through about a 6 per cent recession in the past 18 months. If he is advocating that kind of economic future for Canada, I would have to disagree with him.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is also for the Minister of Finance. Bearing in mind his comments about a 6 per cent recession in the United States, would the minister indicate if he is aware that Canada's inflation level gap between here and the United States is now 5 points and is growing. This five-point gap in respect of inflation is the highest gap in recorded history between the United States and this country. Could he explain, over and above what he has indicated, why the Americans appear to be containing inflation without controls better than we are with controls.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the hon. gentleman that if he would prefer a 10 per cent rate of unemployment, which the Americans have had during the recession, that of course has a certain affect on inflation.

Oral Questions

AGRICULTURE

VIEW OF MINISTER ON WHETHER FOOD PRICES WILL CONTINUE TO DECLINE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my further supplementary question is to the Minister of Agriculture. With the background of today's inflation figures where food prices are lower but other prices continue to soar and having noted the minister's contention that food is cheap in Canada, would the minister indicate whether he believes that recent food price declines will set the pattern for 1976 or does he expect food prices to rise substantially in the latter part of this year.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, to make a forecast that would be even greater than that of the former Chairman of the Food Prices Review Board would entail having a knowledge greater than that of God.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF PLANNING FOR IMPROVED SURVEILLANCE, SEARCH AND RESCUE IN VIEW OF POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION TO 200 MILES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the minister's responsibility for co-ordinating the efforts of surveillance, search and rescue and in view of the extension of Canada's limits in respect of the 200 mile economic zone which will mean a massive undertaking in order to provide surveillance and search and rescue, would the minister indicate what planning is taking place on an inter-departmental basis for this eventuality and what hardware is being considered as well as any other efforts the departmental committee is taking.

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Well, Mr. Speaker, to some extent this is hypothetical because we do not yet have a 200-mile limit. However, we very definitely are making plans to adequately cover that limit of 200 miles if it is established, and we will increase the amount of equipment for that purpose.

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that at a meeting of the Committee on Fisheries the other day the officials indicated that planning was taking place with regard to the eventuality of the 200-mile limit, would the minister make a statement on motions or ask the House Leader to refer to the committee the whole aspect of the need for capable search and rescue surveillance in Canada so that the matter could be dealt with seriously and so that the planning can take place for the future.

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I can reaffirm that the planning is taking place. I will be pleased to announce it as definite and final decisions are taken.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

BRIGITTE BARDOT'S PROTEST AGAINST SEAL HUNT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of State (Fisheries).

In drafting future regulations on seal hunting, does the minister intend to let himself be impressed by the lucubrations of a former movie star seeking to regain lost popularity? Everybody, you included, has recognized that I am referring to Brigitte Bardot.

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is my responsibility to determine what has been lost and what could be regained. On the other hand, I believe I must say that those who protest against this sort of quite legitimate activity on the part of our Canadian fishermen, if they want to be consistent with themselves, should refrain from eating meat, wearing clothes and shoes, and so on.

* * *

HEALTH

INQUIRY AS TO MEASURES TO EXTEND FOOD INSPECTION SYSTEM

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Could the minister tell the House whether, following the crime commission investigation on the matter of tainted meat which took place last fall, new steps have been taken to expand the inspection service under the Food and Drugs Act and, if so, could he tell the House what are those steps the government has seen fit to take to protect the health of Canadians?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but could the hon. member repeat his question, for I did not hear it?

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I would like to know whether, following the investigation of the Commission of Inquiry on Organized Crime, new steps have been taken respecting inspection under the Food and Drugs Act, whether new inspectors have been appointed to protect the health of Canadians so that the situation of last fall does not recur.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already tabled in the House, several months ago, the answer to that question. It will be found in the House of Commons *Hansard*.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Yesterday we learned that not only did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development act in bad faith toward the Inuit Tapirisat by not consulting with them about exploration on land now the subject of land claims negotiations, but also that the minister responsible was not even aware that his department had taken action. Today we learned that an official of the Canadian Wildlife Service has not prosecuted companies under environment protection regulations for fear of damaging the political sensibilities of his minister. Please, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister to take some action to ensure that his ministers and senior civil servants operate according to his government's policy and especially make sure that these two ministers smarten up.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West.

* * *

[*Translation*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

TRANSFER OF HOSPITAL AT SAINTE-ANNE-DE-BELLEVUE—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Can the minister tell the House if the negotiations are still under way between his departmental officials and those responsible for the Quebec government with respect to the transfer of an hospital under Quebec jurisdiction in Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue? If so, because of the representations made against that transfer by the Quebec branch of the Canadian Legion, does the minister think negotiations will be successful anyway?

[*English*]

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, negotiations are being carried out between our department and the department responsible in the province of Quebec. They are progressing very well. So far as the termination date is concerned it is quite difficult to tell you that because negotiations are such that sometimes they take considerable time and sometimes when one makes an announcement previous to decisions being made it does not work out too well.

● (1500)

With regard to the Legion and their input into this, they have sent resolutions to my department concerning the transfer of hospitals in Quebec, but my answer to you, Sir, is that we have a policy in the government for transferring hospitals and the reason we have the policy is that we see that in the long run it is more beneficial to veterans, because if we leave the situation as it is presently, in a few years from now we would have nothing but geriatric and nursing case patients and it would be quite impossible to hold people with proper training to look after these patients.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF TASK FORCE ON PROBLEMS OF BUSINESSMEN IN NORTH OBTAINING CONTRACTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. A short time ago the minister indicated that his department has taken steps to implement some ten of the 42 recommendations and subrecommendations of the task force which was formed to study the problems encountered by businessmen in the north in obtaining government contracts. Can the minister advise the House whether he has taken steps to implement the remainder of the recommendations. I am wondering in particular if he has implemented the recommendation with regard to the bid bond differential.

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting in Yellowknife on April 26 to discuss the outstanding recommendations on which we have not been able to reach agreement. I think there are approximately eight to which we said no and several of the recommendations as mentioned by the hon. member were accepted. On the balance we are going to have further discussions on April 26, and amongst these is the one dealing with the bid bond differential.

PERMITS FOR PIPELINES—SUGGESTED REQUIREMENT THAT STAGING AREAS BE CLOSE TO LARGER COMMUNITIES

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Bearing in mind the minister's interest in the economy of the north, has he plans when considering applications for a land use permit for a pipeline, that it will be a requirement before a permit is granted that the staging areas will be either in, or in close proximity to, some of the larger communities in order that the northerners will benefit?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The representations on this have been made by the mayor of Hay River. There is a proper procedure under which NTCL makes application for permit, and that proper procedure is being followed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. YEWCHUK—POSITION OF MEDICAL DOCTORS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SITTING ON HEALTH COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Outstanding before the House is an alleged question of privilege by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) to which a number of hon. members have contributed. I thought I might indicate to the House that unless this is inconvenient to members, I propose to bring down a ruling tomorrow.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I ask the government House leader his intentions with respect to business of the House until the Easter adjournment which he has announced, bearing in mind that we really have only one full parliamentary day left. Would the minister consider bringing forward Bill C-81 dealing with members' salaries and allowances so that we could deal with this matter, unless, of course, it would upset the carefully laid plot in the Liberal caucus with respect to that bill which suddenly came awry.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might put before the House the government's plans for the rest of the session until the Easter adjournment. On the question of Bill C-81, I would like to have an opportunity to talk to the House leaders before the end of the week and on other measures that are still outstanding.

The debate on second reading of Bill C-83 will be continued until Monday, when the allotted time comes to an end. On Tuesday and Wednesday it is our intention to deal with Bill C-20 and Bill S-31 and, of course, the motion to adjourn. There has been some discussion among the House leaders that if there is necessity for a recorded vote following the completion of second reading of Bill C-83, it would take place at 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday. I hope that can be made an order of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the suggestion of the President of the Privy Council in respect of a possible vote on second reading of Bill C-83. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. Peters: It seems to me that when we have a closure motion, the government should not really expect any kind of consideration from hon. members with regard to the varying of the time of the order which already has written into it the time allowed for the consideration of the bill. If we as members are being asked for such consideration, then I suggest the House leader should no longer put forward closure motions which in any case would probably not have been necessary.

Mr. Speaker: For the sake of the regularity of proceedings, I take it the House has already pronounced itself on the suggestion of the President of the Privy Council, and the hon. member for Timiskaming was speaking on a separate and general point of order.

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a brief point of order. I ask for clarification. I asked a question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and received an answer with which I was well satisfied. I then attempted to ask the same type of question of the Minister of the Environment. I varied the wording slightly because I wanted to make it clear that as a result of a couple of short conversations with both these hon. gentlemen, I was aware of the fact that they had no knowledge of some of the matters referred to by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The Minister of the Environment seemed to want to respond to my question and I wonder if he might now be given an opportunity to indicate whether he wishes to put something on the record.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Of course, I have ruled on the general nature of the question. I invited the hon. member to rephrase his question to make it more specific because, as I recall, the hon. member had put a question asking the minister to describe to the House the involvement of himself or his staff or officials in the Sky Shops affair. That was the language of the question, I believe. It seems to me that it might very well call for a very short answer on the part of the minister; but if the answer is in the positive, it might be far too general in nature to be included, and I cannot wait for the answer to find out whether it would be suitable under the regulations. That is why I did not rule the question out, but I asked the hon. member to be more specific.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question is so important that I think members who are questioning ministers should understand the rules. I was rather interested in your refusal, sir, to allow the question of the hon. member for Central Nova. It seemed to me quite appropriate for a member to ask a minister to answer a question with respect to the operations of his department or his staff regarding almost any matter, whether or not under his jurisdiction. I wonder if Your Honour is, in fact, saying that we cannot ask questions of ministers with respect to the acts of members of their departments which may be regarding matters not under the minister's jurisdiction, and whether the minister is not responsible for the acts of his departmental officials and staff. I would be interested to have Your Honour's guidance with respect to whether or not we can ask questions of ministers in that general area.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That consideration was not involved in the difficulty with that question. Although both questions, the one to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the one to the Minister of the Environment concerned the responsibilities of the ministers on which they no longer report to parliament, that was not part of the difficulty. The difficulty was simply that the question was too general in nature.

The difficulty which the hon. member raises may be another separate one, but until we face this specific incident I do not think I should generalize.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. LAMBERT (BELLECHASSE)—IDENTIFICATION OF MEMBERS OPPOSING STANDING ORDER 43 MOTIONS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

My question of privilege is based on one of our Standing Orders. I wish to draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that since the Standing Orders of the House have been changed, the motions moved under the provisions of

Standing Order 43 must be moved as soon as the House opens, or between two o'clock and 2:15.

Since this procedure has been introduced, I have noticed that motions moved under the provisions of Standing Order 43 are much more serious and concern much more than before matters which require the immediate attention of the House.

However, government members still have the habit of voting systematically against any motion made under Standing Order 43 by the opposition without identifying themselves, which is not always in the best interest of the population. What is more disillusioning, Mr. Speaker, for the reader of *Hansard*, is that he cannot know which member objected to the motion, and that does not do justice to the hon. member who did so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to an important part of our Standing Orders, Standing Order 28, which reads as follows:

28. Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered—

—this is a bit obsolete because no one wears a hat these days—

—and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

However, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of democracy itself and out of respect for our institution, I respectfully submit that any hon. member who wishes to speak in this House and whose intervention aims at justifying a ruling of the Speaker must comply with Standing Order 28 and ask for permission to speak, even if it is only to object to the moving of a motion by simply saying no.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I moved a motion on a very important and urgent matter, as it had to do with thousands of industrial milk producers. Unanimous consent was refused by an hon. member, but from reading *Hansard* tomorrow nobody will know who he was, and yet he did take the floor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Shefford:

That members of this House be required to comply with Standing Order 28, even when opposing or seconding a motion moved under Standing Order 43.

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) certainly brought up very interesting and important points with regard to the interpretation of our Standing Orders and procedures. It is not a question of privilege but a mere matter of procedure. It might be well to explain, first of all, that it is not a matter of getting the floor, pursuant to Standing Order 28, but merely of presenting a motion, without expressing agreement with it. That is an entirely different matter, because there is no question of discussion it. A motion was put merely before the House, under Standing Order 43, which requires unanimous consent of the House. If there is not unanimous consent, a single dissident vote suffices to to prove it. Interpretation of Standing Order 28 therefore constitutes not a question of privilege but a matter of procedure. That problem could perhaps be looked into by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the course of the question period I asked a question of the government House leader with respect to the problem which seems to have arisen out of the fact that if the Salaries Act is to be observed, there is in fact one parliamentary secretary who has been paid—at least, it would appear that way—and therefore sits as a member of this House improperly drawing upon the revenues and resources of the Crown as a result of the resignation of the hon. member for Papineau. I am not sure of the date with respect to that.

Mr. Nielsen: Tuesday, March 16, 1976.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I understand now that it was Tuesday, March 16. The President of the Privy Council, in his answer to the question, indicated that there is likely to be the appointment of a minister later in the day. I ask your Honour, at your leisure, to look at section 25(2) of the Parliamentary Secretaries Act under the Government Organization Act, 1970, dealing with parliamentary secretaries. It provides:

There shall not be at any one time more parliamentary secretaries than the number of ministers who hold offices for which salaries are provided in section 4 of the Salaries Act.

If my figures are correct—and it is subject to correction—there are 27 parliamentary secretaries and 26 ministers to whom this would apply.

Mr. Blais: One minister has two portfolios.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The question then arises: What happens beyond this day if there is a minister who holds two portfolios, as indeed I suspect one additional minister of the Crown might, at perhaps around four o'clock or thereabouts, or whenever these ceremonies take place and wherever they take place?

An hon. Member: Don't you know?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): My time will come, I hope. In any event, there may well be one minister holding two portfolios. I ask the Chair to look into that as a possible solution to the problem. However, I respectfully point out that the way section 25 reads, it would appear that the number of portfolios a particular minister holds does not matter, but what is important is the number of ministers. I have not addressed myself very much to that secondary point, but I think there is a real point to be investigated. I am sure the government House leader would want it investigated because if a minister is sworn in today either as an acting minister or a minister holding two portfolios, in my respectful submission since March 16 there would have been paid out of the revenues of Canada a parliamentary secretary's indemnity to one too many parliamentary secretaries.

I am not sure who it would be or how it would be figured out, but I think the point is there and I am sure the government House leader joins me in wanting to have this matter cleared up.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, first I should like to express my gratitude to the hon. member for drawing this matter to our attention so early. In the event he might be right—and

I am not granting him any rectitude in this regard—he probably will have saved some hon. member on this side some difficulty. I simply point out that with reference to the parliamentary secretary who has carried the responsibilities of consumer and corporate affairs, Your Honour and hon. members opposite will recognize that his responsibilities have increased substantially, and there ought to be no attempt on the part of the opposition to try to subtract any salary from that person.

I point out, as well, that perhaps the hon. member opposite has not recognized that the Prime Minister is also part of the cabinet and is a minister. In addition, quite apart from any announcement that might be made today, tomorrow or in the future, we have at the present time one minister with two portfolios, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of State for Science and Technology, and he has two parliamentary secretaries working on his behalf.

● (1520)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton that this matter ought to be looked into and that there should be a report back to the House about it. However, with respect, I disagree with my hon. friend's suggestion that Your Honour should be called upon to rule on this. This is a point of law and it is the same sort of thing we had a few days ago. If the point is reached when Your Honour has to decide what pay to give members of the House, you will be busier than ever. It seems to me that it is for the government to look into the matter, or for the Auditor General, or for the courts, but not for Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: I would, perhaps with unseemly haste, agree at least in a preliminary way with the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I was, throughout these remarks, asking myself what responsibility I have. There is perhaps an administrative matter involved on the part of the House for which I do have some responsibility, but, again, I suspect that the responsibility lies elsewhere. However, the matter has been referred to and it will certainly be examined to see whether there are any responsibilities so far as the Chair, on a point of order, is concerned. Perhaps I shall have something more to say about it at a later time.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, the hon. member for Bellechasse raised a question of privilege which you considered as being a procedural matter and I would perhaps be ready to agree. But just the same it is disappointing on this side of the House and I would humbly ask you to consider the matter so that we on this side of the House may refrain from moving motions under Standing Order 43. On the other hand, it cannot be expected that members of this side will object. I remember quite well that on many occasions I saw persons in the galleries saying yes or no and I do not see how those words can be ascribed to members when they come from the galleries but are considered as part of our proceedings. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to study this question so that the individual or the member of the House who wishes to oppose a motion moved under Standing Order 43 may identify himself and we may know for sure what he has said, a "no" generally, when he opposed a motion under Standing Order 43, that he has really said those words while participating in the debates of the House and that they have not been said by someone in the galleries.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important matter because words from people we cannot identify because they are not members of this House on extremely important questions often raised by motions moved under Standing Order 43 could make this House look rather ridiculous.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the question put by the House leader of the official opposition to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) who is at the same time the government House leader.

Considering that Bill C-84, which has not yet been presented to the House and is still at the first reading stage, seems to be the cause of considerable delays in the House because of very lengthy discussions, could the President of the Privy Council tell the House if there will be special meetings of the House leaders concerning Bill C-84 so that we can reach agreement without having to refer to Standing Order 75A, 75B or 75C? If that is not possible, when will these meetings be held? Could we delay the study of Bill C-84 until next fall so we may celebrate the Saint-Jean-Baptiste, the holiday of French Canadians, as well as Confederation Day so that this House might be adjourned during those two weeks?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, this is one of the bills that I should like to discuss with the House leaders. I am trying to arrange a meeting for tomorrow and I hope my hon. friend will be present at that time. There is fairly long agenda before us to the end of June, and I share his wish that we should dispose of this business before then. He said that he hoped we would not use Standing Order 75A, B or C on Bill C-84. I certainly had not contemplated anything of that kind. I had hoped, however, that there would be a disposition on the part of the House leaders and the House generally to find some way in which we can debate Bill C-84, have an expression of all points of view and come to a decision within a reasonable time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on this question, perhaps one point we might agree on is to reduce the length of speeches.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

First report of Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services—Mr. MacLean.

Eighth report of Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments—Mr. McCleave.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF REPORT OF LAW REFORM COMMISSION ON EXPROPRIATION

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), I wish to table, in both official languages, the Law Reform Commission report on expropriation.

* * *

CONSUMER PRODUCT WARRANTIES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR STANDARDIZATION OF WARRANTIES

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-433, to amend the Combines Investigation Act, to provide for the standardization of warranties, and to define the minimum provisions thereof.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Combines Investigation Act to provide for the standardization of warranties and to define the minimum provisions thereof. All too often, the consumer purchases an automobile, refrigerator or any one of hundreds of products covered by warranty, only to have the product break down. When the consumer reads the warranty's fine print, he discovers that the document is so filled with exceptions and qualifications that the warranty is almost useless. This bill will correct these anomalies.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

● (1530)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: 4,575, 4,985 and 5,130.

[*Text*]

FISHING DRAGGERS

Question No. 4,575—**Mr. MacKay:**

What branch of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is responsible for reviewing and granting subsidies to companies which own fishing draggers?

Measures Against Crime

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): in so far as Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: The Transportation Industries Branch gives subsidies to shipbuilders, including some who build draggers, but does not grant subsidies to companies which own fishing draggers.

LEGISLATION AMENDING THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

Question No. 4,985—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Has legislation amending the National Transportation Act been drafted and, if so, when will it be presented to the House?

2. Is it intended that the Minister's Strategic Planning Officers' recommendations and findings, if any, will be (a) converted into amendments in the framework of the legislation (b) included in the proposed legislation?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Legislation amending the National Transportation Act is currently being drafted and it will be introduced in the House during the next session.

2. (a) Yes; (b) yes.

COST OF SX CATEGORY

Question No. 5,130—**Mr. Orlikow:**

What is the cost to the government in (a) salary (b) office rental (c) supplies (d) telephones (e) support services for each employee in the SX category?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): The information requested is not readily available. To provide an accurate reply in its entirety, would entail a lengthy and costly examination of the accounts of every department, which would be exorbitant or prohibitive.

[*English*]

Mr. Blais: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Wednesday, April 7, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, how many times have we heard the saying, "Don't choose a book by its cover". The truth of the matter is that frequently when the content is weak, the publisher tries to enhance the appeal by putting on an attractive cover. Such is the case with this peace and security legislation which

we are debating today, and its companion piece dealing with capital punishment. Never, since I have been a member, have I seen legislation introduced in such a beautiful jacket—beautifully stylized and in three colours. When we open up this beautiful jacket, we find that all the material is nicely tucked into two separate pockets in the folder. Inside these two nicely designed pockets we find two bills and three sets of explanatory notes, one entitled "Press Release", one entitled "Highlights of the Peace and Security Legislation" and the last entitled, "Explanatory Notes". If we read all these supporting documents to the legislation, we find in fact that they merely paraphrase each other and sometimes the paragraphs are actually identical. I can only come to the conclusion that the government is trying to impress and "snow" the media, legislators and the public.

Throughout the government's con game they keep saying that they are going to stiffen or lengthen the penalties for certain violent crimes in order to give peace and security to Canadians. This Mr. Speaker, is all so much window-dressing because, in fact, the government has in its so-called peace and security legislation weakened, rather than strengthened, the areas dealing with dangerous offenders or habitual criminals in that they have watered out the habitual criminal and dangerous sexual offender sections in favour or their new section on dangerous offenders. They have, in fact, lessened the severity of the law for many in exchange for a very moderate strengthening of the law for a few, those few who could still have come under the severe restrictions of the law which the government is repealing.

At the same time, the government talks about life sentences as an indication of its determination to be severe with murderers, and that it is interested in protecting the peace and security of Canada. The government does not say that in its new, so-called strengthened legislation a murderer, under certain circumstances, could still get out, completely paroled, in seven years from the date of conviction.

In having to package these two bills in such a beautiful jacket with the three pieces of explanatory notes, the government is trying to dupe Canadians. All parliament needed was the bills. We did not need the expensive jacket and we did not need the three sets of explanatory notes. Surely, this is not government restraint, because the jacket alone would probably cost $1 for each one, and I do not know how many thousands the government has given out. I guess when the government is concerned that the content is so weak, they really believe that if you put on an attractive, appealing cover you can sell the story inside. The government appears to have gone out to sell this legislation, because not only have they used the above physical means, but they have also introduced the time-worn idea of a catch-phrase, just like in an election where you use nice pamphlets and a neat slogan. The catch-phrase here is "peace and security". Now, who in their right mind could ever disagree with that?

"Peace" is a word with a meaning so elusive that man has been chasing it like the Holy Grail, but has never found it. Everybody in Canada wants peace. I dare say everybody in the world wants peace. So, naturally, we agree with that part of the slogan. Peace! A nice idea; I would like to have it. The second word is "security". Again, everybody in Canada would like to have security. I believe everybody in the world would like to have security. Therefore, we agree that security is nice. Put the two together, "peace and security", and we have the best of all possible worlds. We all want peace. We all want security. Let's buy the package.

Then on the cover the government puts "Protection Against Violent Crime". Now, nobody in their right mind is in favour of crime. Even more so, everyone abhors violent crime. This legislation is now, according to the printing on the front cover, going to give us protection against violent crime. It certainly is slick. We cannot disagree with the words used. But do these words really tell us what the legislation is all about? No. The government calls for protection against violent crime, but how do we protect against violent crime with this legislation? To protect us against violent crime we must wipe out the root causes—slums and lack of education—and we should encourage rehabilitation, reorientation. This will help protect us: the giving out of longer sentences, which only comes after the fact of a violent crime, not taking guns after the fact of a violent crime. Perhaps that phrase "protection against violent crime" is a little misleading.

Similarly, the government flogs the idea that, as a major portion of this legislation, they are advocating gun control. With the increase in violent crime, the increase in murder, the increase in the use of weapons in crime, especially guns, most people are presently in favour of gun control. I am in favour of gun control. I believe that everybody in this House is probably in favour of gun control. However, when we start to define what gun control is, we find that not everybody is in agreement.

Today we are dealing with the first bill in this sweet little package, Bill C-83. This deals with: gun control, prison breaks, wiretapping, dangerous offenders, crime inquiries, and parole and sentencing. I object to government's introducing omnibus bills in a package such as this. As a legislator, I may be anxious to support one or more portions of the six in this package and, at the same time, wish to vote against one or more portions. By introducing all of these in one package, it is impossible for the individual member of parliament to cast a vote on each of the serious proposals in this legislation. By putting them in a package or omnibus bill, the government wants an "all or nothing" situation.

In my view, the good which I might like to support might be lost with the bad. It's like the old phrase of throwing out the baby with the bath water. Or, if the bill passes, we are going to incorporate what I believe may be bad law into the statute books along with what might be good law. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) which would be to try to sever the lengthy gun control section of some 38 pages of the 73-page bill away from the rest of the bill. I am sure most of the serious legislators in this chamber would prefer to have had shorter bills—one bill for each of the topics encompassed by this omnibus bill. If that had been done, I am sure the non-controversial sections would have been passed and would now be law; while we could give a more in-depth consideration

to those areas where people are concerned that the law is not as well drafted as one might hope.

● (1540)

I would now like to deal with some of the substantive aspects of Bill C-83. The first major proposal is that of gun control. I believe the vast majority of Canadians are in favour of gun control, but when one reads this legislation one is entitled to have serious reservations. I believe in gun control which is clear, defined and definable, I am not happy with the legislative proposals I find in this bill.

I believe the criminal law should be spelled out clearly in the Criminal Code, I believe that any person who wants to know what the criminal law of this country is should be able to go and look in the Criminal Code and read it. I do not believe, as this legislation proposes, that the criminal law should be changed by delegating powers to the governor in council, the commissioner of the RCMP, the attorney-general of the ten provinces, or the minister of justice.

If we follow the route of delegation of powers through the passing of regulations as proposed by the legislation before us, it will be impossible for persons to know what the Criminal Code really is, because they will have to buy not only the Criminal Code but also a book of regulations, which might be another 50 or 60 pages in length and which will always be in a state of change and flux as the governor in council, the commissioner of the RCMP, the attorneys-general of the various provinces, or the minister of justice may amend, alter, repeal or add new regulations, all at various times.

The greatest concern I have with the proposal of gun control as put forth in this legislation is that it is not set out clearly in black and white in the Criminal Code. I believe that criminal law, being a penal law, must be interpreted strictly, as the courts have done in the past, and that for it to be strictly interpreted it is only fair that the citizens of the country should have an easy opportunity of finding out what that law is. I believe we can only do that by having it set out in one place, that is, in the Criminal Code of Canada. If the government insists on going by the regulatory route and the delegating of powers, I believe the criminal law will become unreadable, that people will tend to ignore it and that it will become a nightmare to enforce.

Bad law, unmanageable law, is probably worse than having no law at all, because if people ignore the law it brings the entire system of law enforcement and administration of justice into disrepute. I believe the gun control section of this proposed legislation is bad law because of the granting of regulatory powers and the delegating of powers. I plead with the government to encompass all the proposed gun control legislation in the Criminal Code. If a form is to be used, I would suggest that the section dealing with the form should indicate that a certificate must be filled out as per form A in appendix 1 and we should put a sample form A in appendix 1 at the back of the code.

I would hope that if, because of some oversight or some housekeeping measure that needs to be taken from time to time, need arises to correct or to make for better implementation of the law, a short bill could be introduced asking to alter the form in appendix 1 or to alter the various sections. I would hope that in the sections dealing with the type of person who could grant a certificate or be the registrar of firearms, or could be the guarantor of an applicant, appropriate lists could be set out in the Criminal Code. If this is not found to be sufficient after some experimentation, then one or more of those on the lists could be deleted, or one or more added by a fast amendment to the Criminal Code passed in the normal way through the House of Commons and the Senate. I believe the criminal law is too important to be delegated to others and that amendments and changes should be made only by parliament itself.

In the present proposed legislation on gun control, there are some 27 clauses or subclauses which give regulatory power to the governor in council, the commissioner of the RCMP, the attorneys-general, or the minister of justice, and in one case the proposed legislation provides for the balkanization of our Criminal Code by allowing the attorneys-general of the various provinces to pass amendments. We could have ten different regulations passed by the ten different provinces, all providing penalties under the Criminal Code, so that a person would not know what the Criminal Code actually is as he moves from one province to another. In a more substantive manner, I am concerned that certain regulations which this legislation proposes could, in effect, be made by the governor in council without obtaining the authorization of parliament and could change the very intent of the law.

In this bill, parliament is asked to classify certain weapons as prohibited weapons, and certain other weapons, such as hand-guns, as restricted weapons. Then, parliament is asked to allow the governor in council to change hand-guns from restricted weapons to prohibited weapons by order in council. I do not believe parliament is really intending to prohibit hand-guns at this time. If parliament wants to wipe out hand-guns—and there are advocates of that course—then let us do so now, in parliament, by voting that way. If, on the other hand, as I believe, parliament is not prohibiting hand-guns now then the governor in council should not be allowed to prohibit them later. If it is deemed that hand-guns should be prohibited, the legislation should be brought forth in parliament so that parliament itself can decide that point.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent some time explaining my abhorrence of the fact that the government wants to introduce massive amounts of delegation of powers to regulatory bodies into the criminal code. It strikes me that the government will make this part of the proposed legislation unwieldy, difficult to understand and will be inviting the public at large to ignore the law. The public at large to which I am referring, is the law-abiding public who would be using firearms for legal purposes. By passing legislation such as proposed, we would be placing a roadblock in the path of their carrying on legitimate, legal activities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on some of the penal aspects of the proposed gun control legislation as they would affect persons who are obviously not carrying firearms for legal and legitimate purposes. Since the revision of the Criminal Code in 1955 which reduced it from well over 1,000 sections to some 600 sections, we have heard that there should be no minimum sentences in penal law but that it should be left to the discretion of the judge to pass sentence based on the circumstances of the case. In

section 98(1) we find the government introduces a minimum one-year sentence if a person is convicted of using an offensive weapon to assist in the commission of a criminal act or to escape from a criminal act. This legislation breaks that principle. I believe it is proper for the government to propose minimum sentences in the area of gun control when a person is using firearms for blatantly illegal purposes. Frankly, I believe the one-year minimum sentence under section 98(1) should be longer. But to put real teeth into the matter, I feel that a person should be brought to trial on this section at or before he or she is brought to trial on the substantive offence he or she committed.

● (1550)

I say that the prosecution, under section 98(1) should be brought at the same time, or before, so that we can avoid plea-bargaining in what is obviously a serious situation by present standards. If the prosecution were forced to proceed with section 98(1) before, or at the same time as the substantive offence, It would avoid the accused pleading guilty to the substantive offence and getting an agreement from the Crown to drop or withdraw the charge of using an offensive weapon while committing that offence. This procedure, Mr. Speaker, could easily be introduced into the Criminal Code, and I would recommend that the government consider it.

As a former Crown attorney, and knowing what plea-bargaining is all about, I can assure you that in the crowded courts of today the accused and his lawyer will refuse any consideration of pleading guilty and will threaten to go into a lengthy trial in order to force the Crown to drop one or more charges. Knowing the log-jams before the courts today, I think everyone will agree that it is an enticing proposition for Crown counsel to accept a plea to the substantive charge in order to drop what has heretofore been thought of as the lesser charge; for example, the possession of a firearm while commiting the substantive offence.

I would now like to deal with sentences for other offences in the gun control sections. In order to try to impress everybody on how serious the government is about dealing with gun control sentences, the government has proposed that the maximum sentence be moved up to 5 years in jail, when previously it was 2 years, and has proposed to increase to 10 years in jail the maximum sentence for all those offences where previously it was 5 years. On the other hand, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the old maximums of 2 years and 5 years were rarely ordered by any judge, and that increasing the maximum and failing to put on a minimum is really just a bit of window-dressing, because the new maximums of 5 years and 10 years will never be ordered by a judge. In each of the sections where the government proposes increasing the maximum sentence for these weapons-related offences, I would suggest that a maximum of six months should be included, if in fact the government is really interested in putting teeth into the law respecting gun control.

Further, Mr. Speaker, one aspect of gun control, or lack or gun control, which for many years has horrified society in the North American environment is the prospect of guns being purchased by mail order. Certain sections of the present legislation allow firearms to be ordered by the mail order method, including the ordering by mail or restricted guns or hand-guns. I suggest that the government would enhance the feeling of security of most Canadians, and would not unduly be infringing upon the rights of those who wish to use firearms for legitimate purposes, if the mail ordering of guns was eliminated. Believe the majority of our people would be quite willing to wipe out the so-called mail order sales of these potentially dangerous weapons. If a person is so keen on a certain type of gun, then I suggest that person can travel if necessary to a centre where he can purchase that gun, or he can arrange for his nearest gun shop or hardware store to order it, so that he can purchase it over the counter, going through all the necessary precautions as is the usual case in firearm purchases.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if the government is really serious in controlling the misuse of firearms, etc., it will change the discretionary order a judge can make prohibiting the carrying or possession of firearms or ammunition under section 102(1) to a compulsory order of prohibition, to force people to abide by the law for fear of losing their rights. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the same section, 102(1), of this bill, should include allowing a judge to pass an order of prohibition respecting any person convicted of a violent crime even though the crime may not be related to firearms or ammunition. A person so misguided and capable of using violence without the assistance of a firearm is surely just as capable of using a firearm in the carrying out of his or her intention, with the prospects of even more violent consequences to follow.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more comments dealing with the section on guarantors. I do not like it. It indicates that a person who wants to have a licence to possess guns would have to have two guarantors who had known the applicant for at least two years, and these guarantors would be on a list of persons to be set forth in the future by regulation. I suggest that those persons should be listed in this section now, and if amendments need to be made later, that can be arranged. I also believe that provisions should be made for statutory declarations, much like we have for a person in order to get a passport, in the case where a person has just moved into an area and would not have known two people for the required two-year period who could act as guarantors.

Mr. Allmand: That is provided for.

Mr. Dick: I have not seen it, and I have read through this section three times. Perhaps this is to come in the form of regulation.

Mr. Allmand: It is in the law.

Mr. Dick: In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should say that the present section 101(B), covering the use of another person's firearm under the direct supervision of the owner, should be incorporated into the present legislation. Thus, persons who may be carrying out target practise with pistols could exchange hand-guns for target practise shots. Perhaps it could also be developed so that a father could supervise his son in the training and use of firearms. In essence, Mr. Speaker, the legislation dealing with gun control, as proposed, puts an onerous burden of control, restriction and regulation on the legitimate and lawful user of firearms by means of regulation, licences, permits,

certificates, etc., but does not in any way come to grips by means of deterrence or punishment with those who would unlawfully use firearms in contravention of the rules set forth in the legislation.

● (1600)

I do not like the delegation of power to the governor in council, the commissioner of the RCMP, the attorneys-general of the provinces, the minister of justice, or local registrars to set out the regulations and conditions for the giving of various permits, licences, certificates, registration forms, and so on. Similarly, I do not like the fact that the forms are not set out precisely in this legislation, rather, there is a declaration that they will be announced. I strongly believe that the forms should be in an appendix attached to the Criminal Code so that people will have certainty in the knowledge of what these forms will require. Last, I do not like the fact that conditions will be announced which can be changed in the future without the knowledge of the person who is a legitimate user of guns. I suggest that the necessary conditions should be set out in this legislation and that perhaps only in exceptional, proven cases could a further condition be imposed by a local registrar.

Mr. Speaker, there are more aspects to this bill than just gun control. I would like now to deal with some of those other topics. Section 5 of this bill deals with prisoners trying to escape, or persons who would assist a prisoner to escape. It increases the maximum sentence from five years to ten years. Again, Mr. Speaker, if the government were really interested in security and in giving people a sense of security, I suggest that it would be a step in the right direction if there were a minimum sentence of, say, two years in order to try to deter prisoners from breaking jail or to deter persons from assisting a prisoner to break jail.

The increase from five years to ten years, as the maximum sentence under this section is, is in itself a bit of a laugh. I do not believe that in recent years any person has been given the maximum sentence of the present five-year term. If this is so—and I would look forward to the Solicitor General's comments on this—it seems obvious that it is unlikely that increasing the maximum to ten years will result in any great number of long-term sentences being handed out, as the perpetrators of these proposals intimate. I will be asking the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) in committee the number of charges laid under this section in each of the past five years, along with the sentences given to each person duly convicted.

Included in this omnibus bill are sections dealing with what is commonly called wiretapping. In this bill the government attempts to go back to the original bill which it presented in 1973, and to repeal or wipe out the amendments proposed and made law that year. Some people will say that these amendments will give the police too wide powers and that by suggesting these amendments the government is undermining the civil liberties of the individual. The amending of section 178.16 to allow as evidence at a trial the direct or indirect evidence gained by a wiretap, even though the wiretap is illegal, will assist in strengthening the efforts of the law enforcement agencies and will thus enhance the security of law-abiding persons.

However, I believe that this alone might open the door for law enforcement agencies to go ahead and use illegal wiretaps on a rather frequent basis, rather than go through the administrative procedure of getting proper authorization. For this reason, I believe the widening of this power to introduce evidence from illegal or improper wiretaps should be counterbalanced with a clause to the effect that in any case where the wiretap is proven or shown to have been made without due authorization, the presiding judge should be required to order the person responsible for the illegal or improper wiretap to be charged under the appropriate section of the Criminal Code.

The fact is that by bringing in this rule of evidence and making it statutory, the government is making the rule of evidence as it applies to wiretapping conform to the rule of evidence dealing with statements improperly or illegally obtained. The essence of the matter is that the improper or illegal statement or wiretap is only available if it is shown that the evidence it divulges is true. I, quite frankly, am happy that our rules of evidence in this country in these matters are substantially different from those applicable in the United States, where I believe the legislatures and the courts have gone overboard in giving the criminal rights, to the detriment of the law-abiding citizen.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed in principle to the extension of the wiretapping powers to give the appropriate law-enforcing agencies their chance at intercepting, proving and hence stopping crime. But I do believe that in giving these broader powers we should also set up some countervailing powers such as I have indicated. Similarly, in order to keep strong these counterbalancing powers, I would be, in principle, against the repeal of section 178.23 which sets out that notice is to be given to each person subjected to a wiretap.

However, I would, in order to assist the police in ongoing investigations of a lengthy nature, support an amendment to existing section 178.23(1B) which would indicate that a judge has a further discretionary power to adjourn the giving of notice, *sine die* if necessary, in exceptional cases based on strong evidence that the giving of notice as contemplated by the section would not be in the interests of justice, or probably would only serve as notification to criminals that their on going criminal activity was being monitored. The only further proviso I would add to adjourning *sine die* the giving of notice would be that all notices must be given when a person becomes charged with any of the offences under surveillance during the period of the wiretap. So, Mr. Speaker, I would not mind supporting the wiretapping amendments contemplated giving enlarged powers to law enforcement officers if this were balanced by reasonable caution in order to protect the civil liberties of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address myself to the new section of the Criminal Code proposed by this bill which is to deal with so-callled dangerous offenders. The dangerous offenders part of the Criminal Code will wipe out the existing preventive detention, habitual criminal and dangerous sexual offender sections, and in my view will water down and severely weaken the present law. The government has advertised that it intends to strengthen

the legislation to provide for peace and security and to provide for protection against violent crime. This may be so, although I doubt it. But at the same time, sections of the Criminal Code will be wiped out which would better protect society if enforced than the sections which are to be introduced.

To begin with, the definition indicates that the new offences which can be prosecuted under the dangerous offenders part being introduced will be offences for which a person must be liable to imprisonment for five years or more. Thus, we see that the new standard is an offence of ten years' imprisonment, whereas the present standard is one of five years' imprisonment. Thus, on the face of it, it does not appear that the government is making prison sentences more severe for these so-called dangerous criminals, although it has announed that it is doing this as part of a great package on peace and security.

At the same time, the new proposals allow for the imprisonment of persons convicted of certain sex-related crimes, but are significantly weaker in this regard than the present law, in that one of the sex crimes covered by the present law which is applicable to dangerous sex offenders is dropped and applications for preventive detention for an indefinite period for attempts to commit certain sex offences are dropped. The present law covers the sex offences enumerated and any attempts to commit those offences. The new law proposed covers only sexual offences if they are committed, but does not cover the possibility of making application respecting persons who attempt to commit those effences but fail. Obviously, the present law is much stronger than the proposed law in this regard. Under the new proposed dangerous offenders section, it appears that the criminal is only a dangerous offender if he is successful in raping his victim, whereas if he is caught in the act and does not have time to complete it, or is unsuccessful in completing the rape and therefore has only attempted it, he becomes a non-dangerous offender. This is a ridiculous situation.

● (1610)

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

Mr. Dick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I do not wish to continue.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate on Bill C-83, the crime prevention bill presented by my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). As Solicitor General, my prime goal and that of all the agencies working within the Ministry of the Solicitor General is to protect the public against crime, and especially violent crime. For this reason I support these measures, which were worked out in close co-operation between the Department of Justice and the Ministry of the Solicitor General, because all the measures included in the bill have been designed to further the goal of better protection for the public.

Furthermore, many of the specific items proposed in this bill will be implemented or administered by the Ministry of the Solicitor General. I refer especially to the amendments to the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to the regulative and administrative changes which will flow from those amendments, but also, of course, to the administrative duties which will devolve upon the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in carrying out the new firearms proposals and the new provisions regarding electronic surveillance.

Before dealing with three areas of special administrative concern to my department, I would like very briefly to sketch in some of the background against which the peace and security package was designed. As the Minister of Justice said in his speech moving second reading of Bill C-83, the concern of the federal government is to prevent and control crime, and especially violent and organized crime, here in Canada. The fundamental principle which must be kept in mind in assessing these measures is that the whole apparatus of criminal justice exists, first and foremost, to protect society against the effects of crime.

As I said before, while crime in Canada is not out of control, it is apparent that it is much easier to maintain control than it is to regain such control once lost. For this reason, the government is now offering to parliament the peace and security program, a series of measures to amend the criminal law and to improve the administration of criminal justice. These measures were proposed after lengthy consultations among federal officials and also with provincial governments whose responsibility for the administration of justice necessitates working in close co-operation with them.

I would now like to turn to the measures concerning firearms, corrections and electronic surveillance which bear specifically on my responsibilities as Solicitor General, and in the course of those remarks I would like to answer some of the concerns raised by hon. members in the initial stages of this debate. Some of the debate on the gun control measures appears to have missed the over-all intent of this new policy by misinterpreting some of the details.

Firearms have been, and continue to be, the instruments involved in frightening and tragic incidents in this country, such as occurred recently in Dresden and Calgary, not to mention the events in Vancouver, Brampton and Ottawa which are still so much in our minds. Many Canadians have expressed fear and concern that they might become victims of the senseless misuse of a firearm. People should not have to live with such concerns if we can do something about it, and I am convinced that we can. To reduce this concern we must reduce firearms incidents. To reduce firearms incidents we must reduce firearms availability—especially to those who can be identified as unfit, irresponsible, or dangerous.

Those who suggest that the answer to the firearms misuse problem in Canada lies in stiffer penalties against criminals alone have too restricted a view of the problem. Such penalties can help somewhat, of course, and to that extent new offences and higher maximum penalties have been provided for in the measures here proposed as outlined by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, at the opening of the debate. Yet it cannot be stated too often that few firearms murders are acts perpetrated by what we might call hardened or professional "criminals". Firearms murder is most often a domestic or acquaintance event

carried out in passionate circumstances by a person without heed for consequences with an all-too-available firearm.

Mr. Dick: That is manslaughter.

Mr. Allmand: It is murder. Two-thirds of our murders are committed in that way.

We must also keep very much in mind the fact that firearms were the instruments in around one-third of our more than 3,000 suicides in 1974, and caused death in more than 100 accidents in that year. The same circumstances apply all too often in cases of firearms robbery. In many cases, if a gun was not easily available, the act of robbery would not have occurred. The stolen, or borrowed, or easily purchased gun supplies the false courage and the clouding of reason that leads to a senseless act.

Some have suggested that we prohibit all firearms. We reject such a suggestion. Such a suggestion denies the legitimacy of firearms ownership and use for target shooting, hunting for sport or for food, or antique collecting, and these are uses which the government recognizes as perfectly legitimate. Furthermore, it is the government's belief that these uses of firearms need not be prohibited in order to reduce firearms incidents and public concern. Most current users should accept the appropriateness of the measures proposed, since by curbing firearms misuse they enhance legitimate use. It is difficult to understand why a current, responsible firearms owner would object to demonstrating his fitness for ownership or to ensuring that his guns and ammunition were securely stored and responsibly used. By this process he can also feel more secure that fewer guns are in hands of the irresponsible or criminally careless. Many sportsmen have indicated that they can live with, and benefit from, measures designed to screen out possession and use of firearms by those not fit to use them.

No one would be so naive as to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any package of gun control measures will completely eliminate gun misuse. The roots of violent behaviour go deep and the gun as a tool of criminal activity will not disappear—not with ten million guns in Canada, or one for every two Canadians. In such cases, society's denunciation of such an act will be expressed in mandatory and stiffer sentences, if the proposed amendments in this bill are approved. Yet this is certainly not the whole solution. Where we must concentrate our attention is on the prevention of tragic incidents. Firearms ownership and use represents a collection of circumstances, and we must use a package of measures to have an impact at every stage. For each step, we must ask: What are the possible benefits of measures here, and what are the offsetting costs?" When the benefits exceed the costs, a proposed option should be adopted.

● (1620)

I referred earlier to the many circumstances surrounding firearms possession and I am anxious that the measures we have proposed be seen as, and be considered as, a package designed to have an impact on all of those circumstances. We are trying, first and foremost, to reduce availability through tough import controls, new prohibitions, a voluntary recall program, and a needs test for the possession of restricted weapons, second, for those who continue to possess firearms, we wish to ensure they have nothing in their backgrounds that might render them unfit to do so. Further, we intend to offer an education program in responsible and secure gun storage and use, and we propose to augment that by applying criminal sanctions against careless misuse. Third, in dangerous situations that might still arise, we have proposed broader powers to the police and finally we suggest making greater powers available to the courts to deal with offenders. Each of these items in isolation can reduce the problem of firearms violence in Canada, but their real strength lies in their interlocking nature.

With respect to the most complex part of the package—the licensing system—let me try to differentiate it from a registration system and say why we rejected extending registration to long guns. Registration pertains to things—guns in this case—not people. It records the description, serial number and ownership of each item or weapon. For extremely lethal and easily hidden weapons such as handguns—which in Canada are restricted and of which there are relatively few—it is a workable and relatively effective system that screens owners and weapons alike and inhibits casual purchase. However, for the ten million long guns in Canada I believe that a registration scheme would be unworkable and impractical in comparison with its potential benefits. Instead, I believe that we can accomplish most of the same ends by a different means—licensing users. With licensing we focus on the person rather than the object, and we endeavor to ensure that he is not unfit to possess a lethal instrument such as a gun.

The government is pleased to see that some provinces wish to go even further in using the provisions of section 106(8) of the act, which encourage provinces to ensure that the licensed possessor is "safety trained" by means of programs they are now operating or could establish. Once licensed, a person could possess as many guns as he needed or wanted to have. Thus, with this bill's approach we are faced with the task of screening some two million to three million owners rather than having to register some ten million weapons.

Obviously, a licensing system as proposed here is a complex undertaking. Yet it has been designed so as to provide maximum flexibility in introduction and administration at the lowest possible cost. Aside from record-keeping, the system will be highly decentralized, with a number of licensing officers throughout Canada. These officers would process applications and approve licence issuance if justified. They would be supported and aided by local registrars, and each province would have a chief local registrar at the provincial level. Local registrars would normally be police officers as well, but licensing officers who will perform most of the administrative tasks would not necessarily be. Retired police officers or armed forces personnel may be excellent for this function.

Thus, individuals applying for a licence would deal with someone from their district or region of the province who may well know the applicant and be able to easily confirm his fitness to hold a gun licence. The police would carry out necessary record checks, while officials would handle administration. The requirement on the applicant to obtain a declaration signed by two guarantors who must affirm

the fitness of the applicant as a responsible person is an important part of this system. The idea is analogous to that of the passport system, but the list of potential guarantors could be widened to take account of the special needs and concerns involved; that is, it could include wildlife officers, officials from shooting or hunting clubs, Indian band organizations, and so on. The government wishes to involve sportsmen and take account of localized needs as much as possible in the administration of this program.

In the event of a licence refusal or revocation or for refusal or revocation of a restricted weapon, an appeal would be available in a court of law, and reasons for the refusal or revocation would be provided in writing to the appellant. Such appeals currently exist for firearms' registration certificates, but are rarely used, suggesting that original decisions are seen to be fair and appropriate. We would expect this pattern to continue here.

The exact costs of licensing and dealer regulation are still being worked out in conjunction with the provinces. The point I wish to emphasize here is that the cost to society of firearms possession and its attendant control will be borne principally by the gun owner. We think nothing of paying a fee for the privilege of driving a car—or owning it for that matter—or for numerous other privileges that may impose a cost on society. We aim at ensuring that drivers are fit to handle such potentially dangerous machines as autos by prohibiting driving without a license, which a potential driver must pay to obtain. So it should be with an instrument of potential danger such as a gun. Screening potential misusers is not without cost, but we believe that serious and responsible gun owners should be willing to pay for such a process.

Hon. members surely cannot support the current system, under which a person who has just been released from a prison or a mental hospital can walk into a sporting goods store, or a hardware of department store, and buy a high-powered rifle or shotgun, with no questions asked. Nor do I think hon. members believe it is reasonable that the same system—or lack of it—applies to young persons buying their first gun or individuals who, in the emotional wake of a personal crisis, rush to a store to purchase a firearm with which they believe they can resolve their problems.

One subsidiary, but not inconsequential, benefit of a licensing system is that it, hopefully, will cause many people to rethink the entire subject of firearms possession. Many guns are kept today because they were acquired some time ago, used briefly for shooting or hunting and then simply put away in a closet, such as occurred in the recent Dresden incident. As such, they represent danger through theft or use in a violent incident. This casual owner may decide he would rather turn in such a weapon rather than go through the process of obtaining a licence and the mecessary devices to keep his gun secure in his home. The active gun user will not be inhibited, since the process is straightforward, and security may well already be a fait accompli.

I feel I should remind the House that the total firearms package is not represented by the bill before it alone. Let me stress again the importance to the package of such measures as the voluntary recall of weapons, the education program, tighter import checks, and an on-going consultation with the provinces. Many of them have already promised additional measures that will augment and strengthen the controls proposed here. In fact, many have such measures in place already. I was recently reminded that Newfoundland has some of the strictest firearms controls in Canada and one of the lowest incidences fo firearms violence as well.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on criticisms made against these proposals by former RCMP commissioner L. H. Nicholson, now with the Canadian Wildlife Federation, as reported in the press. On the subject of the alleged ignoring of the views of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, I can say that the government gave careful consideration to the brief and, in fact, adopted many of its recommendations. The rejection of a registration system, provision of an amnesty program, prohibition of sawed-off rifles and shotguns, and improvement of seizure provisions under sections 103 and 105 of the Criminal Code were all recommended by the Federation. The suggestion to strengthen provincial safety training standards was also accepted and, in fact, formed the basis for the proposed licensing system.

● (1630)

It was felt, however, that it was not enough to require only competency in gun handling or storage. The government concluded, after considering the views of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, FARO the Shooting Federation of Canada, the Canadian Sporting Arms and Administration Association, and other groups, that before a person should be able to possess a firearm he should be able to show that he is not unfit to do so.

On the complaint that the bill was kept secret before tabling, I can only reply that of course it was. If it had been released to outside interest groups before presentation in this House, the government would justifiably be subject to severe criticism. This is not to say that there was no prior consultation of the general subject matter. However, as I mentioned just now, in fact Mr. Nicholson himself was invited to address, and did address, the first national conference of local firearms registrars held in Ottawa last June. He attended the conference for two days. I listened to many of the remarks that he made and they did have some impact on the legislation.

In addressing the House, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) drew attention to the definition of "ammunition". He suggested a person finding a spent shell might be guilty of an offense for possessing unlicensed ammunition. I am sure the hon. member recognized that the concept of *mens rea*, along with discretion on the part of the police, Crown attorneys and the judiciary, must be taken into account in any discussion of this point. In fact, the government intends to amend this section in order to make the requirement of *mens rea* very clear, so that no one can be found guilty of an offence merely by finding a spent shell. Also, the definition in the bill is purposely complete because it is intended to require those people who possess the means for making ammunition and guns to be screened for fitness as much and as thoroughly as are the possessors of the completed item.

The hon. member for Calgary North also said that the gun control measures introduced by the government are, in effect, an ill-prepared and hurriedly worked out effort to

distract attention from capital punishment. I would like to deny that statement in the strongest possible terms. I must remind the House that firearms control has been a long-standing concern of mine. On two occasions as a back-bencher I sought to give Canadians more control over firearms misuse. As Solicitor General, I assembled a working group to study the area and to report to me. It is their work that forms the basis for the measures proposed here. Further, as Solicitor General I called the first conference of firearms registrars and officials held in Canada to discuss the restricted weapons system and general control. It gives me considerable satisfaction to see before the House this package of measures to control firearms misuse within the context of the government's over-all concern with peace and security.

I could with some enthusiasm continue to point out the intention and strengths of the measures proposed here. But I am confident they will become abundantly clear as the bill is debated and reviewed by committee. Some people have criticized the government's proposed firearms control measures as the first step in the eventual confiscation of all firearms in Canada. Others have criticized the government for not offering stronger measures. The government, of course, is attempting neither to lay the groundwork for consideration of weapons, nor to appease those who oppose all gun controls. Instead, these proposals are designed to offer a workable, moderate, feasible approach to the serious problem presented by those who misuse firearms in Canada.

I believe the measures proposed in the bill we are now considering do offer a reasonable and reasoned approach, and I commend them to the House. If there are suggestions and ideas to improve that approach, then committee consideration of the bill is obviously the forum in which to present and study them. The Minister of Justice and I have made it clear that we welcome reasonable amendments in committee.

I would now like to turn to consideration of the proposals—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether the minister would permit a question before leaving gun control. In the Yukon, and I believe also in the Northwest Territories, the police, who have responsibility for granting permits to trappers, prospectors and persons engaged in exploration work in the wilderness, have received instructions not to issue any more permits to anyone. I just want to confirm whether or not that is the case. If that instruction has gone out from Ottawa, in order to afford guns to people who require to use hand-guns in the field for protection from grizzly bears and the like, could the instruction be revoked so far as the two northern territories are concerned?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I understand the registrar for the Yukon has issued a directive not to give permits to prospectors who apply for a hand-gun permit. It seems that up until recently the registrar of the Yukon did grant permits for the use of hand-guns by prospectors for self-protection, whereas in the Northwest Territories they did not. I am led to believe that the two registrars got together and felt they should have one policy. I recently received a number of letters from prospectors in the north, and the question is under review at the present time.

Mr. Nielsen: The instruction came from Ottawa.

Mr. Allmand: It did not come from me. It has been brought to my attention, and it is under review. I cannot tell the hon. member what the outcome of the review will be, but I have had representations from prospectors in the Yukon. I said I would now like—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott) wishes to ask a question.

Mr. Scott: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I am not in total support of Americans bringing guns into Canada, Mr. Speaker, but this does represent a large segment of the tourist industry and each province, especially the province of Ontario, earns millions of dollars from American hunters coming into Canada. What provisions have been made to allow Americans to bring guns into Canada for sporting reasons?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for temporary permits for sportsmen coming into Canada to hunt, just as hunters coming into Canada get temporary hunting licences in the different provinces. There are different rules in each province. I forget the actual section of the bill, but provision is made for a temporary firearms licence for these people. We can discuss this at greater length in committee, but that is provided for.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I should now like to discuss the proposals affecting the corrections system, namely, the proposals dealing with the custody and release of inmates. As the Minister of Justice said in his speech, the Ministry of the Solicitor General has already undertaken a series of administrative changes aimed at improving the screening process for release decisions. The peace and security program, too, includes a number of changes affecting the custody and release of inmates. These changes are being proposed after careful consideration of the Ouimet report, the Senate report under Senator Goldenberg and the Hugessen report, the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission and extensive consultation with the provinces.

A number of the legislative proposals are intended to improve the capacity of the penitentiary authorities to provide increased security within penitentiaries through better control of inmates. The maximum penalty for escape or attempted escape from a penitentiary has been increased from five years to ten years. This change is being introduced to further improve the penitentiary service record in so far as escapes are concerned. Since 1972, when we started an improved program of security in our penitentiaries—there were 187 escapes in that year—we have, through these improved measures, reduced the number of escapes to 115 in 1973, 50 in 1974 and 43 in 1975, a total reduction in that period of time of more than 75 per cent.

● (1640)

Another new measure related to the custody of inmates repeals statutory remission. Those sentenced to a penitentiary after the new legislation comes into force will no longer be automatically credited with one quarter of their sentence. Instead, they must earn all remission. An inmate will earn one day for every two days served during which he applies himself industriously. In other words, the inmate will be able to earn remission to a maximum of one-third of his sentence. The new amendments stipulate that earned remission is subject to forfeiture in the same way that statutory remission is at present. Once forfeited, however, it cannot be restored, nor can remission withheld at any given point be restored at a later date.

With the best possible conduct and industriousness, an inmate who is not granted parole can be released after approximately two-thirds of his sentence has been served. The fact that all remission will be earned, that none will be automatic, and that it will be subject to forfeiture for misconduct, will place a greater onus on the inmate to earn the earliest release date possible. This should promote better conditions within institutions, including greater participation in programs.

Under the proposed changes, the Commissioner of Penitentiaries will become the commissioner of corrections and the control and management of the national parole service will be transferred from the National Parole Board to the commissioner of corrections. Subject to the direction of the Solicitor General, the commissioner will become responsible for the preparation of cases for all types of release and the supervision of inmates on temporary absence, day parole, full parole and mandatory supervision. This will relieve the National Parole Board of its management responsibility for the parole service and, therefore, allow it to maintain its independence in its decision-making role. This action will also result in better co-ordination of programs and services between the Canadian penitentiary service and the National Parole Service. At the same time, the National Parole Service will obtain additional staff to increase supervision for inmates on temporary absence, day parole and mandatory supervision. The parole service will also be responsible for monitoring temporary release plans both for individual inmates and the program in general.

In addition to the above legislative proposals, the government intends to initiate the following administrative measures to provide a greater degree of security in penitentiaries. First, additional training in the techniques of security and in the behavioural sciences for correctional officers. Second, establishing emergency response teams or "crisis" units to react immediately to potential danger or actual trouble such as prison disturbances and hostage-taking incidents. Members of the unit will also be trained in negotiation techniques.

Third, extending the "team" concept of deployment of staff in maximum security institutions. This involves the grouping of staff in units of manageable size under permanently assigned supervisors. In addition to providing improved security, this team concept results in more effective programming through increased involvement of staff in the daily lives of prisoners, and also facilitates communication between staff members. At present, the team

[Mr. Allmand.]

concept, in the form of the "living unit" program, has been employed almost exclusively in minimum and medium security facilities. The concept has proven to be of sufficient value to warrant its expansion into the maximum security area.

Fourth, an accelerated prison construction program which will involve phasing out some old, obsolete institutions and replacing them with smaller facilities of the type recommended by the Mohr committee, better suited to the rehabilitation and control of specific groups of inmates. We are currently completing construction of such an institution in Mission, B.C., and have received approval for sites in B.C., Alberta and New Brunswick. Fifth, we are also moving ahead with the construction of regional psychiatric centres in the Saskatoon, Kingston, and Halifax areas.

The government recognizes the need for, and is committed to, the gradual release of inmates through an effective parole system involving temporary absence, day parole, full parole and mandatory supervision. The hon. member for Calgary North intimated that the parole and temporary absence problems had led to a large number of failures. In reply I would like to stress the overwhelmingly successful record of parole and temporary absences and the important role these programs play in the rehabilitative process within the criminal justice system.

Hon. members should bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that fully 95 per cent of our inmates are sentenced to definite terms, which means that one day, inevitably, they must be released into society. Only a very small percentage are in prison on life sentence. If no efforts are made to smooth that return by a program of gradual, supervised release, then the chances of successful reintegration into the outside world are much smaller.

The temporary absence program has a success rate of over 99 per cent. The 15-year average success rate of parole is between 75 per cent and 80 per cent. I must, of course, agree that there have been failures in our system and that some of these failures have had tragic consequences. Because of such failures in the past, we have tightened up our selection precess and we are introducing further legislative, regulatory and administrative improvements at this time.

In this peace and security program, a number of further amendments to existing parole legislation and regulations are proposed in order to achieve greater control over the release of inmates who are prone to violence, while at the same time providing fairness and equity in decisions which affect the release of all inmates, including those on parole.

Many of the measures affect the organization and jurisdiction of the National Parole Board. The number of parole board members will be increased from 19 to 26. New members will be appointed for a period not exceeding ten years. These additional appointments will allow the board to assume further responsibilities, such as the authority to grant unescorted temporary absences and to conduct internal review hearings, and will allow for an improved selection process on the part of the board members by reducing the caseload on each member, which is extremely burdensome in Ontario, Quebec and the prairies.

Provision is also made for the addition of special community members of the Parole Board by the Solicitor General on recommendation of the chairman of the Parole Board for cases involving convicted murderers and dangerous offenders. These persons may include representatives of police forces, provincial governments, municipal or other local authorities, or members of the local professional, trade or community associations. The purpose of this provision is to allow greater community input into parole decision-making in cases of convicted murderers and dangerous offenders by bringing local knowledge and local concerns right into the parole decision-process itself. These members will have all the powers and responsibilities of a regular board member, including the right to vote. The votes of panel members will be in addition to the number of regular board members required to vote in such cases.

The National Parole Board will have legislative jurisdiction over all unescorted temporary absences from federal institutions, thus removing the authority to grant temporary absence without escort from the penitentiary service. This change is designed to avoid situations where different authorities come to different conclusions concerning the advisability of temporarily releasing an inmate, as has happened on a few occasions in the past. A number of significant regulatory changes will alter the Parole Board's rules governing the eligibility period of release of inmates. The National Parole Board will no longer be permitted to grant parole by exception where, in special circumstances, an inmate may be released before he has reached his parole eligibility date.

Offenders convicted of certain types of offences involving violence and who have, in addition, a history of violent crimes, will not become eligible to be considered for parole until they have served one-half of their term of imprisonment, or seven years, whichever is the lesser, instead of the normal one-third, or seven years. At the same time, the government is moving to safeguard the rights of those inmates and parolees who are affected by these measures. These will provide a fairer method of dealing with parole violators who are subject to parole suspension and revocation.

● (1650)

Furthermore, procedures guaranteeing certain elements of due process will be incorporated into Parole Board hearings. Although the Supreme Court of Canada has held that the National Parole Board is an administrative board and not subject to judicial review, the government feels a responsibility to provide those persons appearing before it with some procedural safeguards, and to make existing practices more visible.

Regulations will be proposed, following approval of the bill, which will provide that the board hold hearings for both ordinary parole and day parole, that reasons be given for parole decisions and that an internal review mechanism be established. In addition, the board will experiment with the concept of allowing inmates prior access to some of the information upon which board decisions are made, with the idea of allowing inmates a form of representation before the board, and with holding hearings after suspension of parole in order to make a decision regarding revocation. These regulations will provide visible procedural safeguards for those appearing before the board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. minister, but before he deals further with this subject I must inform him that his time has now expired and that he may not continue unless he has the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is sufficiently important for us to wish the minister to continue with his explanation. However, having regard to the fact that the government has imposed closure, I hope he will be as brief as possible.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Allmand: I appreciate the consent given by hon. members, and I will try to wind up quickly. I now wish to comment on the four proposed amendments to the protection of privacy legislation. The first point that must be stressed is that none of the proposed amendments extends any new authority to the police. The stringent controls and accountability procedures contained in the law currently will continue. For the benefit of those who have expressed doubts concerning these amendments, I shall summarize these controls and procedures once more. Although I refer to procedures followed by the RCMP, similar procedures are followed by the various police forces across Canada.

The investigating officer must satisfy a more senior officer in his department of the need for an authorization to intercept a private communication. If the senior officer agrees that a need exists, the investigating officer must then go to an agent of the Crown, usually a staff member of the Department of Justice. He must once again present his evidence and satisfy this agent of the Crown that there is a legal requirement for an authorization. If the agent is satisfied, he then makes application to a judge who has the appropriate jurisdiction and presents the judge with affidavits showing the necessity for employing electronic surveillance. If the judge is fully satisfied that the law has been complied with, then, and only then, will an authorization be issued permitting the interception of a private communication. In addition, the requirement for an annual report to parliament is part of the accountability procedure. Honourable members will recall that I tabled such a report in the House of Commons on February 13. This report provides a public record of all authorizations which were issued in 1975 to police officers investigating federal offences. My provincial counterparts are also obliged to make public a similar record of the details of authorizations issued under provincial authority.

When this new law was proclaimed in July, 1974, I assigned to members of the Ministry of the Solicitor General the task of maintaining a continuous liaison with all the provinces and of conducting a formal review of the law and its effectiveness after it had been implemented for one year. This review, which was completed in October, 1975, involved federal officials from the Ministry of Justice and the Department of the Solicitor General, members of the RCMP, provincial officials, members of provincial police forces and those at the municipal level. The results of this review were discussed last fall at a conference of attorneys general in Halifax, at which the proposed amendments now before this House were agreed to by all ten provinces.

Mr. Nielsen: What about the territories?

Mr. Allmand: And the territories. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to deal with some of the objections which have been raised by hon. member with respect to parts of the peace and security program, in particular the provisions respecting dangerous offenders. However, I do not wish to take advantage of the courtesy the House has shown, so I shall end my remarks at this point. I simply wish to confirm that the Minister of Justice and myself are already preparing amendments which have been suggested to us during the course of this debate. We have already agreed to incorporate certain amendments which appear to us to be reasonable, and we shall be pleased to hear further representations in the committee. We expect representatives of all the national associations involved in hunting, shooting, antique collecting, and so on, to appear before the committee, and I am sure that with the co-operation of all honourable members we can bring in legislation which will better protect the Canadian public and bring them the peace and security they deserve.

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on Bill C-83 which I see as yet another piece of legislation which is taking away certain rights from native people across Canada and will be causing hardship to hunters, trappers and prospectors in the Northwest Territories.

I notice that the time available this afternoon for debating this subject is running out, so may I call it five o'clock and resume this evening?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Social Security; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Transport; the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert)—Floods.

The House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions. It is my understanding that there is agreement to proceed with motion No. 97, in the name of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon).

Mr. Paproski: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree to stand all the other motions which appear on the Order Paper ahead of motion No. 97?

Mr. Paproski: That is also agreed, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*English*]

CONTRACT BETWEEN LOCKHEED CORPORATION AND GOVERNMENT

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria) moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the proposed contract between Lockheed Corporation of Burbank, California, and the Government of Canada for the purchase by Canada of eighteen long-range patrol aircraft, including the agreed formula as outlined at page 11617 of *Hansard* dated March 9, 1976.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise with a certain amount of hesitation, bearing in mind that the speech of the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) on the peace and security legislation had to be interrupted.

● (1700)

I suppose the story of the LRPA should be divided into three eras, and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) has always been talking of new eras of defence financing. The story of Lockheed could almost be prehistoric, historic and modern. Perhaps you will forgive me if I start in with the historic period of the Lockheed program. The Lockheed story first came to the knowledge of the House of Commons on March 17, 1969 in reply to a question by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). The then minister of national defence, Mr. Cadieux, said they were going to replace the Argus. That is something over seven years ago.

The next five years in the history was a study of the problem. They looked at three or four aircraft companies, narrowed it down to three, and then dropped the British product, the Nimrod, two years ago. The government then announced, with a great deal of fanfare, that they were down to two companies, Boeing and Lockheed, and were then entering the final definition phase. There was to be a bill of $11 million for that final definition stage, to be split approximately 50-50 between the two companies. The two companies duly completed the final definition phase. The culmination date of that was August 1 of last year, at which time a contract was supposed to be signed. Then we started into the modern era of delay.

I would ask you to note that in the humble address I particularly ask that they not only provide the contract but include the agreed formula as outlined on page 11617 of *Hansard*. The part of *Hansard* on that page I want to draw to the attention of the House and the minister is where the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) said:

As for the terms of payment of this eventual contract with Lockheed, we are not required to make a downpayment. According to the agreed formula, we pay as the production goes on.

It would be very interesting for the House to be informed whether the Minister of Supply and Services had seen this agreed formula, because we find that the Minister of National Defence said at page 11402 of *Hansard* for March 2, when speaking about the government:

At the time it agreed to purchase the Lockheed, the government made agreements for full payment when the aircraft were delivered—

This is exactly the opposite of what the Minister of Supply and Services said. I would not wish to suggest that either one of those gentlemen was deliberately deceiving the House. I understand it would be unparliamentary to do so. I would not do so in any event, because I do not think the House trusts them enough to be deceived by them any longer. Let it be said that they have said diametrically opposite things. One says we are to pay for this aircraft according to an agreed formula as the production goes on, and the other says we are to make full payment when the aircraft are delivered. In other words, according to the Minister of National Defence, the government expected Lockheed to provide interim financing for three years. This would be a huge sum, I think well beyond Lockheed's capability even without its current difficulties.

Lockheed, on the other hand, told me that this would be quite contrary to normal financing arrangements for such contracts. Lockheed has said that the payment schedule was all set down in the final proposal to the government of last August, which the government accepted in principle when it announced its decision to buy the Lockheed plane. I must say that from my scant knowledge of the world of armaments and armament purchases, Lockheed seemed to be setting out a fairly reasonable position. It claimed that its final offer spelled out to the finest detail the dates and the amounts that were going to be owed by the government to Lockheed as the plane was produced. My understanding is that the first payment was due at the end of January, and was in the approximate amount of $1 million, and there were to be monthly payments from then on.

From these three pieces of evidence we can see that the Minister of Supply and Services and Lockheed are on the same side, but flatly contradicted by the Minister of National Defence when he stated we were going to pay for the planes in full when the order was completed. To enable the opposition and the Canadian people to determine the truth, we want these papers tabled. If there is an agreed formula which spelled out that monthly payments were due, how could the Minister of National Defence possibly make the statement he made at page 11402 of *Hansard*, where he said: "The government made arrangements for full payment when the aircraft were delivered"?

Having made this statement, the minister adopted an attitude of shifting the responsibility from himself to his negotiating team and, indeed, to individuals on that team. To me this is a lamentable practice. Ministers are responsible for everything that happens within their departments, and if the negotiating team was under the supervision of the Department of National Defence, then the Minister of National Defence should cheerfully accept total responsibility. If it was not operating to his satisfaction, then it was his duty to find out. If there were misunderstandings or deceptions going on, it was up to the minister to find those misunderstandings and deceptions and take corrective action. If he did not have the proper personnel on the team, then he should have changed the personnel. The minister should not try to shift the responsibility from himself to any of his subordinates.

It is the minister who said the government was going to pay for that plane when it was finally delivered, and he is flatly contradicted by another minister of the Crown. I might say, in passing, that the Minister of Supply and Services was rather neatly taken off the hook in respect of this whole mess by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he said, as recorded at page 12436 of *Hansard*:

> —the arranging of the financing and the supervising of the execution of the contract are the responsibilities of the Minister of National Defence.

It seems to me he want one step further than he had to, to be sure the Minister of Supply and Services would not have the eight ball placed in front of him but would have it placed in front of the Minister of National Defence. This is an example of the inner politics of the cabinet which is far too devious for my simple mind to understand. However, it did become clear that, as far as the Prime Minister was concerned, if there was anything wrong with this contract we should blame the Minister of National Defence.

After a cabinet meeting on November 27, the minister announced the momentous news that Canada was going to replace the Argus with the Lockheed LRPA at a cost of $950 million. In fairness to the minister, he said at that time there would be additional interest costs, but he did not say how much. It turned out later to be $111 million. One should read closely the minister's earth-shaking announcement about the decision to re-equip the Canadian forces. I might say this was a very surprising decision. I could hardly believe that the government was going to spend $1 billion on 18 aircraft, knowing its disposition not to spend money in support of the forces. I hoped for the best. When reading the fine print of the announcement one found that there was to be no money actually spent by the government for some three years. It was going to go through an intricate system of switching funds from the operating budget to the capital budget, ending up with jam tomorrow, only three years down the road.

● (1710)

I would like to say, en passant, that the method by which that announcement was made left much to be desired. I imagine that people even as thick-skinned as some of our ministers must have thought how foolish we looked on the world stage at that time. I should like to quote a newspaper article in this regard. I refer to a column written by Duart Farquharson, headlined "Canada finally leaves NATO military purgatory". One would think, in view of what has happened around the world in the last two or three weeks, that we would hate to be faced with the way we advertised ourselves last December when the minister, having made his announcement, dashed off to Europe to reap the gratitude of NATO. The article reads:

> NATO welcomed Canada back into its military good graces Tuesday as defence minister James Richardson announced the Trudeau government's plans to beef up its contribution in Europe.
>
> The "unanimous appreciation" of the alliance members as described to reporters by Richardson was led off by Admiral of the Fleet Sir Peter Hill-Norton, chairman of NATO's military committee.
>
> NATO secretary-general Joseph Luns, who earlier this fall publicly criticized the equipment Canadian forces are using in Europe as grossly inadequate, offered his congratulations after the Canadian minister spoke.

The difficulty is that they did not understand Canadian ministers and that when a Canadian minister says he has made a decision to buy an aircraft one should never assume that is what he meant. One should assume that it had been discussed, will be discussed again and that perhaps an aircraft will be purchased, maybe someday but

certainly not today or this year. It is strange to read that a minister of the Crown would go to Europe and announce the position in the way he did by indicating that the money was in hand and that the planes would be rolling. Now, of course, it is an entirely different story. After December a period of doubt came along.

I asked the Minister of Supply and Services some time in December if he would give me a copy of the contract which it was expected would be signed that day. He said he would give it to me, but I did not receive it. They had the quietest non-signing I have ever heard of on January 4 when the officials from Lockheed flew up here from Burbank to sign the contract. There was deathless silence. In the words of the Minister of Supply and Services, there were "technical difficulties".

He asked me if I would hold up the motion I had placed on the order paper and said that in a few days he would give me the contract because they were just going to straighten out these technical difficulties. He said after the signing I could have the contract and everybody would be happy. But nothing happened for two or three weeks, and I asked again. He said that the technical difficulties had to do with the long-term financing. With deference to the minister, I believe he may have meant interim financing because the kind of financing we have heard about is not long-term in the generally accepted sense. I thought the Minister of Supply and Services was quite honest in saying that the problem was in respect of financing while the Minister of National Defence said the problem really involved the bribery scandal concerning Lockheed around the world.

The contract was not signed on January 4 and the bribery scandal did not begin until three weeks after that. At that time it became obvious that there was something besides the bribery scandal that kept the parties from signing this agreement. The minister then said there was a financing problem, but that they were about to settle it and that they had the assurance from Lockheed that it could handle the financing. Eventually, a few days ago, a letter was tabled from Mr. Heppe, the executive vice-president of government programs for Lockheed. I believe this correspondence is available to any member and I believe, also, to any member of the public. The Minister of National Defence claimed that Lockheed would find the money. He liked to quote one sentence; speaking about a loan by Lockheed. The sentence reads as follows:

> We believe this approach has merit and after due consideration would receive a positive response.

What the minister refrained from saying at the time was that this involved a relatively small amount of $27 million which Lockheed thought it would have to provide because Canada could not provide it, for a very short period of eight months which ended this April, and the fee for that would be $800,000 which Canada would pay off in April. That letter was tabled, as was the response it occasioned. The letter which occasioned this response from Lockheed was signed by Mr. L. H. Stopforth, deputy project manager, also known as a very senior official in the Ministry of Supply and Services. We might recall that the Minister of Supply and Services did not know about the financial difficulty, and yet one of his immediate subordinates indicated that there was a financial difficulty.

This matter continued to become more and more complex. I could easily go on for hours on this subject. I think this story is now of great interest to the people of Canada. It is a story of utmost confusion. We would like to examine the matter in order to determine where the fault lies. The Minister of Supply and Services admitted in the House two or three days ago that if this contract is not signed, the cost to Canada will be at least $28 million even before the cost of the project team is considered. One billion dollars is a very serious matter and one which is really beyond the understanding of most people. If we had had public disclosure of these two letters from Lockheed about the small loan last summer, we would have told the government and there would have been no doubt in the minds of government members, if they were not smart enough to realize it themselves, that this in no way represented an offer to do the interim financing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government, in the interest of good government and in the interest of getting a good contract, will see its way to tabling these documents so that everyone can operate from the known facts and perhaps clear away some of the confusion which exists at least on the government side insofar as this contract is concerned.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am willing to support the motion of the hon. member for the production of papers pertaining to LRPAs, Lockheed, and so on although my willingness may be for reasons different from his. I cannot understand why a government of Canada, of whatever political stripe, would conduct any kind of negotiations with an outfit like Lockheed, with the kind of reputation it has and the practices in which it has been engaged over the years. That is the first question the government has failed to answer. If the government of Canada were to deal with an individual or a Canadian corporation which carried on the same kind of practices, it would not likely happen. My view is that this whole deal would be forgotten by the government of Canada.

● (1720)

Even if it were to cost the $28 million of which my good friend speaks, it seems to me that would be a lesser evil than to continue dealing with this kind of outfit, with the kind of practices and reputation that we now know they have and about which we have known for many months.

Let us speak about the aircraft itself. I find it interesting, in light of the questions and answers yesterday, and in fact I even agree with my leader—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: That is rare.

Mr. Benjamin: —who finds that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) is preparing for the second world war. I thought maybe he was preparing for Custer's last stand. In the area of technology, in which I am not an expert, I understand that in Ottawa, at Bell's Corners, they have developed the next generation's communications and electronics technology for surveillance and detection, at which the U.S. defence department and others are looking with great interest with the likelihood that they will buy it. But the Minister of National Defence is going to pur-

chase aircraft the surveillance and detection technology of which is already outdated. I find that passing strange.

If the U.S. defence department and other countries will be buying technology from Canada which is better and in advance of that which they have themselves, then I do not understand why the minister would want to continue dickering with Lockheed. That is another reason why the documents asked for in this motion should be presented to the House. The minister cannot make up his mind, but perhaps with the help of these documents we might help him make up his mind.

The minister made some effort yesterday to justify these negotiations on the basis of what the boys in NATO have been telling him about the Russians being ahead of us in certain areas of weaponry. With the 18 propeller-driven aircraft whose detection and surveillance capacity is already outdated, I do not understand how we can possibly make any contribution to NATO or catch up with what the Russians are doing, other than be laughed out of town not only by the Russians but by our colleagues in NATO. So why the minister would pursue that argument, and say that Canada might make an equivalent or up to date contribution to NATO with 18 propeller aircraft which are outdated, is beyond me.

If there is a legitimate point to be made about having an aircraft with up to date surveillance and detection capacity, not for military reasons but for a lot of other reasons about which members of the House and the country as a whole should be concerned, and if we have some technology and capacity ourselves, or if countries other than the U.S. have that technology and capacity, then surely that is where we should be looking.

I think we need a coastal capacity both on the surface and in the air far beyond anything we have at the moment. Believe it or not, it is possible that the defence budget with an NDP government would have would be higher than the one this government has. But it would be higher for a hell of a lot of different reasons. If we are going to exercise our sovereignty and provide a capacity to maintain that sovereignty, and if we are going to exercise surveillance in the areas of fisheries, pollution, and search and rescue to the 200-mile limit, then of course we will need aircraft and surface vessels.

The Minister of National Defence is trying to play in a champagne league with beer equipment. The minister is trying to buy some long-range patrol, propeller-driven aircraft—they might even be turbo-props—with a built in computer and electronic capacity which, speaking conservatively, so to speak, is five years out of date, and perhaps ten years out of date, in spite of the technical capacity which we already have for surveillance and with the capacity we already have for airframe construction in a couple of companies which the government of Canada has bought. I cannot stand private enterprise which goes public when they do not believe in it. They make a Crown corporation, not because there is something valuable in having such a company but to bail out some private enterprise friends who have gone belly up.

This leads me to another point. I must take issue with hon. friends to my right. We are very busy dealing with Lockheed. Normally, under the free enterprise system, if you want to sell something to a customer, be it the government, a corporation or an individual, you have to stand on your own feet, you must have your own production, your own finances and arrange your own loans and guarantees. In fact, you must be able to drag yourself up by your own bootstraps.

A national government is buying defence hardware—whether it is the government of Canada, the U.S. or any other country—but suddenly the private enterprise outfit which will sell you this stuff needs to have many things on paper ahead of time to help them out with their financing so they can make the product you are going to buy, and in the course of that you will have to add some extra millions of dollars to allow them to get the money to make the product which you are going to buy. Even if I were a raving capitalist and free enterpriser, I would say that if I have to go through that nonsense I would prefer to build the aircraft myself. That is another reason why I am happy to support the hon. member's motion for the production of papers.

Since when does the government of Canada and the taxpayers of this country have to contribute to the financing and funding of a corporation with the reputation and business ethics of a tomcat? If I were a raving free enterpriser and believer in the capitalist system, that would be the last company I would deal with, because they hardly add to the credibility and credence of so-called private enterprise practices and theory. That is another reason I do not understand why the government continues beyond six o'clock today to pursue any kind of bargaining or negotiating with Lockheed. They should tell them to go home, that they do not even want to talk to them any more. How can the Minister of National Defence allow himself to be sucked into buying an aircraft that is already at least five years out of date? I do not understand that, and I am not even an expert. I wonder what Canadian experts think of all this.

I suppose you could call all this a business in the worst sense of the word. If a corporation, intending to deal with the public in an open and honest manner, is prepared to compete—in the worst or best sense of the word, depending on how you look at it—it will have no hesitation in being totally open and honest with the government with which it is dealing, and in turn the government will have no hesitation in being totally open with the public and with the House of Commons.

● (1730)

In light of what has happened over the past number of years nobody can convince me that the people in the higher circles of the Government of Canada were not aware of the kind of people with whom they were dealing, whether it was Lockheed or numerous other corporations. They knew what Joe Citizen for years suspected, and that has been confirmed by the events which have occurred in the last 12 or 18 months.

We need to put an end to any dealings with Lockheed in the search for a long range patrol aircraft and coastguard capacity. We have not even scratched the surface, but I think this search is a legitimate move on behalf of the people of Canada. What we require will cost a lot of money. It cannot be done in just a few weeks, months or

years, but requires much planning and investment. It will cost much, but it has to be worth while.

Acquiring aircraft for coastal work, including the 200 mile limit, the Arctic, search and rescue, fisheries, pollution, and displaying sovereignty, will require much more than 18 propellor driven aircraft with technology which is five years out of date, leaving aside the outfit with which the government is presently dealing. If this corporation is reputable, of international standing, of international capacity, of international reputation and so forth, it should not require or even ask for any kind of loan guarantees, financing, or influence from the Government of Canada. That corporation should be here on its own terms as a private enterprise competing with all the others. However, it is not here on that basis.

There would be nothing wrong with the Minister of National Defence getting up and admitting that he made a mistake in even talking with these people, and indicating an intention to cut off negotiations. He would receive the applause and approbation of every member of this House on all sides. I do not see any point in continuing negotiations with an organization which almost requires a blank cheque. It may or may not go belly up after it has been given a blank cheque; that will depend on what President Ford and some U.S. senators and congressmen decide. I see no point in our discussing giving that organization a blank cheque so that it can have the money to build something we are going to buy. If we are going to do it that way, let us build it ourselves, or if we are going to give money to somebody let us give it to a Canadian company or some country which needs help.

I do not not understand why the government has hesitated so long. It has run scared, and judging by the performance of the Minister of National Defence yesterday, if some nut ever does push the button and we are plunged into a nuclear holocaust, I just hope that the Minister of National Defence is not there calling the shots. He continues to practise what has been going on with our national defence capacity in NATO and NORAD, and he even extends it to what is more a civilian operation with long range patrol aircraft. He continues that mentality. In other words we are the new Belgium and the new Poland. We are caught in the middle; we are dead ducks.

To suggest that these long range patrol aircraft could somehow be useful in protecting convoys and detecting nuclear submarines, really, for a rank amateur in defence matters that exceeds even my credulity. From what I have been able to read and discuss with people who know something about convoy procedures in the event of a third world war and with people who have some experience with nuclear submarines, the missiles which they can fire and the detection of them, I submit what is proposed to be in these Lockheed long range patrol aircraft will be totally inadequate and worthless.

If a submarine were dumb enough to surface and stand still for a while, perhaps some Canadian long range patrol aircraft might accidentally find it, but even with 12 of them in operation 24 hours a day, and six of them on stand by—and with the number of miles of sea to cover—who is the minister trying to kid? As I said, he is trying to play in a champagne league with a beer operation.

This whole thing needs much more going into than is being done in the question period. It needs more than what the hon. member responsible for this motion is seeking, and I hope that the House will agree that these materials should be made available to parliament and to the public. I hope also in the course of arriving at that conclusion hon. members on all sides will take a pretty good hard look at other things we are doing through the Department of National Defence in areas we are involved in like NORAD and NATO, which do not really add to the effectiveness of those operations.

According to middle level and senior officers, if the nuclear button were pushed, those operations would not amount to anything. Perhaps after we adopt the motion, Canada and this government will look a little more seriously at the kind of role we can and should be playing in the areas of peacekeeping, fisheries surveillance, and pollution.

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

Mr. Walter Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 97, dated March 31, 1976 and moved by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), was opposed by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) because it was felt inappropriate to table in this House papers relating to negotiations leading to a contract until that contract had been executed. I would have thought this reason to be straightforward and clear to my friend, the hon. member for Victoria. However, I was mistaken.

I find certain similarities between negotiations of a contract, such as the one we are concerned with for long range patrol aircraft, and the defence prepared by an attorney for a client. Does an attorney make his defence strategy known before the case opens? I always thought not. Yet the hon. member for Victoria is asking the Minister of Supply and Services to make public all the clauses of the proposed contract, including the payment formula, the very heart of the negotiations. Does this sound reasonable?

As if too little had already been said about the matter, I must reiterate what has been said in this House on the matter of guidelines for the production of papers, tabled on March 15, 1973, and printed as an appendix to *Hansard* of that date at page 2288. The same guidelines were also tabled by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) on December 19, 1974, and were referred to a standing joint committee of this House for consideration. Indeed the seventh report of that committee presented to the House on Tuesday, December 16, 1975, was the subject of a motion debated in this House on an allotted day for consideration of the business of supply, on Thursday, February 12, 1976.

● (1740)

So important and of concern of so many is this matter of freedom of information that the committee asked to be authorized to examine the matter further during the balance of this session. It seems to me that having adopted the motion is proof enough of the seriousness of this important issue.

It has been said in this House by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that these guide-

lines were the government's own rules by which it determines whether or not it will make papers public. At least they are a starting point for a committee of this House to formulate some reasonable rules and, as suggested by my colleague, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton), they are better than those of most other countries. This motion could well have been withdrawn, perhaps never moved, if we had an adopted set of guidelines such as those proposed. I suspect, as did the hon. member for Welland, who sat as a member of that committee, that the notice of motion for the production of papers was a ploy to obtain a debate.

I do not feel it is too much to ask the hon. member for Victoria to be just a little more patient. The Minister of Supply and Services had earlier agreed to provide the hon. member for Victoria with a copy of the contract with the company when it had been executed. On February 2, 1976, in reply to a question by the hon. member, as reported in *Hansard* of that date at page 10524, the Minister said:

> The contract has not been signed, Mr. Speaker.

He then told the hon. member that some technical difficulties had emerged which caused some delay.

Just a short while later on February 12, and again on February 13, in reply to questions from the same member, *Hansard* reports at page 10868 that the minister said:

> These technical problems relate strictly to long term financing—
>
> Mr. Speaker, the contract we intend to sign with Lockheed Aircraft Corporation has been subject to a long study by an interdepartmental committee, under the direction of the Department of National Defence, and for which the government paid a considerable amount of money to have the program finalized. This contract has finally been negotiated through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to establish what would be the best economic repercussions for Canada.
>
> We thought we had all the possible advantages to meet our needs and our economic objectives. This is why we are considering the possibility of signing the contract with Lockheed Aircraft once the arrangements concerning the long term financing are completed.

As reported at page 10919 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Supply and Services said this:

> Mr. Speaker, we are now studying the problem of long term financing. The Minister of National Defence is taking a very close look at it and I would not like, for the time being, to disclose anything which might harm the negotiations. This is why I am requesting the hon. member to be patient. I think that within a few days the Minister of National Defence and I will be able to say exactly what has been the fate of this contract.

The minister was trying to tell the hon. member that until the negotiations were completed and the contract signed, there was no document to produce. Surely what has been said is clear. I fail to understand why the hon. member would move that a copy of the proposed contract be tabled. The government is not trying to withhold information; it is merely trying not to impede or jeopardize the negotiations which are still being carried out.

If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, a few more quotations from *Hansard* will assist in establishing the chronology of events. On March 9, as reported at page 11617, the Minister of Supply and Services said:

> Mr. Speaker, from the contract negotiated but not yet signed with Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Ltd., will flow a major economic boost for Canada and we obviously keep this advantage in mind.
>
> As for the terms of payment of this eventual contract with Lockheed, we are not required to make a down payment. According to the agreed formula, we pay as the production goes on. As for the risk of dealing with Lockheed, some officials met with representatives of the American government to assess what would be their own position toward Lockheed, given the prevailing circumstances surrounding this corporation.
>
> The American government accounts for two thirds of Lockheed's over-all orders, which means that Lockheed considers the United States government as a major player. The fact that the United States chose to deal with Lockheed reassures Canada to a certain extent.

Up to that point in time no contract had been signed, but the hon. member will agree that the minister was keeping the House informed of the development in negotiations, almost day by day. The most recent significant development was transmitted to the House on April 1 when, in reply to a question from the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), the minister is quoted in *Hansard* at page 12350 as saying:

> Mr. Speaker, it is true that Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Ltd. did some work before the contract signature. It is also true that Lockheed gave us a first delay until March 31 without any change in prices and in the economic advantages for Canada. This is in fact a provision of the letter of agreement we signed to the effect that we are going to pay Lockheed for work done between January 5 and April 30, with a view to preserving the price we negotiated last December, preserving the production schedule which is advantageous for Canada, and preserving the economic impact which is evident for the country since we sign a $614 million contract with Lockheed and we are going to have economic repercussions of about $580 million in Canada.
>
> In consideration of all these advantages, we agreed with Lockheed to pay a maximum of $16 million in case we put an end to our negotiations between now and April 30. This being said, we do intend to sign the contract if possible, because these are the best conditions we can get for Canada to fulfil its role in NATO.

From these open answers in this House it can hardly be said that the government is withholding information. On the contrary, I feel strongly that exemption No. 10 of the guidelines was carefully weighed before being proposed, and likely with the precise object of avoiding any impediment to the orderly unfolding of negotiations. This is why the government chose to oppose the motion presented by the hon. member.

Guidelines are criticized and rightly so; results would not be achieved otherwise. I am looking forward to the final report and recommendations from the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments which will bring in definite rules by which the public and parliamentarians will have access to more information. In line with the policy of openness that the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) is hoping will be adopted, I am confident the recommendations will not breach the confidentiality of such deliberations as are presently going on in relation to this contract. I shall now conclude, Mr. Speaker, and give some other hon. member a chance to contribute.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr Speaker, the parliamentary secretary seems to miss the point on this issue. I must say I find it rather strange that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) is not in the House to argue his own case since we are talking about a $1 billion contract. It has been subject to six weeks of questioning in the House of Commons, and the matter has been brought up in committee, but we still do not have the answers. I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that he take this information back to his minister.

This would have been an excellent contract for the national defence committee to have studied. Buying aircraft

like these is in the national interest and is a defence matter; it has nothing to do with partisan politics. What is so disturbing is this loose contract and verbal assurances. It is unbelievable when you read the background of this company. When it received backing in the United States, a 48 to 48 tie had to be broken in the Senate before it could receive any financial aid from the United States government. That would not indicate it had very strong support in the United States. As far back as 1971 it was stated, and I quote:

● (1750)

The legislation would permit the government to guarantee up to $250 million in bank loans to any corporation whose failure would "seriously and adversely" affect the national economy or that of any region.

That is referring to Lockheed.

—Administration spokesmen made clear their expectation that the entire $250-million would be used to shore up Lockheed . . .

Mechanically, guarantees of the loans to Lockheed will have to be authorized first by a three-man board that is created under the legislation. The members of the board are the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

As far back as 1971 you can see the financial straits this company was in, and this certainly should have alerted the minister and the government when dealing with it. They should not be talking about verbal assurances, as was the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) on a number of occasions. The Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) said that he does not believe in verbal assurances of contracts.

In an article in the December 9, 1972, New York *Times* there are further comments about Lockheed by the General Accounting Office, the U.S. congressional watchdog agency. I quote:

Firm orders for 110 of the large planes "will probably generate about $393 million in cash through 1975—an amount sufficient to repay the government-guaranteed loan", the agency said. However, it added: "Lockheed could suffer substantial losses if it does not receive additional Tristar orders."

You can see the difficulties it was in at that time.

At the last meeting of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence on March 23 the matter was pursued further. With regard to questions about the Lockheed purchase the Minister of National Defence stated, and I quote:

The problem was that the particular company that we were dealing with had an understanding with their banks and with the United States government that they would not borrow further. But they did not reveal that to us.

The Canadian government certainly did not go into any detail whatsoever in drafting this contract with Lockheed. One member of the committee then asked:

Was the government aware of that limitation?

The minister replied:

No, we were not, and that was the prime cause of the misunderstanding.

The Minister of National Defence was premature in making the announcement about this purchase in November, 1975. There was no firm contract. If he had waited until there was a firm contract and all negotiations were completed, we would not be committed to this $60 million.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

In all probability we would not be in the mess we are in today. Further at that committee meeting our defence critic, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), stated:

Well, the fact that Lockheed were not able to borrow further was common knowledge in the United States—

I just revealed this fact going back to 1971.

—and I am a little puzzled about this remark that it was not known by an organization who were planning to spend $1 billion of Canadian taxpayers' money on this company.

The minister replied:

I can only repeat, Mr. Chairman, that our officials were advised by Lockheed that they could provide the financing.

There was no official documentation. It is unbelievable that the minister would get involved in a contract like this on verbal assurances.

At the committee meeting of December 1, 1975, we questioned the minister about this contract. He had stated that a large part of the work would be done in Canada. I was most interested in where and who in Canada was going to get this work. I put this question to the minister:

Mr. Minister, I would like to get more information on the manufacturer of parts for the Lockheed Orions in Canada. You stated that there could be a maximum of $560 million spent in Canada in the manufacture of parts, and that you had a firm commitment that $283 million would be spent in Canada. Apparently a General Allen of National Defence was chairing a committee to firm this up. Could you inform the committee as to what provinces, or what firms, will be getting this spare-part manufacturing business?

The minister replied:

I can give you the over-all figures even more precisely than I did the other day.

The minister had given me some information in the House a couple of days earlier.

I mentioned in the House a figure of $283 million that was confirmed, and the $285 million figure. I understand that both of those figures are ones the Lockheed firm are prepared to carry out in Canada for a total of $568 million. The reason for their separation is that the $285 million of work has not been identified as to its exact location, but it still is work that can be done and will be done by the Lockheed company in Canada.

I was interested in what work would be going to Winnipeg. The minister informed me that work would be going to Standard Aero and Bristol. He said, and I quote:

I do not have dates, but the program is starting now and it certainly will be during the life of the contract. Even Standard Aero will not have to wait, even though it is repair and overhaul, until they are starting to repair engines from our own aircraft. They will start to get work now,—

That is what he stated on December 1, 1975. The parliamentary secretary told us today that they are still negotiating a firm contract, but the minister stated in committee that they will get work in Winnipeg "now". What did he mean by "now"? May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, the first point I would like to make in connection with Bill C-83 concerns the way it was presented to the House. The bill covers some six separate areas and I feel that issues as varied as gun control, wire tapping, and parole reform should be presented to the House separately because each of these issues is of great interest to many people. I am sure many of my colleagues will agree with me that parts of the bill are acceptable and that parts of it should be thrown out entirely. However, the government has put us in the position of having to accept all or nothing. But I suppose that is in keeping with its usual methods of consultation, Mr. Speaker.

At this stage of the bill I intend to confine my remarks to the section dealing with gun control. This problem, Mr. Speaker, is a difficult one. The difficulty arises because of the great variety of uses for guns. After all, they are just one of man's many tools. In my own riding, guns are used for legitimate recreational activities such as hunting and target-shooting. Some of my constituents collect guns for their value as antiques, and as personal mementos. And there is no doubt that some guns are used for illegal purposes, just as there is no doubt that a great many people in my constituency use guns to put food on the table.

What I am getting at is that devising a set of controls which will apply equally to people who live in highrise buildings in Toronto and to those who hunt and trap for a living in the High Arctic, is not easy. My main fear is that by attempting this big job the government has placed too much emphasis on conditions in the big cities at the expense of people who use guns as a tool by which to live.

Perhaps I can illustrate my point by the use of a few examples. The bill now contains provision for a police officer to enter a house without a warrant and seize any firearms. I realize that this could happen only under certain conditions, but it could happen. In a lot of cases that is a valuable provision. As several hon. members opposite have said, most violent crimes involving guns occur between people who know each other, often members of the same family. If a police officer feels tempers are running high, and removes the temptation of a gun, many deaths could be prevented.

In a city having your gun removed is not a serious matter. Under the provisions of the legislation before us it could be reclaimed in due time. City people who legitimately own guns rarely use them more than several times a year, and then only for recreational purposes. But this is not the case in other parts of the country. For hunters and trappers there are certain critical times of the year. Ducks and geese fly over only during a short period of time. The same is true of migrating caribou herds. During these critical periods hunters will usually take food to last for several months. What would be the result if their guns were taken away during one of these critical periods? They and their dependants would face hunger, and the government would likely incur increased welfare costs.

Another factor should be taken into consideration. In a city the police are always handy and the courts are in operation all the time. It is fairly easy to fulfil whatever requirements the courts may stipulate to have a gun returned. This is not the case in areas where hunting is the major occupation. There are many villages in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, and other places for that matter, where there is no permanent police station. Such places are served by travelling police officers, game officers, and circuit courts. Under these circumstances a hunter may lose the use of his gun for many months unless this bill is amended.

● (2010)

Another problem arises in the provision for a licence to own a shotgun or a rifle. Because of the expense and lack of demand people with the authority to issue licences will not be easily accessible to hunters, trappers, fishermen, propectors and so on. Hunters live in areas away from large centres of population, and they must travel great distances at great expense into remote territory at certain times of the year. It will be difficult for many hunters to go and get the required licence. As well, hunting communities are small. There may not be a priest, or a lawyer, or other person usually used as a guarantor handy to sign on application, let alone there being two there at the same time.

Many people will also have problems with these provisions in respect of licences because of the cost. This program evidently is supposed to pay for itself. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said in his remarks a few days ago that the estimate of the cost of processing a licence could run as high as $30. Hunting families, fishermen, and others who use guns to take part of their food do not usually have large cash incomes. If there is a large number of hunters in a family, of course this will be a major obstacle.

Then there is the age restriction. In the city it is a good idea to restrict access to guns to people over the age of 18. I agree with that. In cases where families participate in some recreational aspect of shooting the bill makes adequate provision for allowing licences to people over the age of 14. However, the provision for permits for hunters at age 14 will cause problems. This will cause problems among native families not only in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon but, I am sure, also in many of the northern parts of the provinces across this country.

As I have said on a couple of occasions before, guns are tools. In the hunting or trapping family they are part of everyday life, and no matter how safely they are stored they are always accessible to children. Because of this children must be taught to use guns safely and effectively at a very early age. It has been my experience that children are usually given their first gun at around 12, 13 or 14 years of age. They are trained in the use of guns very carefully by their parents who know how to use them, and safety is the number one point that is always stressed.

Other clauses in this bill attempt to regulate or control the circulation of guns by making it an offence to loan or sell a gun to someone who does not have a licence. That makes sense in the city. There are too few legitimate reasons for guns to be used that it is of only minor inconvenience to make sure that the required documents are on hand, and this can be done very easily in the city.

However, I should like to mention here that there is a long-standing tradition among hunters, trappers, and prospectors that a person will loan his tools; his guns, his traps, his sleeping bag, his dog team, his motorized toboggan, or whatever, to a person who is without these means of survival. By making it an offence to do this with one of the most necessary tools the government is destroying a tradition and adding hardship to people who may be in need of a gun to make a living during critical times of the year. That is the time of the migration of the cariboo, of migratory birds, and so on. These are problems that do not arise in the city.

The government should be aware that by trying to solve problems in one part of the country it is actually creating problems in other parts. I have mentioned in this House before that in cities, especially in Ottawa, we all know as members of parliament that we have to contend with red tape. Much of the time we have great difficulty in cutting across the red tape. In the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon we have another problem because there is a high ratio of civil servants to the general population. We have learned there that we not only have to cut tape traditionally like it is done here, but most of the time we have to cut the tape lengthwise instead of crosswise, and that is not easy.

There are other parts of the bill I feel are either too strict, not strict enough, or too vague. For example, the bill contains provision for a licence to be issued on the word of two guarantors. Why is there no mention of the applicant himself or herself proving that he or she is able to handle firearms safely, and why are there no provisions for public education about the dangers of firearms?

I have one other suggestion. As I understand it, much of this gun control legislation is aimed at preventing the "I didn't know it was loaded" type of accident. Would it not be possible to do the same thing and to replace much of this bill by requiring or making it mandatory that all guns have a trigger lock, keeping the guns locked up, and not easily accessible particularly to children? Such a lock, if kept in place at all times when a gun was not in use, would sharply reduce the number of accidental shootings and would provide a little time to think for the person who picks up a gun in the heat of an argument.

In addition I would like to see the hunters, trappers, prospectors and fishermen in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon exempt from the licensing aspects of this bill. They should keep their firearms under lock and key at all times to prevent accidents.

Having regard to handguns, it is very important to people who work in my part of the Territories, and I am thinking of prospectors, pilots, hunters, trappers and so on who go out into the bush, that they be allowed to carry handguns not only for protection but as part of their survival gear. These people are not always in a position to carry a heavy rifle. There are times when they have to go out with a number of packs carrying their food, survival gear, and that kind of thing, and if you add a heavy rifle on top of their burden it becomes too much. That person is not going to endanger the life of any human being out there in the bush. By having a handgun this would be a convenience, and this is one other part of the bill that I think should be looked at carefully. I would like very much to have this aspect of the bill considered on behalf of the people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

As I mentioned earlier before calling it five o'clock, I consider this bill to be another erosion of the rights of the native people of this country. It is an erosion of their aboriginal rights to hunt, trap, fish and so on. This is another area in which we are taking away the rights of these people without very much consultation. That is all I wish to say, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, much of what I have to say parallels that which has been said by my neighbour, the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth). However, there are a few areas he has not covered and a few examples he has not cited. I am sure we are on all fours on the manner in which we view this legislation.

What the hon. member has said, and what I had intended to say, in respect of the rights of the native peoples in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon brings up a question in my mind as to whether—and I am very happy to see the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan) in the House because this has perhaps not occurred to him—the provisions of this bill in so far they affect the native peoples of this country are constitutional. They have been granted by treaty in many significant instances the absolute right to hunt and fish on all unoccupied Crown lands. The Treaty of Paris guaranteed, in the case where no individual treaties exist, the absolute right to hunt and fish on all unoccupied Crown lands. This bill purports to interfere with that right which has been given to them by Her Majesty in the Treaty of Paris, and by the Government of Canada in certain specific treaties across this country.

● (2020)

This used to be a very serious constitutional question which in all probability the government did not even look at in drafting this bill, but I do not find that unusual with regard to this government particularly in view of the answers given by the minister to questions asked by the hon. member for the Northwest Territories in respect of the granting of permits. Had it consulted in depth the native organizations in this country in respect of all provisions of this bill, no doubt forceful views in respect of the absolute hunting rights of these people would have been

expressed. I hear the minister say that that was done. I do not know whether he means that the question of constitutional rights arose during those discussions. If it did not, it certainly should have and should have been considered. That points out not just the question of the lack of consultation with the native organizations but with the two northern territories generally.

I had to remind the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) about that this afternoon when he was speaking on some of the discussions and relationships with the provinces, and about the conferences which were held between the attorneys general of the provinces and himself in respect of this legislation. No such consultations occurred in so far as the people of the north were concerned. There were no consultations with the elected councils of the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories in respect of how they regarded this legislation.

Had such consultations taken place then the points my neighbour from the Northwest Territories made and which I will be making would have found their way into this bill. I cannot understand the government being so harsh and unfair in respect of the needs of the people in the High Arctic islands and the remote regions of the mainland of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory that it would ask these people to abide by the provisions that are being written into the law by this bill. These people depend for their very livelihood on the firearm. Without it they do not eat. They have no industrial or commercial pursuits.

I think particularly in my riding of the people of Old Crow whose very lives revolve around hunting, trapping, and fishing all year around. That requires the unrestricted, the absolute right to use a firearm. When you take that right away from them or interfere with it, then so far as they are concerned what you are doing, as my friend put it, is taking the grub right off their table. That situation probably exists in many parts of the northern portions of the provinces, but in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon Territory it is very acute.

The situation in respect of the people of Old Crow I think can best be exemplified by an example. The hon. member for the Northwest Territories used an example. Let me use one. There is a small village in the Yukon called Champagne. An Indian person was walking along in the woods not far from Champagne, which at that time was a small village of 20 or 30 souls. While he was walking through a wooded portion of the valley all of a sudden he found himself face to face with a grizzly bear. His rifle was slung on his back. He did not have time to get the rifle off his back and cope with that grizzly bear. Had he had a hand gun he might have been able to cope with the situation. He did not.

The grizzly bear without a second thought attacked him. With one cuff the native person was on the ground. All he could think of doing, because he could not reach around to get his rifle from his back, was to play possum, to play dead, which he did. He lay on his stomach.

The bear took another swipe at him, and ripped the back of his scalp down over the front of his head. The grizzly bear pawed and sniffed around him.

All this time the Indian did not utter a sound. He played absolutely dead.

The grizzly bear used his mouth to pick him up by the back of the neck. He gave him one or two more slaps, and dropped him again.

There was not a sound or movement. That man lived, despite the serious mauling he received. That is the type of situation the people who walk in the wilderness are apt to meet every day of their lives.

It is common practice, indeed essential for survival in the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories, to have the right to carry the 44 magnum, which is the common gun used in the bush, rather than a heavy rifle. People carry this firearm in addition to the pack and other gear most carry in the bush.

People engaged in exploration and heavy work carry all sorts of equipment, such as transits and the like, which burden them down. The common weapon for everyone is the 44 magnum. Now, after the right to carry this kind of a weapon has existed for so many years, almost a century from my reading of history, we find there is a restriction—the Solicitor General appears to be ignorant of this fact—which has issued from Ottawa, which has the effect of telling the RCMP that there will be no permits issued for anyone for the carrying of handguns.

Big game guides, outfitters, prospectors, trappers, and others whose livelihood is in the wilderness have been told they will not under any circumstances be issued the permit they have been accustomed to receiving year after year after year for carrying a handgun in the bush. It is unfortunate that the Solicitor General is not in his seat. He said that he has received representations from the prospectors in the Yukon in connection with this matter. However, it is not only the representations by the prospectors that are important. I am sure he has received representations from others. Just as important are the representations from big game guides, outfitters, and those engaged in exploration work in the field. They must have that permit in order to function.

We are now on the verge of spring after a long winter and I urge the Solicitor General, who I hope will read by words tomorrow since he is not here, to revoke immediately this instruction which has been given and which has the effect of denying the people of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon the right to carry handguns in these circumstances.

Let me use the Solicitor General's example in this matter of handguns and firearms generally. He spoke of the need for safety; he spoke of the millions of guns owned in Canada and of the two million or three million individuals who own firearms. He used that, plus the safety argument, plus the accident argument, plus the criminal argument, to say that there are far too many guns lying around loose in the country and therefore we have to impose regulations. My argument against that is simply that, of the millions of owners of firearms in this country, 99 per cent are law abiding citizens and their guns will not be used for unlawful means. Yet for the crimes of a few, for the illegal acts of a few, all of us are to be penalized.

● (2030)

I might use the same argument when speaking of the overwhelming—I think that was his word—success of the parole system. The minister says that hundreds and thousands of paroles are granted under the existing system and only a very small percentage fail, again to use his own words. So in effect what he is arguing is that because of the great number of successful paroles that are granted, the few isolated incidents of crimes by parolees should not be the reason for putting the whole parole policy in the wastebasket. But that argument can be very effectively turned around and applied to the gun situation. I say that the number of illegal uses to which firearms are put by relatively few individuals in Canada should not be the reason for imposing these onerous provisions on the majority of law abiding citizens who own guns.

I should like to draw an incident to the attention of the minister when speaking of the right to use guns in Canada. Notwithstanding the passage of this bill—and I have no doubt it will pass with the majority on the opposite side—there will still be what I consider to be a very undesirable situation. I am not familiar with how it affects the rest of Canada, although I have heard one or two speeches from this side of the House drawing attention to the non-Canadians travelling in the country bringing guns into Canada.

I draw the minister's attention to the policy which exists as it relates to those travelling along the Alaska highway. There is a large number of U.S. citizens travelling along that highway, both to and from the state of Alaska, and a large part of that group is military. The practice of the government when such vehicles enter Canada is for the customs officials to ask for the disclosure of the possession of any weapons.

A very large percentage of there travellers carry handguns and those handguns are normally carried in car glove compartments. So what is the practice? The customs official takes the handgun, without any obligation to unload it, places it in a little plastic bag which he ties at the neck, and gives it back to the traveller who replaces it in his glove compartment. He is permitted to carry that handgun in the plastic bag in the glove compartment of his car as he travels from one end of the Alaska highway to the other. There is not even a seal on it. The bag is tied with a little red ribbon. For heaven's sake, it is a plastic bag. There is no trick to getting a handgun out of a plastic bag.

Here we are in the Parliament of Canada saying in effect that there should be no ownership of handguns by Canadian citizens without a doggone good excuse to have one, yet we are permitting thousands upon thousands of non-Canadians to carry handguns in Canada. This is absolutely ludicrous. It is a situation which commends itself for immediate investigation and rectification by the government.

Then we come to the question of emergency gear when travelling in sparsely populated areas. Again this is something with which I have some experience. While it would be discomforting to me to have to fly in isolated areas without a hangun, I can live with it. However, I would sooner carry a handgun, which I have been doing now for some 24 years in the Yukon on every flight that I have ever gone on in my own aircraft. But now that will not be permitted. Now I am bound to carry a rifle, if I could get a licence to carry it, but there is no way I can get a permit any longer to carry a handgun as part of the survival gear in the aircraft.

Mr. O'Connell: Sure you can.

Mr. Nielsen: No, I cannot. I have checked with those who will be asked to carry the responsibility of administering this law. I was told that I will have to get along with a rifle from now on. I do not see why I should have to live with that, but I will live with it and I will carry a rifle if, as I said, I can get a licence to do so, and I do not think it will be all that difficult.

An hon. Member: Get a guarantor.

Mr. Nielsen: That is a whole new aspect to the bill. Who is to guarantee? I always encourage trips by members of parliament to the north. The more MPs who go across the 60th parallel up to the Northwest Territories and the Yukon the better I like it, because only then will they understand the circumstances. The hon. member who intervened in a good natured way raised the question of guarantors. Who in God's white earth up there will find a guarantor for an Inuit on King Christian Island? Where are we going to find a guarantor on Baffin Island, other than in Alert or some other place?

If a family from Old Crow, for instance, is out trapping on Crow Flats, as they do for months and months, where is the Eskimo going to get his guarantor or even the paper to sign which would let him have a rifle? This is impractical. I can see this kind of regulation—as my neighbour, the hon. member for the Northwest Territories said—applied in Toronto and in Montreal. My God, I see the need for it in Montreal. I can see the need for it in Vancouver or Hamilton.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Or in the Liberal caucus.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, the Liberal caucus, but by George, Sir, I cannot see the need for it in the 1,500,000 square miles above the 60th parallel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Forty per cent of Canada is populated by a total of 75,000 people, and the government is going to administer this law all over that area for the same purpose as it would in Hamilton or Toronto. Sir, this is completely impractical. I hope that the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice, whoever is responsible for drafting the amendments, will make an absolute exception of the native peoples in the two northern territories whose very livelihood depends on owning and using a firearm. I hope that an exception will be made before the bill gets to committee.

The Solicitor General spoke this afternoon of the government incorporating amendments into the bill as a result of suggestions made from this side. I hope not only the native question in the two northern territories will be made an exception, but also that an additional exception will be made, so far as handguns are concerned, for big game guides, outfitters, prospectors, and others who are

required by virtue of their jobs to exist in the northern wilderness. I suggest that the provisions with respect to licensing are simply impractical as far as the native peoples are concerned, and an exception should be made in that regard as well.

● (2040)

I hope that when this kind of legislation is planned in the future there will be some consultation with the people of the north through their elected representatives who sit on the respective territorial councils. The day is long gone when this kind of legislation can be prepared without that kind of consultation, notwithstanding what the Solicitor General says, both in this House and in the pamphlet he distributed to hon. members and others entitled "Questions and Answers Regarding Proposed Gun Control Legislation".

In that pamphlet the question is asked: was the hunting community consulted before this bill was drafted? The answer given is: it was. I say it was not. Certainly it was not in the Yukon, and it was not in the Northwest Territories. The answer goes on to say the following:

> Wide consultations preceded the drafting of the proposed legislation and many briefs from organizations of responsible gun-users and other interested bodies were received.
>
> Prominent among those who submitted briefs were the Canadian Wildlife Federation . . .

In almost the same mail in which I received that interesting pamphlet from the minister I received a critique from the Canadian Wildlife Federation dated March of 1976 analyzing Bill C-83, and on page 10 of that critique the committee of the Canadian Wildlife Federation says the following:

> Finally, the committee questions the manner in which the government prepared this draft legislation, draft legislation that has been in preparation for well over a year. Despite the fact that one of its main features would impose a licensing requirement on some two million Canadians, there has been no meaningful consultation with interested groups, and the over-all approach the government intended was a matter of mystery until the bill was tabled. The CWF offered to explain its position and to help in the collection of relevant information, but its offer was not even acknowledged.

There we have the Canadian Wildlife Federation denying the words of the minister in the House today, and denying the printed pamphlet, produced at government expense, saying that the government had consulted with the Canadian Wildlife Federation. Obviously they are at odds. Perhaps the government feels that tabling and exposing the bill is consultation, but that is not my idea of consultation, and it obviously is not that of the Canadian Wildlife Federation.

I do not think my mail has been unique, and I do not think the mail of any hon. members of this House, whether they be Liberal, NDP, Social Credit or Conservative, has been unique. I have received more letters and more complaints from my constituents on the gun control feature of this bill than on any other single subject. It has exceeded the correspondence I have received on such matters as abortion, capital punishment, and the like. In all my time here I have never had such an inundation of objections to a piece of legislation as the objections I have received with respect to this bill. That fact surely has been conveyed by the Liberal caucus to the cabinet, and every speech which has been made from this side which I have heard or read has conveyed the same thing. Surely that must carry some kind of message to the government that the legislation is lacking, that it is improper, and that there is a great need to amend it.

My voice here and the voice of my neighbour from the Northwest Territories are two small voices in this Chamber when it comes to legislation of this kind. There are only two members here for that 40 per cent of Canada, so perhaps we do not carry much weight, but there are 75,000 to 80,000 Canadian souls living in the north whose livelihood for the most part depends on the right to the free use of firearms.

I urge upon the government now, in the absence of the consultation there should have been, to heed my words and those of my neighbour from the Northwest Territories, and to incorporate the amendments we have both suggested into this bill. Otherwise it is going to work extreme hardship and, perhaps not inconceivably tragedy on certain families and individuals in the two northern territories.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the second reading debate on Bill C-83, many members have departed from the discussion on the principle of the bill to take out some excerpts, isolate them from their context, interpret them subjectively and as a result draw false and erroneous conclusions, losing sight of the true spirit of the legislation. I therefore feel I must take part in this debate to reiterate and analyze briefly Bill C-83 as a whole and its various general provisions.

Although I want to stress the intent of the bill, this does not mean that I think that some of its provisions may not be amended at the later stages of its study, so as to perfect it and make it more consistent with reality. In fact, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) already suggested that some amendments could be made to that effect. Rising crime rates, including rates of violent crime, are bringing home to Canadians that changes in the criminal law and in the administration of criminal justice are needed if the best possible protection is to be afforded to the public. The whole apparatus of criminal justice exists first and foremost to protect society against the effects of crime. Crime in Canada is not out of control, but it is much easier to maintain control than to regain it. It is for this reason that the Government is now putting forward the Peace and Security Program, a series of measures to amend the criminal law and improve the administration of criminal justice. These measures are designed to come to grips with the increasing incidence of crime in Canadian society and to meet the need the public feels for a greater measure of protection.

Public concerns focus upon the increase in violent crime; the difficulty encountered by the law officers in contending with the "untouchables" of organized crime; repeated crimes committed by accused persons released on bail; a few spectacular crimes committed by persons released mandatorily from federal institutions, by parolees and by offenders on temporary absence from prison; disturbances and hostage-taking in penitentiaries; repeated crimes by offenders who seem to be chronically violent; and finally, the tragic and spectacular crimes involving the use of firearms.

● (2050)

Protection against violent acts will precisely be provided in this bill through the following means: first, the provision of increased resources in crime prevention; second, a stricter program of gun control, including increased penalties for those using firearms while making a criminal offence, special provisions to ensure control over dangerous offenders, a real concerted attack against organized crime, by making police investigations easier through wiretap and by establishing a provincial commission of inquiry into criminal activities.

On that matter, incidentally, changes might probably be made to this legislation, in view of the recent decision by the Supreme Court of Canada declaring the Quebec Commission of Inquiry into Organized Crime as constitutional, and finally, the imposing of more efficient selection procedures for freeing violent criminals out in society and the exercise of a better surveillance of these offenders after their release.

We know that the program will also include plans to improve the training of policemen and prison personnel; speed up the building of smaller prisons which will eventually replace the fortress-like present institutions; improve the police special training programs to help law enforcement personnel cope with critical situations; assist police forces by introducing new policies and preventive measures; evaluate the effects of violent crime on its victims; get a better knowledge of the public response to the administration of justice and criminal law.

The House has already passed the bill, now before the Senate, which aims at amending the Criminal Code by, among other things, tightening the conditions for release under bail and correcting the abuses inherent in this system; making more difficult for the organized crime boss to bleach the money he has acquired through criminal activities; and changing rape trial procedure to ensure better protection for the victim.

At the present time the government is considering views expressed by the Law Reform Commission of Canada on some aspects of criminal law and its enforcement, and national consultation is going on to pass new legislation with respect to young offenders. The "Order and Security Program" therefore should be looked upon as a step in an ongoing process, not as the ultimate goal of the government with respect to the protection of society against violent crime.

It is appropriate to bear in mind that criminal justice is essentially a control mechanism and that it is not in itself responsible for the incidence or prevention of criminality in our society. Criminal justice concurs in limiting the incidence of criminality through the awe arising from the penalty it imposes on criminals and in preventing criminality through police action. What maintains order in society is the set of values of society and the efforts made to keep up in every citizen the conviction that he is responsible for his actions and his environment.

With regard to gun control, it is striking to realize that the public is increasingly concerned about the rise in gun-related crimes and incidents. Statistics show that murders committed with guns increased from 178 in 1970 to 272 in 1974. Indeed, guns are used in close to half of the murder cases. Moreover, each year guns are involved in more than one third of the 2,500 suicides and in more than 100 accidental deaths.

The present legislation controlling possession of handguns is among the best in the world. On the other hand, the owners of some 10 million long-barrel guns such as hunting rifles and shotguns are subjected to few restrictions on their use and handling. The government shares the public concern with respect to the role of guns in crimes, suicides and accidents. Therefore the Criminal Code has to be amended and other measures have to be proposed to control the general avaibility of guns, to promote increased public responsibility in relation to firearms, and to increase the penalties for the use of guns during the commission of offences.

However, the new legislation does not forbid either legitimate ownership or use of firearms for hunting and target-shooting. In the case of sanctions, the new provisions of this legislation provide for higher maximum sentences when used as offensive weapons. In addition, whenever an individual uses an offensive weapon in committing an indictable offense, he will be liable to a mandatory minimum penalty at least one year and up to 14 years, to run consecutively to any other.

With regard to arms seizure, the police is not now permitted to do so without warrant, except if a crime has already been committed or is being committed. In addition, the law allows the obtention of a warrant if there are good grounds to believe that possession of such weapons jeopardizes someone's interest and security. This provision will be extended to authorize a policeman to seize a weapon without warrant if he reasonably believes that an individual's security is endangered, and if there is no other way out. Thus, a policeman can seize a weapon when a threatening situation arises, for instance, in the case of domestic quarrels which contribute to one third of murders in Canada.

With respect to firearms availibility, we know that a great many of the 10 million guns in Canada are held by people who no longer have any use for them. The government must start a vast information and amnesty campaign to recover these useless weapons. The purpose of this campaign is to inform the Canadian people of the responsibilities underlying the possession of firearms and to encourage them to give over voluntarily these weapons at the nearest police station if they do not want to keep them. As far as prohibited or restricted firearms are concerned, the Criminal Code now requires the registration of firearms such as handguns and so on, and it allows the possession of such weapons only at home or at the place of business.

Under the new provisions of Bill C-83, the registration procedure for restricted firearms will become much stricter. The applicants will have to prove that they need these weapons even before a certificate is delivered. The only admissible reasons are the protection of life, legal position, authorized target practice and the collecting of such weapons in good faith. Some weapons are already prohibited. The legislation will extend this prohibition to cover weapons which were restricted before such as automatic weapons, weapons with sawed-off barrels and second-hand weapons which are not very expensive and not very accu-

rate, called "Saturday Night Specials". As far as the permit is concerned in Canada, the registration of all weapons seems neither possible nor really effective.

● (2100)

This legislation does not provide for the registration of long-barrelled guns but for the issuance of licences. This government believes it is more important to ensure that those who possess firearms or ammunition or those who want to acquire them are fit to do so. Therefore, anyone who owns a firearm or ammunition will require a license. Once more, it is not necessary to register them. This license will be valid for five years and will be issued only if the licensing officer is satisfied that the applicant's background warrants such issuance.

Further, the applicant must submit the statements of two guarantors who have known him for at least two years and who certify that to the best of their knowledge, the applicant is not unfit to get such a license. The fees collected from licensees will cover the cost of this system. People who are under 18 years of age who wish to use a firearm must apply for a special permit that will be issued subject to very strict conditions. This permit will be issued only for target practice, in hunting or in target practice training. Applications for a permit made by people who are under 18 must be signed by two guarantors, one being a parent or a close relative of the applicant. Special provision is made in the legislation to enable people under 18 to possess firearms for the purpose of hunting game for food or family support if, in given areas, hunting and trapping are part of the way of life. In such cases, the issuance of the permit will be free of charge in order not to increase the financial burden on these people. A permit is required for all firearms and ammunition dealers, wholesalers and retailers, importers and manufacturers. All these people must maintain records of all their transactions concerning arms and ammunition. These records will be regularly checked, and the legislation will also provide for other means to improve present import controls.

Also as regard firearms, in particular the legal responsibility, we must not simply scrutinize the case of those who possess fire arms and ammunition. We must also ensure that permit-holders are not minusing firearms. Careless handling and storage can lead to a maximum five-year jail term. As far as administration is concerned, it should be noted that control measures described in the bill require a flexible administration system. A large number of local registrars and licensing officers will be located throughout Canada, so that every Canadian may apply easily. In most cases, there is ample provision for appeals where a citizen feels his permit has been unfairly denied or cancelled.

When the government looked for ways of better protecting the public against violent crimes, they realized at once action was needed in respect of firearms. Availability is a natural incentive to crime. Moreover, firearms play an increasing role in various kinds of murders committed in Canada. Strict measures were needed to deter criminals from using guns. Prompt action was needed to ensure responsible possession and use of firearms.

There were some suggestions that carrying firearms was a right and attacks made on the government for attempting to regulate another area of the average Canadian's life. But these censors must recognize that firearms are too often an instrument of crime and a cause for accident. Failure to regulate their use would leave free hand to criminals and expose the public to the worst tragedies. Opponents of the program have nothing better to propose to prevent firearms abuse.

For that reason, the government had to propose the various measures contained in Bill C-83. It should be stressed that the right to own a firearm is not abolished. Those practising hunting or target shooting, young people desiring to join the militia or a gun club, all have the right to own a fire arm. Simply, they must obtain a permit. This will prevent firearms from falling into the hands of some potentially dangerous persons. The disadvantages of control are very little compared with the lives thus saved.

As for the dangerous delinquents, we know that for some ten years there has been a quite substantial increase in violent crimes in Canada. The new legislation is aimed at restraining the progress of criminality including rape and other sexual offences. It considers the creation of a group of dangerous delinquents liable to indefinite sentences, that is life sentences which could be periodically reviewed by the National Parole Board.

The bill wishes to abolish the present provisions of the Criminal Code concerning recidivism and dangerous sexual offences. It provides new provisions empowering the courts to impose an indefinite sentence in the case of all dangerous delinquents including sexual offenders. The present provisions of the code do not extend to all groups of dangerous sexual offences.

Once the offender is convicted, the court is asked to impose an indefinite sentence which will require the approval of the provincial Attorney General to be implemented. The indefinite sentence therefore replaces all other sentences provided by the law for crimes committed by dangerous offenders. The court can impose such a sentence if the offender has been convicted of an offence for which he can be sentenced to imprisonment for 10 years or more, and which include violence or an attempt at violence or a behaviour dangerous or potentially dangerous for the life of another person or a likelihood of inflicting severe psychological damage to another person.

Before a request for an indefinite sentence can be made however, the approval of the provincial Attorney General must be obtained. When making such a request, the court must be convinced that the offender constitutes a threat to the life, security or welfare of the public according to evidence or a repetitive behaviour pattern showing that the offender cannot control his actions and could cause injuries in the future, or a pattern of persistent aggressive behaviour, showing a substantial degree of indifference on the part of the offender as to the consequences of his behaviour, or a pattern of excessively brutal behaviour.

An indefinite sentence can be imposed if the offender has been convicted of rape, attempted rape, sexual intercourse or attempted sexual intercourse with a female under 16, indecent assault on female or male, or gross indecency, or if the offender has shown that he cannot repress his sexual impulses and will probably cause injury, pain or other evil to other persons through failure in the future to control his sexual impulses.

The proposed legislation provides for a certain number of safeguards for the offender, including the right to call as a witness any psychiatrist, psychologist or criminologist and the right to appeal the decision of the court. On the other hand, the Parole Board should review the case of a dangerous offender, first of all, at the latest three months after the verdict and then every two years, in order to determine whether the offender should be released in the community on condition and in such a case, under what conditions.

A periodical review appears necessary because the punishment does not include either the termination date, nor a fixed date of eligibility for parole, as is the case for all other offenders. The Parole Board will not release a dangerous offender unless two members of the regional community are admitted to the proceedings related to this subject.

Bill C-83 also includes measures relating to crime detection and electronic listening device. Six main amendments are involved in this bill. Courts may allow interception of communications with regard to all criminal offences instead of the limited number of crimes specified in the existing law. Further, any offence, criminal or not. may warrant an authorization, when such a offence seems to be part of an organized crime. Evidence derived directly or indirectly from an unlawful interception may be admitted by the court. This restores the common law rule in part but the unauthorized intercepted communication itself remains inadmissible and the act of interception punishable as a criminal offence. Court authorization for electronic surveillance will be extended from thirty to sixty days, experience having shown that the average interception is likely to last approximately sixty days. Evidence of an offence other than one for which the authorization was obtained will be made admissible in prosecuting that other offence.

Reporting by the media of an intercepted communication that has been revealed in open court will not constitute an offence. These changes are of course designed to increase the effectiveness of the police: still, the new powers should not be abused in order not to encroach upon the individual, right to princacy. Rigourous sanctions must apply, criminal and civil, in all cases of violation of these rights in line with the protection of the individual's rights to privacy granted by Parliament in 1974.

As to the provisions of Bill C-85 dealing with special crime inquiries the proposed amendements add to the traditionnal means by enabling the provincial authorities to create special commissions of inquiry when it is deemed neccessary to obtain knowledge about crime or criminal organizations, which is not likely to be acquired through the normal investigatory procedures. Those measures will no doubt be discussed in committee with respect to special crime inquiries, considering the recent judgment by the Supreme Court of Canada declaring constitutional the Quebec Commission of Inquiry into Organized Crime.

With respect to the custody and release of inmates, the bill includes amendements aimed at ensuring a better control of inamates in penitentiaries and bringing about amendements with respect to their paroling by way of full paroles, day paroles or temporary absences. Certain procedural safeguards will be introduced into parole hearings so the decision making of the Board will meet the expectations of criminal justice.

Those safeguards will call for the help of the applicant, the communication to him of additional information and the giving of the grounds in the event of the decision refusing him parole. These will be defined in regulations and will be phased in over a period of several years. Finally, Bill C-83 includes provisions dealing with crime prevention, police prevention, victimization, concerning studies every 18 months over the next five years to assess more accurately the incidence and effects of crime on victims. and with the defensible space, or accelarating work on the development of better knowledge on target hardening and environmental design. Also, there will be strategies to increase the crime resistant qualify of communities.

Those are briefly all the measures contained in Bill C-83 the principle and intention of which I approuve while awaiting its consideration in committee where witnesses will be heard and where in all likeliness amendments can be introduced to improve certain aspects, particularly those dealing with special inquiries on organized crime.

● (2110)

[*English*]

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just resumed his seat recognized the danger of the criminal to the law-abiding citizens of Canada but he did not recognize the greatest danger facing them today, that is, the government which sits opposite.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Towers: This bill merely reconfirms the fact that the government is incompetent to govern and too willing and determined to dictate. Bill C-83 would establish another bureaucracy which could not be fairly administered across this country but would be costly, inconvenient, a burden to policemen, judges and courts, and would place unwarranted restrictions upon experienced users and owners of guns who have not broken any law, as well as on all adult Canadians.

Aside from the inconsistencies in this legislation, which I intend to enlarge upon later, it has created a justifiable fear in the minds of Canadians. They are concerned because in this bill they see another of their freedons removed. Criminals and those bent on crime will not let gun licensing or registration forestall them in their efforts to maim, murder, steal, kidnap, escape custody, threaten guards and other law officers, or commit any other illegal act. This bill will not prevent or deter crimes caused by passion, anger, revenge, or by any planned or sudden desire to get even.

Owners of rifles or shotguns would be compelled to apply for a licence to continue ownership by completing an application form, not described, which could infringe on any human right the government chose, Two guarantors would be required to qualify an applicant for such a licence—their status is not stated. The guarantors would be subject to the discretion of a local firearms registrar, who in turn would be governed by guidelines to be laid down by order-in-council at some future date; the owner

must pay a fee, not stipulated. If the fee levied on such applicants does not pay the entire cost of the bureaucracy, all taxpayers will be called upon to make up the difference. It has been estimated that the implementation of Bill C-83 would require 500 additional policemen, 50 in the province of Alberta, plus necessary administrative staff. That is another example of how the government exercises restraint.

What is meant by "safe storage?" On whose interpretation of "safe storage" will the record of a citizen depend? There could be any number of definitions applied to what is or is not "safe." Locks can be broken on firearm cupboards or cases, doors can be forced, weapons held by licensed persons can be taken at gunpoint by those brandishing illegal or unlicensed firearms. When a home without firearms, or with firearms "safely" stored, due to the persuasion or enforcement of this legislation, is robbed, and its inhabitants are beaten, murdered, threatened or kidnapped, it is a little bit late to start defining whether or not their weapons of defence were safely stored or whether or not they should have beem granted a licence. The government will have rendered them helpless and defenceless. Too often innocent bystanders are victims of criminals, a fact apparently acceptable to this government.

What is meant by "need" of a firearm? Depending on conditions, area, situations, and countless other factors, who can really say whether or not a firearm is needed? This must be clarified because even collectors and dealers possess guns and other firearms as a "need" in their business or hobby.

What constitutes suspicion in the minds of policemen that a firearm might be used to commit a crime? How will police control firearms which have not been registered or licensed—do they have to search every household in Canada? Anyone who holds a grudge, who covets another's right to own a firearm, or for some other reason, could inform a policeman, or even a licence officer, that a neighbour or an enemy had acted in a suspicious manner,—and that person's home could be searched, without a warrant, and his licensed weapon seized without any legitimate reason whatsoever. Why harass law-abiding Canadians in a so-called aim at controlling the use of firearms?

What is the ruling for Canadians who work outside this country or who are employed away from their homes and perhaps only return there once or twice a year, or less often? Their firearms are in their homes. Is another member of an owner's family permitted to purchase a licence or register a gun in his absence? If the owner must take these steps in person, how long does he have to comply with these regulations? My constituents have submitted too numerous doubts and complaints to mention in the time allowed here.

How can any member of this House be so naive and disinterested in his electors to accept this bill in its present form? To add to the sham embodied in this bill, some government members have given a very weak excuse to get it into committee where necessary changes can and will be made when various organizations present their views. I refer to the offer of the Alberta Fish and Game Association to help in the preparation of this legislation. That offer was refused. My hon. friend from the Yukon has already brought this aspect to the minister's attention. Perhaps some Canadians can be fooled by that statement, but fortunately I know a little too much about the way standing committees operate under this government. We all know here that, on more than one occasion, when government back-benchers did not agree with a bill being studied in committee, they were removed from that committee. This is democracy Liberal style.

Perhaps it would not be unreasonable, either to remind everyone in this House that government members outnumber opposition members on every standing committee. That could be an understandable policy since the government has a majority, but the deplorable fact is that those Liberal MPs either will not or are not permitted to accept or approve suggestions of opposition members, regardless of their merit or what positive effect they would have on the majority of the general public. To say that my faith in the procedures followed in committees has deteriorated considerably each year in the short period I have been here is nothing but the truth. Most members are on committees because of their desire to work to improve legislation. I am well aware of their disillusionment.

It is not hard to figure out why the government enforced closure on Bill C-83 to get it into committee where those who oppose any part of it will not be given an opportunity to express their opinions. The government should know the people do not want this type of legislation; the government does not want to listen to elected representatives ouline their constituents' opinions or perhaps offer positive changes; no, the government only knows how to abuse the privilege of power; to silence those trying to do their duty; to shove legislation into committee; to pretend it is concerned about the many clubs, associations, and individuals who oppose some of the gun control clauses of Bill C-83 by extolling the virtues of committee amendments. That is the thinking of the cabinet, of the Minister of Justice, (Mr. Basford) and indeed of most of the Liberal backbenchers.

● (2120)

The government can exercise punishment when dealing with Canadians, most of whom are good citizens, but the same government backs off and cringes because it is inhuman to punish criminals, the law-breakers, those who feel this country owes them everything even though they give it nothing, and if they cannot obtain what they want without exerting themselves, they tote a firearm to be sure they do. Oh no, it would never do to hand out stiff sentences to that type of person—this government prefers to hinder and hamper, harass and frustrate a large portion of the population!

The bill sponsored by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) makes sense and conforms to the wishes of the people who have made their views known to me, and they are not all within my constituency either. Place the law where it can and will deter crime, and make that law a law which can fulfill its purpose.

I say that Bill C-83 would remove some of the security legitimate citizens of this country still have in today's so-called "Just Society." In the last eight years our society has deteriorated morally, physically, mentally to a degree, as a direct result of the permissive and ineffective legislation shoved through by the government. Government policies have encouraged immorality, indecency, obscenity;

and its over-financed Crown corporation, the CBC, emphasizes those policies by producing and importing examples of vulgarity, indecency, anything which is sacrilegious, stressing the illegal use of drugs, of alcohol, and violence, particularly the use of firearms.

When members of this House protest about these shows on behalf of their constituents they receive the stock answer, in a bored and disinterested voice, that the government cannot interfere in the operations of a Crown corporation, or that it is not the corporation's policy to reveal certain facts. Why not be honest and admit to this House and to the people of Canada that the government is neither interested in nor concerned about this nation and its people, or the direction in which Canada is being pushed—on a journey always downgrade?

I cannot understand how the conscientious MPs on the government side of this House, some of whom I know to be men or women of principle and decency, can go along with this type of bill. Have they explained its ramifications and curtailments, its inconvenience and vagueness, to their constituents? Do they listen to and act upon the requests or demands of their electors? Surely there is one cabinet member who knows inside himself that he does not agree with this dictatorial legislation. To be fair, members of the cabinet are expected to support all government bills, but does their exalted position render them immune to reactions of those who put them into parliament in the first place? They could not be ministers of the Crown had they not first been given the confidence and trust of their constituents, the people who pay their salaries and benefits.

The Minister of Justice is following the same pattern of previous legislation by lumping several positive and acceptable measures into Bill C-83 with controversial, unacceptable, and ineffective rules and regulations on gun control. Apparently this is another attempt on the part of the government to convince Canadians that those of us who oppose some of the clauses on gun control are not in favour of those dealing with crime. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are not lead down the garden path so easily; they learned from experience with earlier legislation foisted on them by this government.

I would urge every member of this House to explain to those whom they represent just what this bill will demand. No individual should misunderstand a measure dealt with in this House simply because his MP camouflaged the negative aspects and emphasized the positive and acceptable ones. The government has confused people more than enough with its red tape and bureaucracies.

Before this bill reaches the committee stage—where we all work hard and do our best to protect people—the gun control clauses should be removed and presented separately, and hopefully strengthened in the right areas.

Why make it more difficult for young persons to be taught how to handle and use a firearm safely? Careless handling of these weapons causes many tragedies. Young people today have enough problems without taking away one of their useful pleasures. Can we expect young Canadians, or anyone for that matter, to improve their way of life when those who break the laws are not appropriately punished? The Minister of Justice and his cabinet colleagues have forgotten the word "punishment" and how it should be applied to law offenders—they prefer to curtail the rights of those who obey the laws.

Recently it has been reported that the Minister of Justice believes some offences under the Criminal Code are outdated, are Victorian, and should be removed—another move to protect criminals and indecent citizens. What that will do is encourage more crimes because there will be even less legal control of delinquents. Just because several years have passed since certain acts were included in the Criminal Code does not mean that society has to lower its standards. That is the obvious aim of the government—to make everything which is indecent and inhuman, behaviour even below the level of animals, legal in our Canada, to remove some necessary offences from the Criminal Code, but initiate new ones to curtail legitimate activities of decent people. What do Canadian voters as a whole think of that?

This parliament should tighten up and enforce the laws we now have, and implement effective legislation aimed at those who need to be controlled under our legal system. Did government members come to the House of Commons to fight for the wrongs of the minority of Canadians, or to fight for the rights of the majority who live within the law? Think about that question—my constituents do.

On the positive side no doubt most Canadians who abide by the laws of our land want penalties for the illegal use of firearms. Weapons such as knives, clubs, tools, and countless other objects can never be registered, licensed or placed under control. Bill C-83 will not curb murderers because anyone intent on killing will use any weapon available.

If the sentence for a crime committed with a firearm were scaled according to the offence; sale of firearms were restricted, one of the sensible clauses of this Bill; and if offenders were punished as they ought to be, the Minister of Justice would have received support in the House of Commons and from the Canadian public. Think how much more logical and reasonable, how much less expensive, how easier to administer Bill C-83 would be if it were directed toward the law-breakers? Mr. Speaker, is this too much to expect; is this too easy for this heavy-handed government to accept?

The government prefers to involve the entire adult population of this country through cumbersome, ineffective, vague, unacceptable, and unnecessary measures, some of which are already in force under provincial legislation. This bill duplicates the laws now on the provincial statutes. Why double up on the licence requirement and the cost? The legislation should not have been formulated at all until negotiated agreements had been entered into with every provincial government and territory.

Rather than face up to its responsibilities by introducing policies and legislation which would adequately bolster our flagging economy and help those on or below the poverty line, the government goes out of its way to create situations which drive a certain segment of our population into crime. Bills with the frightening impact of Bill C-83 perhaps do upset people to the degree that they forget about this country's economic mess temporarily, but let us never forget that Canadians are intelligent and have long memories, perhaps into the year 1978 or 1979.

[Mr. Towers.]

People who want to earn an honest living for themselves and to provide for their families do not turn to crime, even though they hand back too much of their earnings to a spendthrift government. Why does anyone rob another? It is usually to obtain money or a thing of value to sell. Why are so many able-bodied Canadians today unwilling to accept the jobs offered? One cannot blame those who do not believe they should work for their living because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said those who do not want to work need not do so. How true that is under the programs of his government. To encourage laziness and destroy incentive fosters crime. When criminals are not punished, and I mean punished, when in prison, they look to prisons for their livelihood, and why not? They are not compelled to work there either.

Instead of spending the time of this House on legislation to restrict our people's freedoms, the government should be bringing in legislation to provide work, to see that those who are able do work before they receive benefits, and to deal with law-breakers as criminals instead of coddling them as if they were privileged.

To get to the root of crime and criminals one must consider the moral standards of a country, how our fellowman is treated, and what has turned a good citizen into a law-breaker. Rehabilitation of prisoners is important and necessary, but more important are the maintenance and rehabilitation of people before they are lead or driven along that downward road. Many offences are committed because of frustration, permissiveness, domination, insecurity, malnutrition, improper conditions, with no future goal.

● (2130)

First offenders are entitled to careful treatment, humane discipline, and an opportunity eventually to return to mingle with their friends, neighbours and families, to work to better themselves. Very often ex-inmates return to lives of crime simply because they know they will be afforded every comfort in prison, and little punishment for another offence. One never hears of an escapee or a former prisoner failing to commit a crime for want of a weapon.

This bill would place restrictions on millions in a lame attempt to trap the minority who are bent on breaking the law. Punishment is meted out to legitimate citizens to protect delinquents, who do not earn their keep, so law-abiding Canadians pay once more.

Many of my constituents have expressed doubts and asked countless questions about Bill C-83. Does the government not realize how difficult it will be to administer this vague and inadequate legislation? Did no one, not even within cabinet, stop long enough to think what the cost would be and how policemen would be hampered, while citizens are harassed, by these measures? Our police are faced with too many risks to their lives now, as well as with escapees who do not honour life. Why should they when their own is not at stake? Already-over-burdened officers of the law will be loaded down with innumerable additional investigations and doubts under this bill.

People are wondering what the next federal infringement on their basic rights and fundamental freedoms will be. My people want to know why the ideas and recommendations of one person or of a small group are accepted and legislated by the government while the suggestions, opinions, and pleas of millions of taxpayers are ignored. Even cabinet ministers were elected to parliament to listen to their constituents and to heed the majority of Canadians on important issues like this. In their comfortable pews, in which they are untouchable and unreachable inside or outside this Chamber, have they forgotten completely why they are here? I want to remind them that they are here to serve Canada and her people, not to turn our country into a dictatorship just to satisfy their or their colleagues' whims. Parliament's duty and role should be to legislate for the betterment of Canada and Canadians and uphold democracy. This government, Mr. Speaker, has become too accustomed to shoving measures through this House and committees.

The Minister of Justice and his colleagues could still redeem some of the respect they have lost and improve the image they have marred. They could do this by supporting the amendment by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and regain a degree of the faith of the people of this country. They could do so by one simple procedure—divide Bill C-83 by placing the gun control provisions in a separate bill. Human nature admires anyone who admits he is wrong; everyone is entitled to some mistakes and misjudgments. Mr. Speaker, it takes a big man to admit his failures, and I would hope that the government is big enough in the right way to reconsider Bill C-83 and our requests.

If the government refuses to go along with the reasonable proposal to divide Bill C-83, all the excuses, camouflages, coverups, yes even telephones calls, or personal representations, will not and cannot turn it into a responsible and dependable government.

The government has a lot of answers to give. Why did the cabinet not accept the offer of fish and game associations to assist in drafting suitable gun legislation? Has the government already started to hire personnel to administer this program? Is the reported estimate of 900 employees going to be required to implement these laws? These are only a few of the questions not answered; there will be many more if this bill is passed in its present form.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words on Bill C-83, the peace and security package of legislation which the government has brought before the House. I believe legislation to control crime is being demanded by our Canadian people all across this country.

This bill deals with many aspects of our criminal justice system. We know of course these measures are not a total answer to the problem of crime. The crime rate has increased by about 31 per cent between 1970 and 1974. These measures are but the tools with which the police forces and our courts can deal with crime more effectively. The total problem relates to many aspects of our society including our family life, the media, the attitudes of our society, housing, our education programs, unemployment and our whole value system. Although the steps we take in this legislation are important and necessary, surely they do not represent the total answer because that is a much wider question.

It is interesting to note that in this session of parliament we have already passed Bill C-71 to tighten up the bail laws and provide for better security of people in our communities in respect of dangerous persons. A person charged with serious offences or charged a second time on a serious offence while on bail will have to show why he should be granted bail.

The peace and security legislation before us now makes a new provision related to dangerous offenders which will replace the present law related to habitual criminals and dangerous sex offenders. The penalty provided under the section relating to dangerous offenders will be indeterminate and will apply to persons involved in crimes of personal violence or sex related crimes such as rape, indecent assault, and gross indecency, crimes which carry a penalty of 10 years or more. Safeguards are provided for this very severe penalty by the necessity of an application to the provincial attorney general of the province involved for this offence.

Another safeguard for the accused will be that after the first three years of the sentence the National Parole Board would review the sentence at least every two years to make sure that a person is not put away indefinitely under unreasonable circumstances. Likewise, the community to which the person under an indeterminate sentence would be paroled would be protected because the parole board would have two members added to it from the area to which the offender might return.

The legislation before us increases the powers of the police to deal with organized crime by giving more power to wiretap phone-calls for longer periods and the removal of the necessity to notify people that their phones have been tapped. I understand the complaints which have been made by the police in this type of case during the last few years. If the police were not completely sure they would get enough evidence to secure a conviction in the one series of wiretaps they would not do it because they would have to notify the criminal within 90 days, and therefore he would know he was being investigated.

I believe the public's right to privacy will be adequately protected by the necessity for an application to a court for the permission to wiretap. That is of course provided for by this legislation and under the existing legislation. It seems to me that this provision after its application for a few years should be reviewed by the government to make sure it is not being abused.

These are a few of the provisions of this bill. There are many others such as those relating to crime commissions and parole and the Parole Board. However, part of this legislation has been the gun control section of the bill. Even last year before we had this peace and security legislation before us and Senator Cameron's bill relating to gun control was before the other place, I received many letters and inquiries from constituents concerning gun control.

● (2140)

I believe that the public consciousness with regard to the whole question of gun control has been heightened by two tragic incidents which occurred in high schools in Ottawa and in Brampton this past year. The hon. member for Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Milne) spoke the other night in the House and described in a very vivid way those tragic incidents which occurred in Brampton in his constituency. These were dramatic and tragic events which were reported on front pages from coast to coast, but they are not isolated ones.

In 1974 some 1,500 people died in Canada from gun shot wounds. That is a 30 per cent increase since 1970. Firearms were used in half of Canada's 543 murders in 1974, and in at least one third of the 15,000 robberies which occur each year. A recent public opinion poll showed that over 80 per cent of Canadians favour registration of firearms. However, in spite of this large percentage favouring some form of gun control, a large number of people are very concerned that this legislation will not be totally effective. I have received a large number of letters, petitions, and inquiries from fishing and hunting associations and gun clubs in my constituency.

There seem to be several misunderstandings of the legislation which I think are worth mentioning. For example, some people believe that all guns will be banned. They will not. Some believe that all guns will be confiscated. They will not. Others believe that all guns will be registered. They will not. Some people believe that a person would be responsible for a crime committed with a gun that was stolen from him even though he took reasonable care in storing it. He will not, of course.

Having mentioned some of the areas in which I believe there is misunderstanding of the legislation, I should like to mention some of the provisions of the gun control legislation. Especially dangerous weapons, such as machine guns, will continue to be prohibited. Other guns, such as sawed off shotguns and cheap handguns like the "Saturday Nite Special" will be prohibited as well. The government, by order in council, may add to this list of prohibited weapons, but it cannot add guns of a sporting or hunting nature. That would have to be done by parliament. Handguns will continue to be licensed, as they are now, as restricted weapons, but they will be licensed on a needs basis, and the need for these guns will be for protection of life, for use in a legitimate business, for target practice, or as collectors' items.

Long guns will not be licensed, but gun owners will. People 18 years of age and over will be licensed for a five year period under the proposals of the bill. Special licensing of younger people between the ages of 14 and 18 will be required for hunting, for target practice, of for training in the use of firearms, provided that the parents or guardians are in agreement. There is also a special provision for younger than 18-year-old hunters who live in areas in Canada where hunting is a necessity for food.

Owners of guns will be required to take reasonable care in storage of guns. Too many tragic accidents occur every year as a result of careless use and storage.

Police will be given authority to seize a weapon if they consider that the gun constitutes an imminent danger to the safety of a person. For instance, if a police officer is called to a domestic squabble and there is a gun involved, this provision could be used, and it would be more practical than the present law which requires a police officer to have a warrant.

Possession of guns used in the commission of an indictable crime will constitute an offence, carrying a penalty of from one to 14 years. This could have a significant deterrent effect on the hardened criminal. The argument is often made that a professional criminal can always steal a gun so what is the value of the licence? That may be true, but at present a person who is released from prison can go to a store and purchase a gun without any inhibitions whatsoever, and then go out and commit a crime. It seems to me that this provision would have a deterrent effect.

When we look at the number of murders committed in the United States as compared to Canada we see that in the United States some 75 per cent of murders committed with a gun are committed with a handgun, whereas in Canada, where possession of handguns has been restricted for many years, only 25 per cent are committed with handguns. So it seems to me that this is some indication that this provision would have some deterrent effect even on the professional criminal.

Likewise it seems to me that in the impulse crime where a person has a fight with his next door neighbour, flies into a rage and rushes down to a store to buy a gun and then commit a crime, such a licensing provision would require time, provide a cooling off period, and would have a deterrent effect.

Likewise a person who has a problem with alcohol or drugs or who is mentally unstable, or a person who has suicidal tendencies, could be screened out by a licensing procedure and be deterred from an incident involving a gun.

Similarly it seems to me that the provisions in this bill would be quite beneficial in the case of careless handling and storage of guns and other weapons. We often hear of children having guns and either hurting themselves or injuring others. This legislation draws attention to the careless storage and handling of guns and not taking proper precautions to preserve the safety of others. The present Criminal Code provides for the use of guns, but this bill adds the provision with regard to storage and with regard to taking proper precautions against injury to others.

There are a number of areas which members of the committee, when they start the study of this legislation, should look at in detail. Perhaps they can strengthen the legislation and make it more practical. One of these areas is the careless storage and handling of guns. A great deal of concern has been expressed about this. I should like to see the committee do a detailed study on this. Certainly proper and reasonable care of guns and storage of guns in a bush camp in northern Ontario will be different from proper storage and handling of guns in downtown Toronto. I hope that the committee will review that provision to make sure that it is practical and workable.

It seems to me that proposed section 106.8(1)(g)(ii) relating to agreements with the provinces could be studied in detail in the committee. This provides for agreements with the provinces under the regulations for the licensing, and implementation of this act. It seems to me that there should be maximum co-ordination with the provinces in that regard.

● (2150)

Many provinces already have hunting licences which require a competency test. Although I am not aware of the details in every province, some provinces may have a fitness test as well, so it seems to me that this provision is very important because in many northern areas where a great deal of hunting is done practically all the gun owners are either hunters or sportsmen. By co-ordinating with the provinces we would be cutting down on bureaucracy, red tape, and duplication of efforts, and likely reducing the cost of the administration of this proposed legislation.

Likewise it seems to me that the committee will want to consider the possibility when phasing in this kind of legislation how it could be co-ordinated with the present hunting licence provisions, especially in northern and remote areas of our country where nearly all guns are used for hunting purposes and where the number of crimes related to gun incidents is minimal.

The third matter at which I should like to see the committee take a close look is the purchase of ammunition in northern and remote areas. We should think of the situation which would occur in northern Ontario and in many areas of the west where the housewife would have to drive 40 or 50 miles to town to buy provisions for her family, and she would not be able to pick up a box of .22 shells which her husband would need to kill vermin or groundhogs. It seems to me that we must look closer at that provision to make sure it is practical and workable, and that we are not just writing a bill which is suitable for downtown Montréal, Toronto or Vancouver.

Those are some of the main matters on which I should like to see the committee go into more detail as it studies this legislation. When this legislation is before the committee, the committee will want to have representatives of fish and game groups and of hunting clubs come before it to outline the practical difficulties in implementing a program like this. We are all aware that difficulties will occur and that no draftsman can ever prepare a bill which is completely perfect, and surely we want to have the deliberations and suggestions which have been made in this House reflected in the work of the standing committee.

Having said all that, I believe we should move on to see this legislation dealt with by the committee. I hope the committee can review it and make improvements, where it is possible, so that we can have a workable and practical piece of legislation which at the same time will improve public safety in Canada.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, when the debate resumes tomorrow I should like to share some of my philosophical thoughts on this subject with hon. members. In the few moments remaining tonight I should like to start—and it will be finished tomorrow—an adventurous phantasy into what would happen if this bill becomes law. I set it in the Halifax area, the front line trench in two world wars, and I think about an occasion—after Royal Assent might be given to the bill in its present form—in which a task force from the enemy lands in Halifax. These people are armed with one of the deadliest weapons which can be used by one part of mankind against another. What is that deadly weapon? It is the Criminal Code of Canada as revised by Bill C-83.

Measures Against Crime

The first armed Canadian meets the foreign invader. He tells him to stand and surrender. The foreign invader replies, "My good man, you cannot carry a loaded rifle." The Canadian soldier, who was not born yesterday, says, "By George, I can," and he points to clause 89 of the present Bill C-83 as set forth at page 7, which reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding anything in this Act, (*a*) a member of the Canadian Forces or of the armed forces of a state other than Canada that are lawfully present in Canada . . . is not guilty of an offence under this Act by reason only that he has in his possession a weapon for the purpose of his duties or employment.

"So there," says our Canadian soldier," I do have a right to carry this rifle." "Not so" says the invader, "have you checked clause 88 of the legislation?" Section 88 says:

> Every one who, not being the holder of a licence under which he may lawfully have in his possession firearms or ammunition, knowingly has in his possession any firearm or ammunition . . .

"That," says the foreign invader, "is where you are caught, my Canadian friend." Indeed the Canadian soldier is caught. Under the bill he is certainly entitled to carry his rifle, but under the bill he is not entitled to carry any ammunition in it." And for that offence," says the foreign invader, "there will be two years to be served in one of Her Majesty's prisons."

That is only the first of at least four horrendous episodes which could happen to our brave Canadian soldier fighting on the beaches of Halifax against a foreign invader armed with a revised Criminal Code of Canada, and I will tell the rest of that story when the debate resumes tomorrow.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and I will just be a moment. I wish to ask the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader if he would be kind enough to consult with his colleagues in the other place to see if they can rectify what I can only assume was a bad error in the drafting and passing of Bill C-92, an act to provide for compensation for former prisoners of war, in that it omits any mention of prisoners of war from World War I. There are still quite a number of these people around. They could be as young as 74 or 73. Surely it must be an omission or error that they were not included in Bill C-92, and I ask the parliamentary secretary to consult with his friends in the other place to see if this can still be rectified.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I will even talk to a couple of the hon. members' friends as well.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[Mr. McCleave.]

SOCIAL SECURITY—SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PENSION SCHEMES

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 2, as reported in *Hansard* at page 12407, I put the following question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde):

> In view of the studies which have been made by the Canadian Council on Social Development with regard to public sector pensions and in view of the call which came recently from the Canada Pension Conference for an inquiry into what is happening in the private sector with regard to pensions, will the minister consider undertaking a thorough review or establishing a public inquiry into pension policy, both public and private, so that we can be sure that things will go well down the road?

If I may paraphrase the minister's reply, it was to the effect that high level studies are being conducted in his department and in the Department of Finance, and that therefore at that moment the minister did not feel that he needed to give me an affirmative answer to my question, but I am happy to say that he left the door open.

● (2200)

My question is obviously one that looks to the future, but it could be a future that is closer than we realize. Before I expand on my question let me just say in a sentence or two that I am sure the minister still knows I am deeply concerned about some immediate improvements that I believe ought to be made in pension policy. In particular, I think that now is the time for an increase in the basic amount of old age security. I also think, even though this is still the session in which the bill was passed providing for spouses' allowances, that the time has come when widows and spinsters, and widowers and bachelors, should be permitted to qualify for the benefit that is now available to spouses between 60 and 65 who have older partners drawing old age security. Discrimination against persons of single status should be ended. The minister knows that, but I do not want him to forget it.

Nevertheless I think it important that we consider the implications of my question of last Friday. The study that I had in mind by the Canadian Council on Social Development is the one entitled: "How Much Choice? Retirement Policies in Canada", published in November, 1975, which was followed up recently by a statement on retirement policies issued by the Canadian Council on Social Development itself.

This study looks very closely at public pension policy and goes into the question of whether in the future we should continue to have only a portion of our pension policy in the public sector, leaving a large element in the private sector, or whether there should be an increasing involvement of the public sector in pension policy.

The Canadian Pension Conference to which I also referred has gone into this matter and expressed some concern, almost alarm, about the future of private pension plans, and this raises the whole question fo whether there should not be an expansion of what is being done in the public sector.

May I digress for a moment to say that studies and papers are being written and produced in the United States with regard to the situation down there which are even more alarming than the statements made in this country.

And rightly so, Mr. Speaker, because I think that our public sector pension plans in Canada are much more soundly based. We started early on a universal scheme which is nation-wide, and I think we are in a better position for the future.

Then we hear other voices, such as some of the provinces that like to be able to borrow money out of the Canada Pension Plan fund at a low rate of interest, making statements about the fact that not very far down the road the rates that Canadians will have to pay under the Canada Pension Plan will have to be increased not just to protect their pension position but to provide low borrowing rates for the provinces.

Then we hear voices of other groups that just do not like universal pensions, universal family allowances, groups that are still saying that these things should be done away with and that payments should be made only in cases of need.

I submit that all of these matters call for the kinds of studies that are taking place in the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of Finance, but time creeps up on us very fast and we could be in trouble. Some of these plans could fail to achieve all the things that we hoped they would achieve. Instead of waiting until there is a crisis, I think an over-all study by a public inquiry or a commission is something that the minister and his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), should establish, and would bring credit upon themselves for doing so.

The minister knows that I think we have to move more in the direction of the, Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan providing almost entirely for the retirement years of our people. I think the Canada Pension Plan has to be enlarged. It has to take over a good deal of what the private sector is now doing. However, that is part of what should be studied, so I leave it at that.

I confess that I have included in what I have said tonight some of my own ideas as to what ought to be done now. I think my proposals should be implemented. However, the main burden of my making these remarks tonight and the reason I am particularly glad the minister is here, and I appreciate his staying for the late show, is that I seriously think that the idea of an over-all study of pension policy is overdue. I hope that tonight the minister will open the door even a little wider to such a study.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my answer on April 2, the issue of a review of public and private pension policy is currently under study by the government.

Officials from my department, along with officials of the Department of Finance and the department of insurance, are currently preparing a situation report on pension policy for cabinet. This report will review all available information on current pension policy and programs. The review by the officials will take into account such issues as those raised in studies prepared by the Canadian Council on Social Development and others. On receipt of that report my colleagues and I will consider what steps should be taken to assist in the future development of policies dealing with retirement issues.

No decision has been taken one way or another with regard to implementing a more ambitious study, either within government or public inquiry or review. I am not ruling out such possibilities, but such a decision would only be made following an examination of the report prepared by our officials.

The hon. member stressed tonight some urgency on the issue. I submit to him that before embarking on a broad ranging royal commission type of study which we might not need, there would be some merit in assessing whether we can arrive at conclusions much faster and by a less elaborate way. I need only refer the hon. member to the experience with the Carter Commission. From the time the commission started until the legislation was finally implemented, a span of almost ten years had elapsed. Also, the final project was much different from what came out of the commission. The hon. member has been in the House much longer than I. He knows as well as I do that royal commissions are not exactly the panacea given this type of situation or problem.

The desire is to put into effect improvements in the area of pensions in Canada. Several have resulted from the social security review. I have no doubt that there are still several important issues to be dealt with and I hope this can be done rather speedily.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear!

AIR TRANSPORT—THREATENED STRIKE OF SAFETY OPERATIONS GROUP—GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO ASSURE CONTINUED OPERATIONS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on the air safety inspector walkout. I find it strange that neither the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) nor his parliamentary secretary are here. I can only assume that there is some secretary here who has nothing to do with this subject at all.

I will have to put on the record two questions to the Minister of Transport. First, in view of the fact that Transport Canada's involvement and authority in air carrier inspection arose out of recommendations contained in Justice Gibson's report of January 29, 1971, into the DC-8 crash of July 5, 1970, at Toronto, why, contrary to these recommendations, has Transport Canada surrendered this authority to the very airline that was subject of this inquiry in the first place, Air Canada?

Second, if at the time this authority was surrendered to Air Canada the minister was unaware that this policy of having Transport Canada Civil Aviation inspectors supervise airline inspection arose out of recommendations contained in Justice Gibson's report, can he assure this House that the authority granted Air Canada on April 2, 1976, will be revoked?

A message from Transport Canada dated April 2, 1976, stated that they were proposing the appointment of chief flying instructors as air carrier designated examiners. It further stated it has been decided to institute a trial program for a period of up to 12 months. This is definitely a move to replace safety inspectors who are on strike. These Air Canada appointments are an obvious attempt at strike breaking by the Liberal government, especially by the

Minister of Transport and by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) who are placing strike-breaking before air safety. A similar notice has been sent to CP Airlines granting some of their pilots the right to become inspectors for a 12-month period.

● (2210)

I should like to quote from the autumn, 1973, issue of the magazine "Pilot". We find there a statement by Mr. Walter McLeish on the role of the Air Canada inspector. Mr. McLeish is the Director General of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Transport. In his statement he said:

It should be obvious that in the public interest and in order to verify the minister's certification, inspections of every operating certificate holder must be conducted on a continuing and orderly basis to ensure that the holder continues to be "adequately equipped and able to conduct a safe operation".

He went on to say:

After the Air Canada's DC-8 accident in Toronto in July, 1970, and as a direct result of specific recommendations made in Judge Gibson's report, authority was received to expand air carrier inspection activities . . .

Further on Mr. McLeish said:

To assess the effectiveness and standard of the initial training program he (the air carrier inspector) will observe parts of the program and then conduct the initial type proficiency checks or the upgrading checks . . . he will conduct the proficiency checks on the designated company check pilots.

Who is going to check the check pilots when their licences run out if the safety inspectors are on strike? This question must be answered in the interest of the safety of the travelling public and of air crews.

In Mr. Justice Gibson's report dated July 5, 1970, the following statement appears:

Most check pilots are reluctant to report a competent line pilot in such a manner as to incriminate him and, I suspect, some check pilots were in favour of the above so-called malpractice in that it reduced the number of bad landings.

This is a retrogressive move going back to all inspections being made by check pilots.

Further on appears this statement:

As the evidence indicated that some Air Canada check pilots did not insist that certain Air Canada pilots adhere strictly to the operating procedures described in Air Canada's DC-8 operating manual (it is recommended) that Air Canada take whatever steps are necessary to make certain that all its check pilots require that all pilots adhere strictly to the operating procedures laid down for this type of aircraft as prescribed in the said manual.

This practice must be stopped and the Minister of Transport must become personnally involved in this labour dispute in the best interests of air safety.

I go on now to quote from the rules and regulations of the Ministry of Transport with regard to air safety inspection, reading from section 8 which has to do with indoctrination and training. There we find the following:

a) Indoctrination and training for all examiners will normally be supervised by an MOT inspector holding corresponding licence and rates appropriate to the particular examiner designation.

b) Responsible inspectors will instruct, observe, test and evaluate to the extent necessary to ensure prospective examiners possess:

(1) Satisfactory knowledge of their responsibilities with respect to the authority granted to them by the MOT.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

(2) Sufficient knowledge, ability and skill required to conduct a particular test.

You can see that this has all been placed aside with the appointing of those Air Canada check pilots while the safety instructors are out on strike.

The document continues:

(3) Satisfactory knowledge of MOT's evaluation, grading standards, formats and reports associated with the particular examiner function.

(c) In determining the above, inspectors will observe the prospective examiner's conduct, evaluate grade and critique at least one complete pilot proficiency check appropriate to the licence involved. If prospective examiners do not satisfy all requirements they will not be approved.

(d) Responsible inspectors will impress upon prospective examiners they will be representing and responsible to the MOT. Prospective examiners must understand that many company pilots, economics—

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

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) I should like to respond to the hon. gentleman's question. The hon. member's statement that 11 Air Canada pilots have expired licences may be quite correct. However, I am informed that this is a fluid situation which may vary from day to day due to the fact there is only one official in most regions available to process licensing documentation. Certain limited measures to relieve the licensing situation, without prejudice to safety, have been introduced. However, the period during which they may continue to be implemented diminishes with each passing day and the situation will deteriorate progressively, and eventually operations may have to be curtailed unless the strike is settled.

In view of the foregoing, therefore, it is the minister's intention to keep himself informed as to the general situation and await developments while continuing to ensure, through all means at his disposal, the provision of safe air transportation for the flying public.

FLOODS—DATE OF COMPLETION OF STUDY OF MEASURES TO PREVENT FLOODING IN MONTREAL AREA

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue in greater depth tonight a question I asked yesterday of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) involving a study of flooding, with particular reference to those riverside areas of the constituency of Vaudreuil that suffered such extensive damage in the floods of 1974 and again this year, 1976.

I note from the records that in the Montreal area damage costs in 1971 exceeded $2 million, whilst protection costs were some $290,000. In 1972 damage costs exceeded $6 million, whilst protection costs were some $260,000.

In a general news release dated October 3, 1974, it was stated that "Environment Canada minister Jeanne Sauvé and the Minister of Natural Resources for Quebec Gilles Massé . . . announced the beginning of an intensive two-year study of methods to alleviate flooding in the Montreal area. The joint study was to involve the federal Depart-

ment of Public Works and Transport, Quebec's Environmental Protection Service and Hydro-Quebec."

The study was to concentrate mainly on the area around Lake St. Louis, the St. Lawrence downstream to Vercheres, Lake of Two Mountains, and the two rivers, des Prairies and des Milles Iles.

Montreal and its heavily developed suburbs, situated at the confluence of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence, are particularly vulnerable to flood damage. Flooding occurs whenever the combined discharge of the two rivers exceeds the natural capacity of channels around the Island of Montreal. The flood hazard is compounded when the water level in the Great Lakes and Ottawa drainage basins is abnormally high, as it has been in recent years.

Several alternatives to be examined by the study board are changes in regulation of the Ottawa River, structural changes in the channels around Montreal, and a program of dyking and land-zoning for flood prone areas.

The following day, October 4, 1974, in a news release, Environment Canada Minister Jeanne Sauvé invited a new federal approach to reduce the mounting toll of damages caused by floods. She said, "Canada has to reduce the toll of personal suffering and financial loss due to floods."

Experience has shown that a flood damage reduction policy based on structural work alone may not be effective. Alternatives to be considered include land use adjustments such as acquisition and zoning, flood warning and forecasting, flood routing through property easements, flood-proofing of structures, up-stream storage, stream straightening, flood by-passing, and dykes.

● (2220)

A resolution passed by the town of Pierrefonds on October 21, 1974, reads in part:

[*Translation*]

WHEREAS the Hon. Jeanne Sauvé, Minister of Environment, and the hon. Gilles Massé have recently issued a joint press release authorizing a new study of the means to control floodings in the Montreal area;

WHEREAS the committee is not required to submit its report before 1976;

It is resolved that our elected representatives be asked to raise questions in the House of Commons and in the National Assembly to determine what procedures will be taken to restrict floodings during that study and to compensate for the hardships and damages endured by our citizens during that time.

[*English*]

To the question I asked in December, 1974, which reads:

[*Translation*]

To this date, what is the total estimated amount of the claims for compensation under the Federal Aid Program for last spring's flood in the Province of Quebec?

[*English*]

—the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Chrétien) answered:

[*Translation*]

. . . the province has provided no official estimate of the expenditures it expects to make for this purpose.

[*English*]

To the second part of the question, which was:

[*Translation*]

Are discussions with the provincial government under way or being arranged to provide for an equivalent amount of money to prevent further floods?

And the answer was:

No discussions have been held with the provincial government to provide any money to prevent further flooding, nor are any such discussions scheduled.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, my three questions are: First, the question posed by the town of Pierrefonds which reads:

[*Translation*]

What procedures will be taken to restrict floodings during that study and to compensate for the hardships and damages endured by our citizens during that time.

[*English*]

Second, has the study been as exhaustive as it was stated it would be in 1974, including consideration of acquisition as well as stream straightening?

Third, will federal funds contributed in 1974 and 1976 be cumulative for purposes of ascertaining the extent of the federal contribution to preventive works recommended by the report?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for his persistence in this matter. I am sure he should rightfully accept some of the credit when this thing is eventually worked out.

Finding the best way of reducing human suffering and damages due to floods in the Montreal area is a very complex matter, as the hon. member stated. The floods are due to one or a combination of three main factors, high flows from Lake Ontario down the St. Lawrence River, high flows in the Ottawa River, and floods from local rivers. To complicate matters further, water levels may be seriously affected by ice jams along the various waterways. It is not then surprising that it has taken several years for the Canada-Quebec technical committee started in May, 1974, to produce a report which will advise us on the most effective and cheapest ways of solving the problem.

In the provisional report, which I have here, which the minister received yesterday and which I received today, the technical people report on studies to change the way the power dams in the Ottawa system are operated to provide a greater measure of flood control without sacrificing hydro-electric power. They report on possibilities of storing more water upstream on the Ottawa for flood control.

They are examining the costs and possibilities of dyking or dredging or removing buildings from the flood plain in the immediate Montreal area. As you can imagine, the weighing of the costs and benefits of these various alternative means of reducing damages is not a simple job. We want the solution to be effective and to cost the least money possible for the taxpayers of Canada and Quebec. The minister hopes to meet with the Hon. J. Cournoyer, the responsible minister in Quebec, in the near future to

review the provisional report and to see what immediate steps might be taken.

The final technical report and recommendations are, however, not due until June 30, and it may be difficult to make sound judgments on the best lasting solutions to the problem until all the facts are reported.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 9, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

SUGGESTED PAYMENT OF EQUIVALENT OF SPOUSE'S OLD AGE PENSION TO WIDOWS, WIDOWERS, SPINSTERS AND BACHELORS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to present a motion dealing with a matter of great urgency to many Canadians. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That the Minister of National Health and Welfare be urged to introduce at this session the necessary legislation to provide for the equivalent of the spouse's allowance, as provided in the Old Age Security Act, to be paid as well to widows, spinsters, widowers and bachelors between the ages of 60 and 65, either on the basis of need or on the basis of their being out of the labour market.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A motion under Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF LANGUAGE COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion of pressing and urgent necessity.

In view of the poor results obtained by the implementation of the government policy on bilingualism and since the Commissioner of Official Languages, Mr. Keith Spicer, himself advocates a new direction of the program to teach a second language to public servants, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard):

That this House entrust a special parliamentary committee with the care of studying, analyzing and if necessary, implementing, the recommendations of the Commissioner of Official Languages.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

TRANSPORTATION

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO ENCOURAGE MARITIME TRANSPORTATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion concerning an important and urgent matter.

Considering that from 1959 to 1973 the government's expenses for maritime transportation and construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway reached only $859 million, while during the same period railway companies received $2.6 billion in subsidies; that Canada ranks among the most important importing and exporting countries in the world and that the Canadian maritime transportation industry is now headed for disaster, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte):

That the House direct the government to take the necessary steps to encourage the building and operation of maritime transport in Canada in order to help ship owners to be present again on the international maritime scene.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore, the motion cannot be put.

● (1110)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—KNOWLEDGE OF PRIME MINISTER OF ROLE OF MINISTERS AND OFFICIALS IN GRANTING CONCESSIONS

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I should like to ask him whether he has taken any steps since yesterday to brief himself more fully on the role of any ministers or their staffs with regard to concessions to Sky Shops and whether he can inform the House if he has discovered any errors of omission or commission by ministers or their staffs in their staff relations or otherwise.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, what I made clear yesterday was that I have not been briefed by the police on this matter. I presume they would have told me if any minister had been under any suspicion, but there was no information conveyed to me by them on that. I said yesterday that I had talked to ministers and asked about their involvement. I am satisfied that neither the present Minister of the Environment nor the present Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce knew of any wrongdoing in their departments or on the part of their staff in the Sky Shops matter.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ALLEGATION ADMINISTRATION TAINTED BY PARTISAN POLITICS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): I certainly thank the Prime Minister for that answer, but I should like to put a further question to him. In view of increasing evidence that porkbarrel politics has been interfering with the administration of the country's affairs at the highest staff levels in the offices of the Minister of Transport and DREE, and in view of previous denials by the Solicitor General that Liberal Party fund raising had anything to do with the investigations, which, of course, has been contradicted by the warrant obtained by the RCMP, does the Prime Minister not concede that he owes the country an explanation as to how his administration has been tainted by partisan politics, to the detriment of the management of the country's affairs?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): From one who talks of partisan politics that seems to me to be a fine statement of partisan politics in which there are unsubstantiated allegations. If the hon. member has any allegations, I will make sure the police look into them, and I will look into them myself. I told the House—and I expect the hon. member to take my word—that I discussed this matter with both ministers and that they knew of no unethical, illegal or improper activities within their offices regarding the Sky Shops affair.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ROLE OF MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT IN APPOINTMENT OF CARMEL CARRIÈRE TO IMMIGRATION APPEAL BOARD

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, naturally I respect the word of the Prime Minister on this matter. I should like to ask a final supplementary of the Minister of the Environment on the question of the appointment of Carmel Carrière to the Immigration Appeal Board. Could the minister indicate whether he played any role at the relevant time with respect to this appointment and whether the appointment will be renewed, or will it be as it was in the case of the Hamilton Harbour Commission? Will there be changes made?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With respect, I have the greatest difficulty understanding how that relates to the minister's responsibility for the environment. Could the hon. member make that clear?

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I think it has a relationship in the sense that this lady was the executive assistant to the minister at some relevant times here and is now on the Immigration Appeal Board, so I am wondering about the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker: At some relevant times is the point which might be clarified by the hon. member. I thought we ought to be clear on what relevant time, what ministry and what minister. We have to understand how the question relates to the minister's current responsibilities because it is to the current minister that the question is put. I do not think we have to use the whole question period to try to sort this out, but if the hon. member has a question for the appropriate minister at the time the decision to make the appointment was made, perhaps the hon. member would like to reflect on how he might be more accurate.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION BY PRIME MINISTER OF ROLE OF MINISTERS OR OFFICIALS IN GRANTING CONCESSIONS

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, with all deference I think the Prime Minister begs the question here, and having regard to our experiences in the judges' affair in which some time elapsed before he was able to apprise himself and make himself fully aware of the circumstances with respect to that incident, I now ask the Prime Minister whether he will undertake at this time to make the fullest and most thorough investigation on the basis of ministerial responsibility and report before Easter with respect to his knowledge or his investigation of whether the ministers or staff members of the ministers' offices were free from any impropriety whatsoever, so that we can be satisfied before we break for Easter.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the preamble to the question the hon. member talked about a lapse of time. I remind him that as soon as the Minister of Justice heard from the judges of any possible impropriety, he launched an investigation by the judges themselves into the matter.

As far as my own conduct is concerned, I always took the position that I would wait for the report of the Chief Justice before investigating into the courts, and I still maintain that was the proper conduct. Indeed, that applied also to the conduct of my ministers. On the question itself, I have launched an investigation, to use the words of the hon. member. I discussed this matter at some length with both ministers. I am satisfied, as I told the House a moment ago, about their conduct. In so far as the police having suspicions about other people is concerned, not in my cabinet and not in this House, the matter has been turned over to the attorney general of the province, and he will take whatever measures he feels are proper. In so far as the responsibilities of the minister are concerned, I have discussed that with them.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, in view of the references made yesterday by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would give us an assurance before Easter. I think it would be proper for the Prime Minister to make an investigation as soon as possible. Therefore, perhaps he will assure us that in order to make sure he is fully apprised of the facts he will communicate with the attorney general or, indeed, the RCMP to see what information there might be that would assist him in coming to a conclusion as to whether there has been any impropriety on the part of senior staff members in ministers' offices and report to us, as I say, before Easter?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this invitation from the opposition because normally I would not ask the police to make a report to me on their investigations. If I did I am sure the opposition would claim I should not be interfering with the police by asking them what they are doing there.

Mr. Clark: You did in the case of the Hamilton harbour.

Mr. Trudeau: I did not in any case. Mr. Speaker, I will, following this series of comments, undertake to talk to the police as early as possible, Monday if they are prepared to see me, to ask them to confirm what I already have from the ministers, namely, that the police have no reason to believe the ministers are involved in wrongdoing. I hope the House will not ask me also to conduct an investigation into other people who are being considered for charges by the courts of justice.

In so far as the ministers are concerned, I repeat the fact that the police have not alerted me to any wrongdoing, giving me a prima facie case to believe that the police have no suspicion and no cause to believe the ministers are involved. It has been a long standing practice that when police are investigating ministers they let the Prime Minister know. In this case they have not found it necessary to tell me they had any suspicion of wrongdoing in the matter. I will satisfy the member and ask the police to give me a much more complete report than they usually do.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

FAILURE OF MINISTER TO BE AWARE OF ISSUANCE OF EXPLORATORY PERMITS—PROMISE OF CONSULTATION WITH INUIT

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I would direct my question to the Prime Minister. On Wednesday of this week in answer to a question by the member for Northwest Territories the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development indicated he was unaware of the issuance of 68 exploratory permits in the Northwest Territories. Would the Prime Minister advise whether he has inquired as to why his minister is unaware, in respect of such an important matter, of what is going on in his department? In addition, could the Prime Minister advise the House whether the cabinet in the commitment to the Inuit Tapirisat people on February 27 indicated that no further permits would be issued in the Northwest Territories without consultation?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, these permits are issued in the regular course of action by the department, and it is necessary that a land use permit be given before any further exploration is to take place. If this occurs, there is a 42 day period required for consultation, so the consultation factor did not come into play in this particular action.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION OF POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN PROSECUTIONS UNDER REGULATIONS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, that only answers one part of the question. The other part asked whether there was any commitment at all given. Let me direct my supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. In evidence before the Berger inquiry by Mr. Douglas Stephen, regional director of Canadian Wildlife Services, he said, and I hope I quote him correctly, that he has not prosecuted some companies under the environmental protection regulations because of the political impact such prosecutions might have. He said to the judge he would put wings and a halo to his minister. I think he was referring to this particular minister. Can the minister advise the House if he has had any discussions with that particular official and whether that evidence indicates government policy in the north?

● (1120)

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I read part of his testimony before the Berger Commission. This is the first time I have heard about that. I have enough halos. I do not need anyone to give me more. I have never asked anyone in the department to look at the political aspect of those problems.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Banish the thought.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I am happy that the right hon. member for Prince Albert has confirmed what I am saying. I would like to see this man to ask him exactly what he meant when he made this statement.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF PERMITS TO DRILL IN BEAUFORT SEA

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): The Beaufort Sea permits for drilling are still being delayed. I understand that the delay will be short. In view of the fact the preliminary studies on the Beaufort Sea indicate a potential for environmental disaster in the event of a blowout, will the minister refer that question to the committee on the environment or the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development so that some study can be done by parliamentarians in consultation with environmentalists prior to the permit being issued? Why is there no activity in the House of Commons with regard to an inquiry prior to the issuance of the drilling permits?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, there has been a very long inquiry. One condition when the temporary permit was issued was that there be an inquiry on the environmental aspect of the problem. We received the report. Everything is now before cabinet. There has been a short discussion on this, even before the standing committee. The permit, of course, will not be issued before the cabinet decision. I cannot reveal that because the decision has not yet been made.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

INQUIRY WHETHER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INVITED THE QUEEN TO OPEN GAMES

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

In a telegram the private secretary of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II is said to have sent to a member of the Quebec National Assembly, it would be clearly indicated that, in compliance with the express wish of the Canadian authorities, Her Majesty has accepted to inaugurate the Olympic Games. As the Prime Minister stated categorically before 1,500 delegates of his party that COJO alone was responsible for that invitation, would he be willing, in order to protect his integrity, to state quite clearly what the truth of the matter is?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the telegram mentioned by the hon. member, but I thank him for the question as it will give me the opportunity of throwing a little light on the facts.

May I point out to the hon. member that he is slightly in error when he says that I claimed that COJO alone was responsible for the invitation. What I told the delegates, and willingly repeat in this House, is that—and to my mind it is important that this be known—under international rules COJO in fact invited the Queen of Canada to inaugurate the games. It did so through normal channels,

that is by asking the federal government to convey the invitation, inasmuch as it is standard practice, whenever a province, a regiment or any other Canadian groups wants to invite a member of the royal family, for the federal government to transmit the invitation.

What I do want to stress is that the invitation came from COJO according to international rules; I transmitted it after having discussed the matter with the Quebec premier, who told me he had spoken to Mayor Drapeau about it. Only after those consultations did Premier Bourassa and myself agree to encourage COJO to go ahead, and I did convey the invitation.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—REQUEST FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance who has joint responsibility with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on the tariff role with regard to the textile industry in Canada. Yesterday the Senate committee studying the textile industry in Canada tabled its first report. Among other things, it criticizes the federal government for its unwillingness to implement the textile policy in accordance with the aims of that policy and, in fact, to promote almost an open door policy. My question to the Minister of Finance is the following: Will the government act immediately on the preliminary recommendations of the committee in order to alleviate the chaotic conditions affecting Canada's textile industry and, more particularly, to assure some reasonable percentage of the Canadian market to the domestic industry and labour force? Also, and this is very important, will the government immediately establish a time limit for the relevant minister to act on the recommendations of the Textile and Clothing Board?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I do have this question under consideration. We hope to be able to make a very early statement on it.

Mr. Grafftey: In view of the mass lay-offs in the textile industry affecting breadwinners who have very little mobility, can the minister assure the House that we will see immediate action to implement these recommendations and bring hope to both labour and industry in this regard?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I have said, we intend to make a careful analyses of this and issue an early statement. But if by "immediately" he means now, while I am on my feet, the answer is, no.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

PROPOSAL THAT CASUALTY AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANIES BE BROUGHT UNDER BOARD CONTROL

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance—the Prime Minister probably gave him notice of it since I asked the question of the Prime Minister last week while the minister was away at the Dominion-Provincial Conference. Has the Minister of Finance considered the recommendation of the Anti-Inflation Board that the casualty and general insurance companies which collectively lost over $400 million last year and would therefore seem to be outside the jurisdiction of the Anti-Inflation Board should in any event be brought under the board's control?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): It is true the picture as a whole indicates a loss position but individual companies have been in a profit-making position. The government has considered the recommendation of the Anti-Inflation Board and I anticipate an order in council on this question next week.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

PRINCE ALBERT—REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CONDITIONS IN INSTITUTION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): In connection with the matter I raised yesterday with the Solicitor General, I should now like to direct a further question to him. Yesterday he said the inmates in Prince Albert penitentiary who had been on the sit-down had gone back to their cells and that all was reasonably well and being investigated by, I think, three civil servants. I would point out that at the very time he was saying this, or almost the same time, while the sit-down was ending, a dig-in was continuing and they had dug a tunnel to within 25 feet of safety. In other words, the situation was serious and illustrates the need for an independent examination of what is taking place. Will the minister not give consideration, particularly in view of the representation of the Métis Society of Saskatchewan that things are serious because of the failure of the department to appoint a judge to look into this matter so that there will be no cover up by civil servants?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): It is true that during the sit-down strike a number of inmates, not all of them, were involved in digging a tunnel in an attempt to escape. I might say that although they had dug about 60 feet, they were far from freedom.

An hon. Member: Twenty-five feet away.

Mr. Allmand: They were 25 feet from the wall but what they did not know was that the wall extends into the ground some ten feet; they would have had a difficult time getting past it through a tunnel or in any other way. It was a lot of work for nothing. As mentioned by the right hon. member we have set up an internal inquiry to look into this matter. I will await that report. If the report is not satisfactory and we do not get enough information I will consider other means of dealing with the matter.

* * *

● (1130)

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED CONFISCATION OF EARNINGS OF DRUG TRAFFICKERS—POSSIBLE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF LEDAIN COMMISSION

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. In asking it I also want to make a positive suggestion. I have noted in the news media that there have been cases where people who have been trafficking in hard drugs have been assessed by the income tax officials. If the department is able to assess the amount of money that these hard drug traffickers are making, would the minister consider whether there is any legislation available that would enable him to confiscate all of this money? This is the one of the most demoralizing criminal rackets today and is one of the great causes of and contributors to crime.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I found the same story that the hon. member refers to rather interesting, to say the least. I have been examining it in light of the amendments that we made in Bill C-71 in regard to the provisions relating to the proceeds of crime; and I have also been examining it to see whether those provisions could apply to such cases.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Is there any policy existing that will change any laws relating to drug trafficking or which will implement any of the recommendations of the LeDain Commission, which report cost several million dollars and seems to be gathering dust?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not legislation will be introduced, I think the hon. member appreciates that this will be announced in due course in the usual way.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE RADIOACTIVE DANGERS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that uranium mines come under federal jurisdiction, what steps are being taken to ensure that authority from the Atomic Energy Control Board is granted automatically to the occupational safety and health department of the Department of Labour to make on the spot inspections to ensure that radioactive dangers at the uranium mines at Elliot Lake are eliminated?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that there is very close co-ordination between the Department of Labour, the

deparment responsible for the atomic energy commission and the commission itself. I might add that we have arranged with various provincial governments, including the province of Ontario, that they will assume their responsibility and co-operate with us in terms of occupational health standards. I think the matter the hon. member refers to has been brought to my attention previously, and I indicated to the United Steel Workers and to other unions the arrangement we have entered into concerning the responsibilities of the provinces.

DATE OF LAST INSPECTION OF URANIUM MINES—AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When is the last time that safety inspectors of the Department of Labour visited the mines at Elliot Lake, Ontario, and Uranium City, Wollaston Lake and Cluff Lake in Saskatchewan? If such a visit has been completed, are the reports of these investigations available to the public?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I will get that information for the hon. member. I must advise him that I will have to check with the provinces in this connection. I will also inquire as to their diligence in conducting these inspections.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

MEASURES TO CONTROL BLUE TONGUE DISEASE—POSSIBLE COMPENSATION FOR CATTLE DESTROYED

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister been advised of the very serious outbreak of the disease blue tongue among cattle in the south Okanagan valley of British Columbia?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You are a month behind.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): It is not a Tory disease. Also, what is the department's policy in dealing with the problem? If it is to dispose of the herds, will there be adequate compensation paid to the owners?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the department's policy is to eradicate the source of the disease, and the herds infected by the disease, as quickly as possible and to pay proper compensation. This disease has been researched. It comes from imported animals from the United States that had the disease in the first place.

[Mr. Munro (Hamilton East).]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES AT WINNIPEG

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport I address my question to the Minister of Labour. Due to labour problems at the finance branch of Air Canada in Winnipeg, hundreds of thousands of dollars in revenue are being lost, and as the CALEA contract expired last August would the minister take immediate steps to have Air Canada return to the negotiating table?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this has been a very difficult dispute. The commissioner has made a report, and as the hon. member knows there have been endeavours made to have the parties get together, without success. As to renewed efforts on the department's part to see whether the dispute can be resolved, yes, we are making those efforts now.

* * *

AIR CANADA

FAILURE OF COMPANY TO PAY BILL AS RESULT OF DISPUTE WITH FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Air Canada is not able to pay its bills on time due to the problems at the finance branch in Winnipeg. As the gas board in London, England has threatened to cut off the gas supply to the Air Canada flight kitchen at Heathrow Airport because the gas bill has not been paid, as Air Canada also owes a 2,700 pounds electricity bill and Seagrams and other companies have served notice that all further purchases must be on a cash on delivery basis, and as two other companies are in serious financial difficulties due to Air Canada's negligence, would the Prime Minister look into the matter immediately and stop this idiotic nonsense which has existed at the finance branch in Winnipeg for the last three years? Canada's image abroad is being seriously damaged by this bill paying negligence.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will understand that I am not familiar with the details of Air Canada's gas bill at Heathrow airport but I will take note of the question. I understand that the Minister of Labour is meeting with Air Canada officials on Monday, and he will, of course, discuss this and many other matters.

* * *

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF FOREIGN BORROWINGS—POSSIBLE REQUEST THAT MUNICIPALITIES AND PROVINCES REDUCE FOREIGN BORROWING

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of large Canadian foreign borrowings last year amounting to

$4.7 billion and to almost $3 billion in the first three months this year, would the minister indicate what he anticipates will be the total foreign borrowing by Canadians in the coming year?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of anticipation that I think it is probably not useful for me to make in this House. I shall be glad, of course, to discuss the general question during the budget debate.

Mr. Stevens: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of this extensive borrowing and the heavy debt charges that are now accruing of approximately $400 million a year for future years, would the minister indicate whether he has contacted municipalities and provinces with a view to having them tone down their aggressive borrowing in foreign markets?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr. Speaker. While we have encouraged provincial governments in the past to seek to place their securities in the Canadian market, for the moment at least that restraint has been lifted from them.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW DAIRY POLICY

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. The minister previously indicated that by April 1 he would announce a dairy policy. When April 1 rolled around, all he said was "April fool, it will be on the following Thursday". Thursday has now come and gone. I wonder whether we can milk him for some sort of policy now since he seems to be dry. When is he due now?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the bellowing over there is not going to bring about a milk program for this year any faster. I notice that no one has suggested that I put any more money into the program; they are all sitting quietly. I am amazed that there have not been more questions about this, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

ENERGY

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON ASSISTANCE TO NOVA SCOTIA WITH THE COST OF PRODUCING ELECTRICITY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In light of the report that was given to the legislature of Nova Scotia by the finance minister of that province following the finance ministers' conference held last week, which so far as he was concerned was not in the least encouraging from the point of view of federal assistance in the production of energy, may I ask the minister whether he has any words of encouragement to give the people of Nova Scotia to the effect that the federal government will assist in a tangible way so their electric power will not be cut off and people will not lose their homes through inability to pay light and power bills, as is happening at the present time?

● (1140)

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I understand the very serious problem facing some of these people. I do not think the question of whether their power is cut off is for the federal government, but I can say that the federal government is looking at the case that has been put by Nova Scotia. However, I think the clear answer is that I cannot hold out very much hope. Our resources are limited.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DATE OF COMPLETION OF COST-SHARING AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES FOR ALASKA HIGHWAY—AVAILABILITY OF COPY FOR YUKON LEGISLATURE

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the agreement been signed between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States with regard to the cost-sharing program for the highway from Haines in the state of Alaska to Haines Junction in the Yukon and from Haines Junction at the U.S. border? If the agreement has not been signed, when does the minister expect it will be signed and that construction will commence?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the agreement has not been signed. Discussions currently are going on with the government of British Columbia with regard to the right-of-way and the environmental questions. A good deal of progress has been made and I believe these discussions will be completed shortly.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for that reply. Is he aware that the Yukon legislative assembly has passed a resolution requesting a copy of the agreement when available, and can he inform the House when that agreement will be public and sent to the members of the assembly as requested.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I understand that consultations have been held with the Yukon and that the contents of the proposed agreement have been made known to their officials. We have not completed the agreement. When it is completed I will consider making it available to the members of the council, but normally such government agreements are not made public. In this case I will consider whether we can make an exception.

Oral Questions

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

REASON FOR WITHHOLDING REPORT ON MERCURY POISONING—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of the Environment. It relates to mercury poisoning, the Minamata disease, in parts of Northern Ontario and the report that was issued by the minister's department which was completed in 1972 and which mentioned the dangers of mercury poisoning in northern Ontario. The report was not released until 1975. I should like to ask the minister what was the reason for the three-year delay in telling the people of the dangers in the food they were eating and whether it is a continuing practice within the department to withhold from people information about things which seriously affect their health.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am inquiring about that. I understand there was a preliminary report in 1972 which was completed afterward and published only in 1975. I hope I can get more information, but this is the reason I was given this morning when I noted this delay. I think that has been mentioned before the standing committee of the House on Environment and Fisheries.

Mr. Malone: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the testimony given last night before the committee to the effect that there was total inaction in respect of the health of the people, and that basically the action has all been directed toward monitoring, would the minister give some indication concerning what kind of approaches are intended so that we do not fall into the position of always trying to assess the health problems but rather will in fact be directly trying to improve the health of the native peoples in northern communities.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is what the report is all about. So far as other Canadians are concerned, we have very strict standards as the hon. member knows. Nothing can be sold above a certain standard which I think is about 0.5 or something like that. As to the rest of the report so far as the Indians are concerned, I hope I will have the information asked for and can inform the hon. member early next week.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES AT WINNIPEG

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Transport I have a question for the Minister of Labour. It is further to the questions asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. Is the minister aware that, rather than trying to meet its employees and reach an agreement, Air Canada is now taking steps to have the work normally done by its own employees in the finance department office in Winnipeg contracted out to CAE which in fact is hiring former Air Canada employees to do the work which should have been done and should be done now by Air Canada employees in the finance department? If he is aware of this will he take steps so that he and the Minister of Transport can try to get the management of Air Canada to sit down and negotiate seriously and amicably with its employees to reach an agreement.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker; it is my intention to have Air Canada sit down and negotiate an agreement with the employees. We are doing everything possible to promote that end. As to whether it would be helpful in achieving that end that I should comment on the observations of the hon. member preliminary to his question, I rather doubt.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of and would he inquire about the rumours that are going around Winnipeg to the effect that the company is preparing to lock out its employees? Does the minister consider that kind of action would require some very strong action on the part of the minister and his colleague the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I certainly will note the hon. member's observation, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORTATION

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO REDUCE DEFICIT—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASE IN TOLLS

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I shall direct my question to the Minister of Finance, since the Minister of Transport is not here.

Considering that since 1959 the St. Lawrence Seaway has recorded nothing but deficits which now amount to $815 million, could the minister tell the House what he intends to do to correct the situation and enable the St. Lawrence Seaway to operate normally as a business?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as Acting Minister of Transport I would be glad to take notice of this question and ask the minister to reply next week.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

According to the president of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, Canadian taxpayers seem to be subsidizing the Americans to a certain extent if we consider that last year only $26 million were collected in tolls; since the operating cost goes on spiralling, would the minister be in a position to tell the House whether he intends to increase the toll rates?

[*English*]

Mr. Basford: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is an announcement that the Minister of Transport would want to make.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ALLEGATION UNITED STATES WORKERS DRAWING BENEFITS FROM CANADA WITHOUT BEING CHECKED—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower I should like to direct my question to his parliamentary secretary. It relates to reports to the effect that some 2,000 American construction workers were involved with employment in and around the Sarnia area and after their employment terminated returned to the United States. Apparently unemployment insurance cheques are still being forwarded to them without inspectors having any way to check whether or not they have found jobs or are in receipt of the United States unemployment insurance. Is the parliamentary secretary aware of this very serious matter, and will he undertake to bring it to the attention of the minister in order that he can look into it and report back to the House as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Unemployment Insurance Act section 12, a reciprocal agreement was signed by Canada and the United States. Under this agreement, anybody having contributed to unemployment insurance may apply for benefits in the state where he worked, or in Canada if he ever worked here. Therefore an American having worked for more than eight weeks in Canada and returning to the United States when he is unemployed may apply and prove his entitlement to the benefits in Canada. However, the applicant must meet all conditions of eligibility as provided in the act and regulations.

● (1150)

[*English*]

Mr. Alexander: We are aware of that particular section. There is another section in the act which indicates that in the event of any duplication of unemployment insurance payments the Governor-in-Council, by way of regulation, can accept that particular employment. So my question still is whether the parliamentary secretary will bring this problem to the attention of the minister in order to see whether or not there is any duplication in payments, and if so, then they are wrong and the parliamentary secretary can recommend the implementation of the regulation just referred to by me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Portelance: Mr. Speaker, the commission is aware of the hon. member's allegations and we shall bring them to the attention of the minister. An answer can be expected within a few days.

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE THAT NO POLITICAL CONSIDERATION WILL ENTER INTO LAYING OF CHARGES

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for New Westminster and it is addressed to the Minister of the Environment. In view of the statement made by the Canadian Wildlife Service Division at the Berger inquiry where it was admitted the agency took political implications into consideration before taking legal action and that the legal action which was taken was only of a token nature, can the minister assure the House that in future charges will be laid without fear or favour?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): I do not accept the statement that this was done in the past because of favour or political interference. It has never been that way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is what the man said.

Mr. Brisco: Is the minister then saying that this is not the policy of his department or that it is not the policy of Mr. Stephens and that Mr. Stephens was in fact making a very grave error in his testimony before the commission?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): The only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is not the policy of the department.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Marcel Prudhomme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question.

The Leader of the Opposition announced this morning the formation of a shadow cabinet. Would the Prime Minister do the Leader of the Opposition a favour by suggesting the creation of a physical fitness and amateur sports department to give the hon. member for Joliette the opportunity of serving as a full-time cabinet member?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of suggestion that I want to make sure will be considered in depth. I have the impression, on looking at seats today, that the shadow cabinet would be more appropriately termed a "ghost" cabinet.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is very cheap.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hope it will not go unnoticed, even by the Prime Minister of the country, that the Leader of the Opposition and other members of our party are attending the funeral of the Hon. Grattan O'Leary who gave service to this country at least equal, if not surpassing, that of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Of course, the remark of the hon. member from the Opposition is not relevant to this. My reflection had nothing to do with the presence or absence of the people on the other side. It had to do with the quality of the leadership over there.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

DRUMHELLER—ALLEGATION MAXIMUM SECURITY INMATES IN INSTITUTION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. Statements have been made by guards at Drumheller institution that it is a medium security prison with maximum security inmates and minimum security standards. Since the Solicitor General has stated that there are people in maximum security who should be in medium security and vice versa, does he intend to wait until we have an Attica in Canada before he takes his own statements seriously?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have not been advised by anyone that they thought maximum security inmates were at Drumheller, but since the hon. member has brought it to my attention I will check on the facts and see that we do not have maximum security inmates at Drumheller.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GARRISON DIVERSION—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE CANADA WILL NOT SACRIFICE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it has to do with the Garrison diversion project. In view of the statement appearing in an article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of February 21 in which it was stated that the federal government was prepared to make environmental sacrifices in order to preserve the level of U.S.-Canada relations, could the minister now assure the House that the position of Canada will not be to make any kind of sacrifices in the environmental sense with reference to the Garrison diversion?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): That is certainly not the intention of the government of Canada which has pressed continuously the obligations that have been undertaken by the U.S. under the appropriate international agreement. As the hon. member knows, the question of the Garrison diversion has been put before the International Joint Commission and presently the commission is undertaking an examination of what possible effects might occur as the result of the construction. Of course, the reference to the commission is broad enough to enable it to require an alteration in the structure if environmental damage were demonstrated.

Mr. Whiteway: That is the very point that is of some concern to Manitobans. In view of the fact that the IJC is

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

taking one year to bring in its report and that there are virtually no alterations in the construction plans of the Garrison and the feeling is certainly prevalent in Manitoba that this is an irreversible project, would the minister assure the House that in view of the continuing construction, and therefore the guaranteed environmental damage which is inevitable, not pre-empting the findings of IJC, that whether or not the project is completed to any degree it will not prejudice the position of the federal government with regard to environmental damage caused by the Garrison diversion project?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in our view the mandate of the International Joint Commission is broad enough to permit it to recommend the discontinuance or the deletion of any part of the project, and for that reason of course the project is not irreversible in that sense.

ANGOLA—REPORTS THAT REPATRIATED SOLDIERS FACE DEATH—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the 4,000 black Angolan soldiers who fled with the South African forces on their withdrawal from Southern Angola and in view of reports that they must be repatriated within a month, has the minister any information as to the truth of reports that many or most would face certain death if they were to return to Marxist Angola?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have information on this point at my fingertips. I will make inquiries and provide any useful information to the hon. member.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROTECTION OF EMBASSIES

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the protection of our embassies abroad totally under the jurisdiction of the country in which they are located and, if so, if Canadians interfere with that jurisdiction are they only charged under the laws of the country or of that embassy?

● (1200)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member might specify a situation. He has really asked the minister for a general interpretation of the law of the country, and I wonder whether the minister wants to try to answer that.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am sorry. I did not understand the question.

Mr. Schellenberger: It has to do with protection of our embassies in other countries. If our embassy—in this case the example is Lebanon—has been interfered with by a Canadian, is that Canadian charged only under the laws of the country in which our embassy is situated?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. I am not attempting to give a legal opinion, but that is my understanding of the situation.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

DECISION TO GRANT INCREASE IN PRICE OF OIL—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance regarding the decision of the Anti-Inflation Board to grant the oil companies an increase of one cent per gallon, which will cost Canadian consumers about $60 million per year. In view of the fact that this increase will come into effect on Monday next, has the government decided to intervene and to rescind the decision of the Anti-Inflation Board regarding this increase in the price of gasoline and home heating fuel?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have now had an opportunity to examine the board's conclusions in this regard. We have noted that the board has concluded that the companies, in their application under the pre-notification procedure, indeed have additional costs involved. In that case there would be no scope under the Anti-Inflation Act for the cabinet to intervene, and of course, we will not be doing so.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TODAY

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is the intention of the Prime Minister to table today some documents relating to the constitutional talks with the provinces, and to make a statement thereon. Ordinarily, this statement would be made on routine proceedings shortly after noon, but as the House has been reminded, today is the funeral of the late Senator Grattan O'Leary.

There is also another difficulty of which we are all aware, and that is that if the statement is made in the ordinary way today and there is some discussion thereon, it would reduce the time available for the completion of the debate on second reading of Bill C-83. Fortunately, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has very generously offered to give up his time on private members' hour at four o'clock today. Therefore, I ask if the House would be agreeable to reverting to routine proceedings at four o'clock in order to enable the Prime Minister both to table the documents and to make the statement.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate the agreement of the official opposition and also to express our thanks to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre for the accommodation he has offered, not only to the official opposition but also to the government so that the Prime Minister could lunch with King Hussein.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the last time I gave up a private members' hour which had been assigned to me, the result was that we got through an important piece of legislation regarding prisoners of war. I dare to hope that my offer today to give up the private

members' hour assigned to me will result in our getting control of our own constitution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion has been made that the House revert to routine proceedings at four o'clock this afternoon for the purpose of receiving a statement, in accordance with our usual recent practice with respect to the making of statements, by the Prime Minister. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. YEWCHUK—POSITION OF MEDICAL DOCTORS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SITTING ON HEALTH COMMITTEE—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I gave some indication yesterday of an intention to finalize today a question of privilege of some importance which was raised a few days ago by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk). It was contributed to by several hon. members, very significantly by the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes), and in turn, because it involved certain allegations respecting remarks by the hon. member, by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt).

The question of privilege raises two very serious problems, the first having to do with the conduct of affairs in our standing committees. I want to make it clear that, while I have given several indications of my reluctance to alter the practice of the Chair of staying away from reviewing decisions of any sort of the standing committees except within the proper proceedings of the House, it is perfectly understood that questions of privilege, if they in fact exist, are not confined to incidents which take place in this chamber. Obviously, questions of privilege can arise from events which take place outside the chamber, and therefore, it follows, in the standing committees. There is no question about that.

If, in fact, a matter does give rise to a question of privilege within our precedents and practices, whether that takes place outside the chamber, perhaps in a standing committee, would in no way disqualify it. However, the situation which is before us, it seems to me, involves not only a disagreement on substance but perhaps also a disagreement on procedure. It may involve a question of order in the committee. I say that it "may". But, indeed, all these are questions which are within the competence of the standing committee to deal with, and in fact the standing committee dealt with it in one way or another. However that was resolved in the standing committee, it seems to me that it did involve questions of order, procedure or substance in the committee and ought not to be a part of the concern of the Chair.

I think the reasoning for that is obvious. When it was seen that there was serious disagreement about the interpretation which ought to have been put on words, events

and the manner in which they took place and their intentions, the House has been very careful in the past to avoid the immense difficulties which would obviously arise if the House were to constitute itself into one standing committee for the purpose of investigating proceedings which have taken place in another standing committee. Therefore, I would reject—except under the clearly established and narrow definitions to which we have referred in the past—that privilege, and in this respect it must almost constitute an obstruction of the ability of a member to function. Therefore, in respect to the events which took place in the standing committee and the disagreements between hon. members there, I find that they might constitute a number of matters of great concern, but they do not qualify as a question of privilege. Therefore, I will not review the events which took place there.

However, there is another aspect to this question, and that is the comments of a journalist who was described in the development of the question of privilege by the hon. member for Athabasca as an employee of the CTV network, Mr. Eric Malling. It has been suggested that he used the following language in editorializing on the performance of certain members of the official opposition in that committee:

> The Conservative representation on the committee consisted of four doctors and a more shameless defence of the witness I have never seen. The way these doctors stick together you would think they had a sponge in a stiff—the entire lot of them.

I will perhaps reserve until later any comments I would want to make about the quality of that language or the quality of the reporting. The concern I have now is not so much with that as it is with the very difficult and very real problem which has been revealed by this question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Athabasca: that is, the balance which must be maintained between the right of individul members, or the membership of this House collectively, to punish contempt of this House or its members and to punish libels against its members or aspersions on their conduct and, on the other hand, the right of a journalist, or indeed of a citizen, to make public comment, to make criticism and in fact to express opinion which, obviously, is not subject to questions of truth but to the standards of opinion as to the performance of elected members.

There have been very few incidents in which journalists have been censured in this way in the history of the House of Commons, for the obvious reason that—and I think quite appropriately—it has always been decided, in situations of that sort, that where there was a doubt between the two rights which were enjoyed, that doubt ought always to be resolved in favour of the public, not only to criticize us but in fact to make comments about their political attitudes toward us.

● (1210)

There does seem to be a suggestion from time to time that privilege extends to us, as members of this House, a sort of special protection above and beyond that enjoyed by the ordinary citizen in this regard. I think it ought to be very clearly stated that this, in fact, is not the case. There is no historical support for that notion, nor do I see any reason why that should be the situation.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The protection in respect of public comment, made either by a citizen or a journalist, that is enjoyed by every private citizen is, and ought to be, more than adequate for the protection of members of this House in that regard. Rather than attempt to describe it in my own language, I find the comments of great interest and relevance in the report recently tabled of the select committee on parliamentary privilege in the United Kingdom. I will quote from pages 15 and 16 of that report; I think members will find it illuminating. Bearing in mind this is not an authoritative document by that parliament, but is really the result of a very serious and thorough study of the question of prilivege—and I will in a moment be making reference to the study we are about to launch here at the instance of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin)—I will quote from paragraph 43. I think the language is interesting:

> The proposal made in paragraph 42 is fully consistent with the principle which your committee believe to be right, that the House should be slow and reluctant to use its penal powers to stifle criticism or even abuse, whether of the machinery of the House, of a member or of a identifiable group of members, however strongly the criticism may be expressed and however unjustifiable it may appear. Your committee regard such criticism as the life blood of democracy. In their view the sensible politician expects and even welcomes criticism of this nature. Nonetheless, a point may be reached at which conduct ceases to be merely intemperate criticism and abuse and becomes or is liable to become an improper obstruction of the functions of parliament. For such cases, however rare, the penal powers must be preserved and the House must be prepared to exercise them.

The second quotation is from the following page, part way down paragraph 46, as follows:

> In your committee's opinion it would be an indefensible abuse of power if a member could evade such a defence by invoking the penal jurisdiction of the House. The citizen has prima facie a right to make fair comment upon such activity of a member as is a matter of public interest; his right is even stronger to speak and publish the truth of a member's conduct. These rights should not in the normal way be defeated by the use of the penal jurisdiction of the House. The exceptions to this general principle are likely to be rare. But if the rights of a citizen, though enforceable in the courts of law, are so exercised as to be likely improperly to obstruct the member in the performance of his parliamentary duty, it must be within the power of the House to restrain him.

I adopt that reasoning, and I think I can simply state that however reprehensible and insulting the language used by the columnist or journalist referred to by the hon. member, and however unnecessary it may seem to be in order to report the proceedings of this House to stoop to that kind of language and comment, I cannot find in it a transgression of the rights, collectively or individually, to such an extent that the privilege procedures ought to be invoked by this House in order to censure the journalist.

Therefore, being in some doubt about that, I would resolve the doubt in favour of the public's right to criticize us and find, again, that no question of privilege exists. This is not to say there are not legitimate concerns raised by the hon. member for Athabasca. Often this is typical of the case in which the precedents and practices vis-à-vis a privilege as we know it, and which is confined, after all, to the very narrow term, while they do not fit the situation in which the House finds itself they nevertheless seem to be the only way out for a member to attempt to retaliate for this kind of language used in public.

Therefore, I say that the hon. member for Athabasca has, as other members have in the past, raised a question of very legitimate and serious concern. It arises, I might also

say in passing, whenever members of the House get into the unfortunate habit or practice of departing from the subject matter of debate at the moment and get into personal references of any sort about members. It occasionally happens in the heat of debate, and we all experience that. I think we all learn the lesson that when this happens, the reason it has been traditionally ruled a disorder—when it does occur—is for the simple reason that it is never really truly relevant to the subject matter under debate. If hon. members can bring themselves to refrain from the practice of departing from the subject matter of debate and getting on to either the qualifications, personal or otherwise, of members or their own personal record or performance, certainly a good deal of this difficult could be avoided.

However, I do say to the hon. member for Athabasca, to the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. Holmes) and others who participated in this discussion, that it did raise problems that are not isolated and are very serious.

I think I have made my feelings clear about some of the aspects of the problems that are before us. I do want to assure hon. members that in launching into the work, largely, as I say, at the initiation of the hon. member for Peace River, on the study here in this parliament—over which I will preside—of the rights and immunities of members of the House of Commons, not only will the work of the select committee in the United Kingdom form a very important working paper for us, but this experience will certainly be given very careful consideration in the deliberations and work of that committee, in the hope that we can expose some clear guidelines for the protection of hon. members in situations of this sort and a clearer understanding of privilege as it relates to these kinds of situations.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Eleventh report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs—Mr. Robinson.

Sixth report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Mr. Rompkey.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,148 and 4,967.

Order Paper Questions

[*Text*]

GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO FOREX INC.

Question No. 3,148—**Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve):**

1. In (a) 1969 (b) 1970 (c) 1971 (d) 1972 (e) 1973 (f) 1974 (g) 1975, what amount was granted by the government to the group known as FOREX Inc.?

2. In (a) 1969 (b) 1970 (c) 1971 (d) 1972 (e) 1973 (f) 1974 (g) 1975, what amounts were granted by the government to sawmill companies operating in the Constituency of Villeneuve?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. In that the Employment Support Program has been disbanded the information is not readily available.

2. Records of grants to companies are not maintained on a Constituency basis. However, an estimated total of $200,000 has been granted to sawmill companies in the region by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce during the period 1969-1975.

1. The total amount granted by the government to FOREX, Inc., under the authority of the Regional Development Incentives Act, reads as follows: (a) In 1969: none. (b) In 1970: none. (c) In 1971: none. (d) In 1972: none. (e) In 1973: $409,268. (f) In 1974: $176,252. (g) To September 30, 1975: none.

2. The total amount granted by the Department to sawmill companies and connected firms in the Constituency of Villeneuve, reads as follows: (a) In 1969: none. (b) In 1970: $465,950. (c) In 1971: $1,060,875. (d) In 1972: $1,226,323. (e) In 1973: none. (f) In 1974: $84,867. (g) To September 30, 1975: $199,400.

FREIGHT ASSISTANCE IN ATLANTIC REGION

Question No. 4,967—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,507, what were the amounts paid to each company listed in the answer to Parts 2 and 3?

2. Is the information available by company in the same manner as subsidies or assistance to the railways and, if not for what reason?

3. What is the government's estimate of payments for the year 1975?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1.

Payments under the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act

1974-75 Fiscal Year

Intra-Regional

Eastern Transport Limited	$571,948.54
Moffat Brothers Moving & Storage Ltd.	426,378.28
Day and Ross Ltd.	378,730.54
Road and Sea Transport Ltd.	369,131.92
Thompson Transfer Co. Ltd.	354,139.12
M & D Transfer Ltd.	223,490.69
Brunswick Petroleum Transport Ltd.	172,792.69
Easson's Limited	152,909.74
Roch Roy Transport Ltée	145,544.89
Cement Cartage Co. Ltd.	145,449.18
Midland Transport Limited	139,322.27
G. M. Armour & Son Ltd.	137,114.51
Roy's Midway Transfer	133,533.02
Bowness Transport Ltd.	124,902.07
Heffler Trucking Ltd.	120,534.75

Order Paper Questions

	Westbound	Selective
Day and Ross Ltd.	$708,960.70	$261,297.52
Rimouski Transport Limitée	186,130.11	31,619.86
Smith Transport	178,100.57	56,537.97
Maritime Ontario Freight Lines	128,773.26	60,039.24
Speedway Express Limited	121,822.27	34,740.41
Hebb's Transport Limited	97,695.75	36,203.48
Transbois Inc.	90,640.98	NIL
St. Lambert Transport	89,570.59	NIL
Jumbo Motor Express Ltd.	82,602.53	37,215.54
O. Belanger Transport Inc.	63,094.03	NIL
Transport D'Anjou	58,460.40	16,515.42
Moffat Brothers Moving & Storage Ltd.	56,190.91	NIL
Transport Théberge Ltée	55,351.45	9,303.98
Household Movers & Shippers Ltd.	51,034.58	NIL
Maritime Warehousing & Transfer Co. Ltd.	48,722.32	NIL

2. Information is not readily available in the form requested. In excess of 3,000 truckers currently participate in the subsidy program and when details of individual payments are requested they must be compiled from accounting records. Current man-year constraints do not permit the compilation of such data on a continuing basis since staff would have to be diverted from other essential duties.

3. Within region—17.1 million dollars. Westbound out of region—3.4 million dollars. Selective assistance—1.2 million dollars.

* * *

[*English*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 4,147?

[*Text*]

*AIR CARGO RATES AND CHARGES

Question No. 4,147—**Mr. Lachance:**

1. With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,514, for what reason and under what authority does Air Canada charge a minimal fee of $5 for clearance of mail sent by air freight?

2. Will the government consider asking Air Canada to cease such a pratice?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as for the Canadian Transport Commission, the answer is as follows: 1. Airlines are required by the Canadian Transport Commission to publish in tariffs, charges made for services rendered by them. Air Canada and many other carriers provide certain services in connection with incoming shipments of air freight requiring customs clearance. There is a terminal service charge of $5 for the processing of "immediate type" customs clearance outside of normal customs business hours.

As for Transport Canada, the answer is as follows: 2. Tariffs of fees charged by air carriers are in effect only so long as they are deemed satisfactory by the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission. The above fee has been filed in accordance with the Air Carrier Regulations and has been accepted by the Air Transport Committee. The government does not interfere with the rate-making process established by the Canadian Transport Commission.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Mr. Goodale.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Thursday, April 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, before lauching into a general discussion on the bill before us, I invited the House to join me in an adventurous fantasy last night. It appeared that shortly after the Criminal Code had been amended by Bill C-83, a gang of foreign invaders had landed on the beaches of the northwest arm of the beautiful constituency of Halifax-East Hants and were prepared to do battle with Canada. Canadian soldiers, equipped in the usual manner, arrived at the scene to find that the enemy was armed with nothing more dangerous, but certainly a very dangerous weapon indeed, than the revised Criminal Code of Canada.

● (1220)

The first encounter between the Canadian soldier and the foreign invader worsted the Canadian soldier. He found that under section 89 of the proposed amendments he was certainly entitled to carry a rifle. However, he found under section 88 that this did not give him the right to carry ammunition in it. Therefore, said the foreign invader—and the Canadian soldier had no way of answering back—the Canadian defender was liable to two years in penitentiary for committing an indictable offence.

The scene now switches to today. There are three more episodes before I point out how the war was won or lost. The Canadian soldier then found that pointing the firearm

without lawful excuse, and his gun was loaded, would not give him a lawful excuse: under section 99 he was liable to five years by way of indictment. The odd thing is that if he had pointed an unloaded weapon at the foreign invader, that would have been quite lawful: he was entitled to carry an unloaded weapon, but not a loaded one. This would add five years to the two years he had already racked up.

The Canadian soldier, in a friendly argument with the foreign invader, pointed out that he, the Canadian soldier, came from the great riding of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce in Montreal. He thought his member had something to do with the government, and that indeed his member was the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). One would have thought the Solicitor General would know the law. The foreign invader pointed out, "Really, my dear fellow, back home we call him a necessity." On the way to the prison camp, the Canadian soldier and his foreign captor wandered through a former rifle range where they found some cartridges scattered about. The Canadian soldier was willing to continue on his way, but the foreign invader pointed out that he had committed another offence. There was ammunition obviously lost or abandoned, and under section 101 of the Criminal Code as proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford)—

Every one commits an offence who, upon finding a prohibited weapon or restricted weapon or other firearm or ammunition that he has reasonable grounds to believe has been lost or abandoned, does not forthwith

(a) deliver it to a peace officer—

When he pointed out that they were only used cases from ammunition, the foreign invader was again able to up-end him by pointing to the definition section of Bill C-83 section, 82(1), which reads:

"ammunition" means ammunition for a firearm and includes any component, element or part—

Of course, the cartridge would be such a part. The foreign invader said, "For this, my good fellow, you are liable to another five years as being guilty of an indictable offence." The war has not taken place very long, but in the first half hour the poor Canadian soldier has racked up 12 years in one of Her Majesty's penitentiaries.

They continued on their way to the maritime command, passing through some of the most beautiful parts of Canada, namely, the streets of Halifax. The Canadian soldier, by then thoroughly nonplussed, entered into friendly conversation with his foreign captor. He suggested that maybe some of the large weapons used in a very brief war should some day go into the war museum on Citadel Hill. The soldier turned out to be a member of the board of governors of that great institution. The foreign invader pointed out that the museum on Citadel Hill was really a private institution. It was not part of the armed forces of the country; therefore, it could not contain within it prohibited weapons. As we all know, prohibited weapons are what they say they are in the definition section, 82(1). The prohibition is also set forth in 86(1) as follows:

Every one who has in his possession a prohibited weapon

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years—

The poor soldier, by working as a member of the board of governors in a non-department of national defence-owned museum on Citadel Hill in Halifax, was guilty of another indictable offence if he should so much as take any automatic or prohibited weapon to that museum. That would add another five years. It is now 17 years that has been racked up against the poor Canadian soldier, and he has not even had the pleasure of firing a shot at his tormentor. He suggested they could perhaps go down to the Point Pleasant park commission. In the south-end of Halifax there are a number of weapons from foreign wars that are much admired by the citizenry when they go there. The foreign invader pointed out, "No, it is not a governmental commission" and that he would be liable to five years, or anybody at the commission if they took some of these prohibited weapons within their control.

They passed by the legislature in Halifax. Outside were some of the guns left over from the gun battle in which the Shannon overcame the Chesapeake. The foreign visitor pointed out it was perfectly legal for the government of Nova Scotia to have those guns there, although the Canadian soldier said that the war that goes on between Gerry Regan and John Buchanan, the premier and the leader of the opposition, sometimes gets more explosive than any other situation than you can imagine. But no, the Chesapeake and Shannon memorabilia may remain on the grounds of the provincial legislature because that is government and not some privately run organization. Finally, the Canadian soldier turns to his captor and says, "It really would have been simpler if I had shot you dead." The foreign captor says, "I will forget that I heard that remark, my good man. After all, on top of the 17 years you have already racked up, you could be put on a peace bond by one of the local magistrates." That, Mr. Speaker, is the fantasy.

Do not expect me to illustrate some of the rather improbable drafting that has gone into the measure we are dealing with today. However, I want to state that the story did have a happy ending. The Canadian soldiers did win the war against these foreign invaders who came armed with the Canadian Criminal Code as amended by Bill C-83. Some of our Canadian soldiers were bright enough to break into a museum which contained medieval crossbows. As we all know, medieval crossbows are one of the greatest weapons ever invented by man. They found that these medieval crossbows had not been placed on the prohibited weapon list as defined by section 82(1) of the act, nor had they been included as prohibited weapons by the regulations made by the governor in council pursuant to this act. Therefore, it was perfectly in order to use medieval crossbows. The enemy was routed, and Halifax-East Hants and the rest of Canada was kept for Canadians.

I will now deal with the philosophic approach to Bill C-83 and to the matter of what is popularly called gun control. I suppose anything that in itself that can be dangerous should have an element of control by the state. Certainly we think that control is necessary when we deal with drugs and alcohol. It would, therefore, seem to be a simple matter, if one asks oneself the question, "Should there be some control over weapons which could be dangerous?" to reply, "Yes, of course there must be". But what sort of approach should be taken? It is here that the bill bothers me. I read through it, come to clause 4 on page 37 and see that some draftsman—and I hope the Minister of Justice finds out who he is and strings him up by his thumbs, because I think this is a horrible example of drafting—has set down words permitting the governor in

council by proclamation to declare what is called "a firearms amnesty period".

● (1230)

Mr. Speaker, I always thought that an amnesty was a retroactive pardon which was given for criminal behaviour so that the criminal act could somehow be forgotten. But this bill creates criminal actions and then has the colossal gall to say that the whole population, or perhaps one million Canadians, will be guilty of a crime but that an amnesty provision will be brought in to clean up the situation. Any government which permits a provision of that kind to be brought before us really has to do a lot of explaining to the Canadian people. To my mind, the use of the language to which I have referred is the most offensive thing that occurs in a large number of very offensive pages. This is why I support the motion put forward by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and, indeed, had something to do with the strategy which inspired it.

The Minister of Justice will find life much simpler if he takes out clauses 3 and 4 and pages 1 to 38 of this measures, puts them aside, and goes on with the rest of the bill. It is true that what remains will need purification and clarification, but I have the impression the other parts of the legislation could be expeditiously handled. I suggest to the minister that he will find himself in a long, cool spring, a hot summer and a chilly fall if he believes the measure as presently drafted and submitted to us is one which is likely to be accepted by the House.

I know that members opposite also have their reservations. The parliamentary secretary who preceded me has reservations with regard to the measure. After listening the other day to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik), I said to myself, "That is the speech I was going to make." After indulging in a little political persiflage, he dealt with all the issues which to my mind were germane to what we are considering. I hope the Minister of Justice has the political sense to recognize that the motion put forward by my hon. friend from Calgary North is one way out of a bad situation.

It may be that the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, by working very hard—it is a superb committee—will be able to straighten out the kinds and overcome the four or five howlers I have drawn attention to already, as well as a number of others of which I have made note. It may be the committee will find itself able to straighten out certain of the technical details. But it is improbably we shall be able to straighten out the philosophy which lies behind a bill which would suddenly, at one swoop, turn a million or so Canadians into criminals who are to be given amnesty.

Surely, if the government is setting its mind upon gun control, the first target should be the criminal element; it should use every legitimate device to grab their weapons, to throw the book at them. Going through this bill, I find only three or four clauses which deal with criminal use and related punishment—a quarter of a page in one place, with two clauses in it, and another quarter of a page later on. Instead of dealing with criminals, this legislation would create criminals, and in a democratic society, when you go out of your way to turn a large class of people into

[Mr. McCleave.]

criminals, quasi-criminals or pseudo-criminals, either the society or the government is very sick indeed.

Let me give an illustration of what the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General talk about doing but are really not able to do. The Solicitor General has made the point that most murders, where a gun is used as a weapon, are committed by the victim's relatives or friends. Most of these murders are, in fact, within that category. I ask the hon. gentleman to look at clause 103(1) and ask himself, if murders really take place in people's homes, as many of them do, in tragic circumstances often associated with too much liquor on a Saturday night, whether clause 103(1) really bills the bill. A former commissioner of the RCMP, Mr. L. H. Nicholson, a man for whom I have great respect—I hope he will be appearing before the committee, giving us his advice—points out that sometimes the people in the neighbourhood are in the best position to head off trouble. They can hear a quarrel; they might know of a weapon which could lead to fatal consequences, and decide to alert the police.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctity of a person's home is one thing, but clause 103(1) does not permit the police to enter a home in such circumstances, so doubtless we shall continue to hear of Saturday night tragedies. If there were any ground for being peremptory and ignoring the old attitude that a person's home is his castle, it would surely be a situation where neighbours know that something bad is going on and something much worse might happen unless there is speedy intervention. I will ask the Solicitor General further questions about this aspect when the bill goes to committee.

Another aspect which concerns me—and perhaps this is a special interest of mine—is the use made of the power of regulation. I refer specifically to the powers set forth in clauses 82 and 106. Regulations and orders in council have been a special topic of mine for a number of years. Regulations can be very strange animals indeed, and they tend to reflect the philosophy of the minister in charge of the department concerned. Incidentally, the ministers I have in mind are not here; as a matter of fact, no ministers are here at the present time. Yes, I see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury) is here. The law officers of the Crown are not here, though. Perhaps they are out advising one of their colleagues who is in trouble. In any event, the acceptability of a regulation depends to a large extent on whether or not the minister is an autocratic type. Later this session, when the House sees the report of one of the House committees in a month or so, it might ponder my words.

● (1240)

Another matter that bothers me is the question of guarantors. I think that does go too far. I was going to ask the Minister of Justice about this, and I hope someone on the other side will pass this along to him. We keep hearing disturbing reports behind the scenes to the effect that when the regulations are drafted there will be a requirement to list weapons on the backs of licences. This report is fairly current and I hope the hon. member from Lakeshore is giving me his attention: he is familiar with the regulatory process. I hope the minister can provide an answer if he does take further part in this debate, or at least that someone on the other side will give me an answer whether or not this will be done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it will help much to be told what goes on in other countries in the matter of gun control. Switzerland has been mentioned, but Switzerland has a different tradition. New York City was referred to, and so was Ireland. They have tighter controls in Japan, yet the same homicide rate as Canada. All of this has been thrown into the melting pot in this debate. I do not know whether any of these matters are really germane to the situation in Canada. I do not think there is any Canadian city that quite approaches the situation in New York. They seem to be degenerating into a rat race and it seems to me that city is on its last legs. Although our Canadian cities have a crime rate, they are nowhere near that of New York City's. Neither have we got into the woeful state that they have in Ireland. We are too large and have too much interdependence with other countries to be a sort of Switzerland. We are not insular in the way Japan is.

The problems that we have to solve are surely "made in Canada" problems. We have to consider that we are mainly city folk—or are tending to be—with a fair element of country folk. It is not too long ago that our ancestors were scraping up a livelihood by running fur lines and the like, and they needed weapons to fend off bears and other marauders from the forest and to find food. To me, Mr. Speaker, our traditions are much different from the other countries cited in this debate. We must pay some regard to the traditions of the past from which we have come.

One of the obvious defects of this measure is that there has really been no consultation about it. The wildlife people and the trapshooting people have never been consulted about the bill. I have been told time and time again, and presume it must be so, that somewhere a group of people gathered together in Ottawa and put together the 37 or 38 pages of legislation that is under discussion today, using a very autocratic and arbitrary approach. They compounded the legislation with rules, regulations and all sorts of red tape and set out to catch crooks, turning too many other people into crooks in the process instead of concentrating on the crooks themselves.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, in committee, in a spirit of reasonableness we can separate these gun control provisions from the rest of the bill, send the bill back to the House and then get on with formulating some decent gun control legislation instead of the stuff with which we have been presented.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin); and I should like to wish him well on Monday.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your good wishes and for recognizing me at this time. At the outset I want to say I support the legislation in a general way in principle: but let me also say that I have some degree of sympathy for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and am tempted to vote for that amendment and may well do so.

I say that because I find myself in a position similar to the one I found myself in when we were debating the western grain stabilization bill. I or one of my colleagues moved a similar motion, that the subject matter of the bill be referred to committee for further study, but I supported the legislation in principle. I see nothing inconsistent with that action. However, I want to proceed to deal briefly with the major sections of the legislation and to express not only my feelings on the matter but to reflect to some extent the feelings of many of my colleagues and also the attorney general of my own province of Saskatchewan.

I feel that the split of first and second degree murder, on the present basis, is sensible and that the provision of a minimum of 25 years' imprisonment for first degree murder and at least ten years for second degree murder before being eligible for parole is an improvement and will be looked upon as such by the public. However, practical problems arise, of course. Twenty-five years looks like forever to most of us, and a prisoner may well feel that he is in a nothing to lose situation. We may be required to provide additional protection and incentives for prison guards.

The new parole provisions, including the three-judge panel, may decrease the eligible time for parole after 15 years, but this may diminish the deterrent aspect of such a sentence which, after all, was its main purpose. So long as there is a way of avoiding the maximum penalty, you run the risk of the deterrent factor being lost. However, I think the risk of losing some of the deterrent effect is minimal and I, for one, am prepared to give several years of trial to that particular provision.

The power to set up special provincial commissions of inquiry into organized crime is potentially a good provision but adds little to good police work. It can be a good thing when used as a public pacifier, but it really depends on the provinces and is not really a criticism of the legislation.

I want now to move to the crime detection and electronic surveillance amendments, some of which are generally welcome. I submit the major defect is the departure from the rest of our criminal law wherein an unauthorized interception is inadmissible though evidence arising from such interception will be received. I think this has the effect of encouraging unauthorized interceptions, something I suggest parliament should not do. Either it is all admissible or none should be. Lack of basic philosophy in this part of the legislation seems to me evident.

Another concern has to do with the elimination of notice to a person whose telephone has been tapped. This portion of the legislation has potential for abuse. I do not think anyone can question that. My colleagues and I know the attorney general of Saskatchewan came down on the side of the present system whereby notice should be given, to ensure accurate police work and to protect individual rights.

● (1250)

I am more than surprised—in fact, I am shocked—that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and his colleagues would even consider introducing such changes in the law relating to electronic surveillance. I would have thought they would have been the last persons to bring in such a change. The legislation we now have in this regard, I believe, is sufficient. It should be left as it is. There may be some minor improvements which could be made to some parts of it, but certainly this major power in respect of

electronic surveillance and the unauthorized ones that can be allowed, I submit, cannot be countenanced by this or any other parliament. I hope the minister and his colleagues will have second thoughts and agree that this provision should be withdrawn. Too many decades have been spent in this and many other countries in the expansion and extension of the guaranteeing of civil liberties and the freedom of individual citizens for us to take this retrograde step in respect of this legislation.

In respect of dangerous offenders, the amendments remove some of the previous formality without getting rid of the former sanctions. I think this is a general improvement. If it should fail to achieve its objective of protecting the public against dangerous offenders, sexual and otherwise, the fault will be with the judicial system and not the law. Concerning where the fault may lie, it seems to me if faults of this kind should become evident through experience in the enforcement of this legislation, it will be incumbent on government and parliament in the future to bring in further legislation to correct any faults there may be in the judicial system.

On the matter of the custody and release of inmates, I think it is high time the absurdity in respect of the calculation of sentences should be removed. At the present time a sentence does not mean what it says, and very few lawyers in this country are capable of calculating a release date in a complicated situation. Earned remission is inevitable under present rehabilitation reasoning and may help in the control of inmates. I, for one, agree with the idea of earned remission. The conduct of the prisoner himself will decide what length of sentence he will serve. That onus in respect of individual responsibility on the part of the inmate is not only a good rehabilitative feature, but I feel it is one which will help in the control of inmates and their behaviour.

The increase in deterrent for escape is realistic, but the effort to provide a greater degree of security and safety in prisons will not be accomplished without the clear statement that a prisoner, by his very status, loses certain rights. Once again there is evident here lack of a clear philosophical base, which will continue to create uncertainties and strife within our jails.

I agree with the increase in the deterrent for escape and attempted escape. That penalty should be there and should be added to the sentence which remains to be served. I would hope that those who are far more expert than I, those involved in the law who have great experience and training in this regard, will take a further look at the legislation.

There has been a great deal of emotional hysteria around the country in respect of this legislation and different parts of it. I find this comes from both extremes, those who are for and those who are against portions or all of the legislation. Some of this emotional hysteria, I submit, has been generated by people who in many cases should know better. I have been appalled by some of the outrageous lengths to which some people have gone to criticize this legislation whether in respect of the control of firearms, the abolition of the death penalty or any other feature.

They have attempted to stir up emotional, unreasoned, inane and insensible hysteria around the country. I think that is very unfortunate. I would have expected more from many of those spokesmen. I am sad to say that even some members of parliament, perhaps unwittingly, have tried to attract more of that unreasoned hysteria and emotionalism, which has degenerated to sheer absurdity in some of the arguments put forward in opposition to portions or all of this legislation. That is no help to parliament or to the government in arriving at good, sensible, reasonable and enforcible amendments to our Criminal Code or additions to the Criminal Code. I would hope that the level of the arguments put forward against some of the measures in this legislation would reach a higher level in respect of some hon. members than has been the case so far.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock, so that I may complete my remarks later?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

● (1400)

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, before turning to the main part of my speech regarding firearms control, I want to add a few more comments to those I made prior to one o'clock on the matter of electronic surveillance. You will recall that I said I was shocked that the government would want to wreck the civil liberties aspect of the law with regard to electronic surveillance.

I only want to add to those remarks that we must keep in the legislation the notification features. Anyone whose telephone has been tapped or who has been subject to electronic surveillance in any other way is entitled to be notified within 90 days after the fact that surveillance was carried out in that manner. Secondly, the provision requiring police to obtain a court order or a warrant from a member of the judiciary not only must be maintained, but I think all police forces should want that provision in the legislation, even if it means having to get a judge or a magistrate out of bed at two o'clock in the morning to obtain such authorization if it is that urgent. That would be the route to go.

In my opinion, there should always be a judge on call, similar to doctors. If he is needed by the police force in the carrying out of their duties in order to live up to some part of the law, there is no reason a judge cannot be available at all times to assist the police in that respect. So I hope the present provisions on electronic surveillance will be left as they are and not amended in such a manner as to erode civil liberties and the basic rights of the citizens of this country.

I was saying, also, prior to one o'clock that in my opinion there has been a great deal of nonsense, hysterical and idiotic argument put forward against some parts or all of this legislation by people who I believe should know better. In fact, many of them do know better, and I regret to say that some of them are members of this chamber.

● (1410)

I will support any firearms control legislation which is reasonable and enforceable. As one who has owned a rifle and a shotgun for well over 30 years, in addition to having them trained in the air force and in the army in the use of Sten guns, Bren guns, .50 calibre machine-guns, Lee-Enfield rifles, and so forth, I think I can speak with some knowledge and experience on the subject. I said I will support any firearms control legislation which is sensible, reasonable and enforceable. I feel that owners of what are called long guns—rifles or shotguns—or any firearms under this legislation in most cases feel individual responsibility for the care, handling, safe-keeping and use of those firearms; and so they should. It seems to me that any potential liability of the firearm's owner has always been there.

I feel that having to obtain a licence to own a firearm will increase the sense of individual responsibility which each firearm owner already has, or should have. I also feel that the liability part should be limited so that the licensed firearm owner who has taken reasonable care and precautions will not be subject to liability if someone else misuses his firearm.

I think that in some ways licensing owners of firearms will help reduce the accessibility and availability of firearms to those who are either unfit or unable to own or use one. I am thinking not only of the criminal element, but also of children who in too many tragic instances have been wounded or killed because of firearms which were not safely stored and for which reasonable precautions were not taken. Too many tragedies occur in this way every year. There was a tragedy in Regina just last year. A careless and irresponsible firearm owner left a loaded shotgun in a room in a house. Two children ended up playing with it, and one blew the other in half. If the licensing provision will increase the sense of responsibility each of us should have in any case, then it is a step in the right direction.

With regard to reasonable precautions and safeguards, the overwhelming majority of firearms owners already keep their weapons in a safe condition. They do not leave them loaded in their houses. In fact, many have their rifles stored, or a rifle hanging on the wall has the bolt removed: it is locked away in some other place and the ammunition is also kept separate. If anyone were to steal the firearm or start playing with it, it would not be capable of being fired. So if a licence to own a firearm requires reasonable safeguards, we will have made a good move toward reducing the horrifying number of deaths and woundings, whether deliberate or accidental, which occur every year in this country.

There has been much talk about two people being required to endorse or to recommend a person in a firearm's licence application. I agree with that provision. I have hunted with many people since I was 15 years of age and, quite frankly, there are probably half a dozen individuals who are friends of mine and with whom I have gone hunting once or twice but with whom I will never go again. In no way would I endorse their licence applications if they were to ask me, because they are not fit to own a firearm. I would treat that matter in the same as I would an oath, an affidavit, a passport application or on any document where one's name and signature signifies his word, his honesty and his desire to abide by the law. I, and I think most citizens, regard endorsation as a serious matter. I do not think many people would endorse lightly an application for a licence for a firearm.

There should be a large number of licence issuers. For example, officers of gun clubs, whether they be collectors, sports shooters, target shooters, antique gun collectors or whatever, should be licence issuers. They should be authorized to issue firearms' licences to all members of their own clubs. In the main, these are very responsible, well run organizations and their members know how to handle guns and how to keep them safely. They can be considered as suitable to issue licences to their own members to own firearms. I submit that this would help relieve some of the administrative load from local police departments and other officials, particularly in large cities. For example, in Regina I suspect that anywhere from 2,000 to 4,000 individuals belong to gun clubs. The licences could be issued by the officers of their own clubs, and I think they should be.

Yesterday the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) made some excellent points and in the main I agree with him. I suggest to this House and to the government that consideration should be given to exempting the licensing requirements for residents in the northern area of Canada, say north of the fifty-fifth or fifty-sixth parallel.

Mr. Ellis: The sixtieth parallel.

Mr. Benjamin: It needs to be somewhere south of the sixtieth parallel because some of the northern parts of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and Labrador should also be exempted from the licensing requirements except in what could be called urban centres, for example, centres with populations in excess of 5,000, such as Yellowknife and Whitehorse. In those places licensing should still be required, but the residents of the rest of the area should be exempt from the licensing provisions. Non-residents such as myself who might go there on a hunting trip should still be required to hold a licence to own firearms. The people in those northern regions know how to handle firearms and for the most part handle them properly. I suspect that the people of the north have a much better safety record than people in the settled parts and in the so-called urbanized parts of Canada. I would feel no hesitation in exempting that part of Canada from the licensing provisions. I support the idea that anyone who is to be given a licence to own firearms should be required to demonstrate fitness to own those firearms. Frankly, I think there should be tests on gun handling and gun safety. One should be able to show some competence in that regard.

Under the provisions of the migratory game birds legislation of the federal government, and provincial laws respecting upland birds and big game, there should be some kind of game identification, hunter safety and courtesy tests for those who wish a licence to own firearms or for those who wish to purchase a licence to hunt.

● (1420)

I will support firearms legislation that I consider reasonable, sensible and enforceable for another reason that I think is the most important of all. I am a little tired of those who run around spouting what I call the cowboy syndrome. They look and sound like some hick sheriff from Texas, and act like some seven-year old boy playing with a toy gun. Surely we must put an end to this nonsense of anyone with a prison record, a history of violence, of insanity or extreme emotional instability being able to walk in off the street and purchase a rifle or a shotgun. Every responsible gun owner I have talked to agrees that we must put an end to that kind of sloppy nonsense.

We must put an end to a situation in which a 12-year old or a 14-year old can purchase a firearm by mail order. There has been a history in this country of mail order houses selling some weapons that were in fact unsafe; for example, shot guns with twist barrels or old rifles with worn actions. With today's high-powered ammunition, these guns could blow up in your face. There has been little or no control over the quality of these mail order weapons.

Similarly, I feel there needs to be a greater measure of responsibility taken by manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and transporters of firearms and ammunition. Too often the criminal element obtains firearms by hijacking trucks between the factory and the wholesaler. Insufficient precautions and safeguards are taken in the transportation of weapons. Too often wholesalers and retailers are absolutely sloppy about the way they keep firearms. You can go into retail outlets and find guns hanging out in the open in the stores and an expert shoplifter could have a ball. A good burglar could do well by emptying the whole case of weapons and ammunition in an evening. There are insufficient precautions taken by wholesalers, retailers and transporters of firearms and ammunition.

I think it also should be a requirement to keep records similar to those kept by druggists. They keep very close records and are very meticulous in the handling of drugs which could be harmful or dangerous. No druggist or citizen objects to that. Surely it is nothing more than reasonable to expect that the sellers of weapons and ammunition should keep up to date records on these sales, including the names of the purchasers, the serial numbers, the quantities, the quality, the description, and so on. Surely that is nothing more than good sense. No reputable businessman that I know would complain about this. No operator of a reputable gun store or department store I have talked to objects to this. In fact, some of them keep that kind of record on their own now, and it is to their credit that they do. I think it should be a provision of the law that this kind of sensible safeguard should be required of manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and transporters.

Much has been made about the licence fees. I think a reasonable fee of $5 or so for a licence could not be complained about seriously. The government should not attempt to recover the total costs of licensing from the licensee who wants to own a firearm. That would be putting an unfair financial burden on a small number of people who would be expected to pay the total cost of this measure which attempts to provide greater security for the public at large.

The federal government should not attempt to collect the full cost from the licence fee, neither should it foist the major part of this cost on the municipalities and provincial governments, since the purpose of this measure is to provide greater safety for the public as a whole. On that basis, surely the public as a whole should bear the major part of that cost through the national government.

If this government and this parliament want maximum co-operation and assistance from the police forces, the municipalities and the provincial governments, the Minister of Justice should be saying that the national treasury will reimburse those sections of society for administering and implementing this legislation. I think it would be unfair to ask the already over-burdened municipal budgets and, in many cases, provincial resources to carry this additional financial burden. I hope the government will do something about that when the bill is before the committee, because the great majority of the people would, in my opinion, support reasonable and enforceable firearms legislation.

There are some ridiculous aspects of this legislation that, hopefully, will be eliminated by the committee or by the House at report stage. We have heard some equally ridiculous statements about the harmful effect of the legislation, most of which have been dreamed up or imagined by those who want to incite unreasoning hysteria across the country. There have been a few in this chamber guilty of that, Mr. Speaker.

In closing, I want to say again that I have a great deal of sympathy for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North. I may well support that amendment and support the bill in principle on second reading. However, unless the government makes some significant improvement at the committee or report stage—and I hope accepts some sensible and reasonable proposals from members of the opposition and from its own backbenchers—I may find myself having to vote against the legislation on third reading. I may have to conduct myself in the same way I did in respect of the grain stabilization bill. I make no apologies whatsoever for the way I conducted myself in that respect.

It seems to me the government might well take seriously the idea of submitting the subject matter of this bill to the committee where most of the witness could be heard. When the committee then met later on to deal with the actual legislation, it would be in a position to deal with the whole subject much more efficiently and much more quickly. If the subject matter of this legislation were referred to a committee, a great deal more light could be generated by those who wish to submit briefs. We would than have something worth while, rather than the silly heat we have been getting.

I hope the government will seriously consider accepting a number of amendments. We could then proceed later in the summer on the actual legislation and do a lot more, with a lot more thought, than has been the case so far.

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 that we are now discussing aims at protecting Canadian society against those who commit violent crimes and other

types of crimes. It deals specifically with firearms, electronic surveillance, parole and reformatories.

Since many members have already spoken on the subject, I will deal with only two aspects of the bill which I find extremely important since they concern particularly civil rights, the possession of firearms and electronic surveillance.

Bill C-83 provides that any citizen who wants to own a firearm should obtain a licence. Consequently, the owners of the 10 million or so guns or shotguns that exist throughout the country will be asked to give them to the police if they do not need them. Furthermore, firearm dealers and suppliers will have to keep accurate registers of all weapon sales. Moreover, any weapon owner or dealer could be charged and convicted if a murder is committed with a gun which belongs to him because he does not keep all his weapons in a safe place. Mr. Speaker, obviously, pressure groups of all types are protesting against the government proposal requiring that every gun owner have a licence.

I sincerely believe that this bill will not reduce the crime rate since most crimes committed in Quebec of other parts of the country are committed with weapons such as revolvers and machine guns which are now extremely difficult to obtain because of the rigidity of the present legislation.

Will the legislation proposed by this government give the anticipated results? To tell the truth, I am concerned about this. Indeed, we only have to note that the legislation of the State of Massachusetts in the United States, which is the strictest law ever applied in that country as concerns gun control and provides for an automatic sentence of imprisonment for one year for anyone who transports a weapon without a permit, has brought about very little changes in Boston during the first six months after its implementation. According to the statistics of the Boston police, the number of armed crimes such as murders, thefts, rapes and assaults committed during the first six months after the implementation of this legislation is about equal to the number registered for the same period in the previous year, before this strict legislation was implemented.

One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, even the extremely severe penalties imposed by the law in the State of Massachussetts do not seem to have the desired dissuasive effect. Consider that in the case of revolvers, Canada established controls before the last World War, that these same controls became more severe during the sixties, to the extent that possession became so difficult as to be practically impossible, and yet these controls did not succeed in curbing the use of firearms for criminal purposes.

I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government wants to establish at any price both strict and efficient controls on firearms. To do so, it must consider also some other appropriate sectors, for instance, the use of drugs which is steadily rising. In schools, CEGEPs and even in several universities, the use of drugs is widespread.

I am astonished to note that policemen seem to tolerate those kinds of things and to find them normal. The use of drugs is constantly increasing and requires huge sums of money. We know how much money drug users need to get them.

To that can be added the startling conditions arising from the parole system in Canada. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, too many criminals are paroled without taking into account the possibility that they can become a threat to society. Giving further thought to the matter, I note that as the result of the disintegration of discipline and morality in an increasingly permissive society, we have lost all objectivity and every concept of values.

We must admit that problems raised about firearms and their violent use are very complex and often ambiguous. In addition, the relation existing between firearms and violence tends to conceal other much important related facts. Indeed, one only has to realize that the majority of offensive weapon owners want to use their weapons in an appropriate way. Now, if one looks at the statistics, one realizes that most of the time it is law-abiding sportsmen, honest and model citizens who deplore the use of firearms for criminal purposes.

So would it not be preferable to solve the problem giving reasonable consideration to their needs? Furthermore, it should never be forgotten that violence results from causes a lot deeper than the simple proliferation of firearms. Indeed, the gun is not dangerous by itself, the car is not dangerous by itself, nor is the gas that must be used. It all depends on the individual using it. It must be admitted that if firearms do make it easier to express violence they certainly do not provoke it. Also, if one makes a retrospective of events one realizes that all social perturbations in fact have their origin in the current economic system. To illustrate that one only has to think about someone coming out of jail. To survive, he must find a job. But unfortunately he will be refused employment because he has a criminal record that follows him everywhere.

Yet, he is a human being with physical needs who has to eat and dress, like everyone else. If he does not find work to meet those needs, he has but one alternative: go back to the vice for which he was condemned in the first place.

Undeniably, the proposal whereby bureaucrats would be empowered to determine who can have a firearm and who cannot is an alarming example of the philosophy according to which all that is not mandatory must be forbidden. May I also add that, if this bill becomes law, we can expect anything. And especially this: firearms will be restricted to an elite, and also those weapons will be registered by serial number.

That way, it will be easy for a government that suffers from delusions of grandeur to confiscate all firearms under the pretext of emergency measures, apprehended insurrection, and thus ensure the docility of the population.

In my modest opinion, the registration of firearms surely does not prevent criminals from getting them and, moreover, it will not save the lives of citizens who could be killed by people who never showed a propensity to crime in the past. I sincerely believe that the government is making a big mistake by proposing the adoption of this bill, because its purpose is to impose unnecessary measures to law-abiding citizens. There is for that matter no evidence at all that firearms control can effectively reduce the rate of crime, except in totalitarian states.

In addition, this bill will only create a number of annoyances for sportsmen and honest citizens in general. The

government would be better to prevent the selling of military surplus to the public, for I regard the fact of putting such arms on the market as criminal. I would like to add that the minimum age to buy firearms should be 18 or more.

In its present state, Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 provides that a much greater number of justifications will be available to intercept private communications. An authorization of the courts would still be needed before intercepting communications and the period during which interceptions are authorized would be increased from 30 to 60 days. And it would no longer be necessary, after 90 days to notify a person whose communications have been intercepted. On top of allowing that more interceptions be conducted, Bill C-83 indicates that the police will even be allowed to use the private communication that has been intercepted as evidence in courts even if they have not been authorized by the judge.

Private communications are intercepted especially in the case of persons suspected of drug trafficking or gambling for these are areas in which the police is not always successful. But, even we can easily recognize that organized crime is now a real plague that we should fight with all possible means, do we really wish to allow the police to interfere in the private lives of honest people in such a generalized way in order to fight a war which they cannot win.

This measure seems inacceptable to me for it is unconceivable that in this free and democratic country, the research and the punishment of the guilty comes before the respect for the private lives of the honest citizens. For the moment, the law authorizes interception of private communications only in some very resricted cases and I hope that this will continue to be so.

Police officers are only human. They are not immune from error. We must therefore oppose any provision leaving too much discretion in such an area, because it is extremenly important not to infringe unnecessarily on the rights of a number of innocent people.

This does not mean wiretapping is not valuable. Any investigation technique, and especially undercover ones, may bring useful information. But I would not readily suggest it is the most precious police weapon, nor that the police cannot successfully conduct investigations without it. We must be realistic about it.

It must be added that intrusion has been made into the privacy of hundreds of thousands of individuals, with the aim of restricting freedom of speech and association, in the name of national security. Each year the government spends millions of dollars in that area, while neglecting more important services that could undoubtedly help eradicate factors leading to crime. And to what success, Mr. Speaker? A few drug peddlers, a handful of gamblers and bookeepers sentenced. Never are the major bosses arrested, for the simple reason that the big ones probably do not receive that many phone calls. Evidently, those not wishing to get caught do not use their telephones where they suspect they might be wiretapped. Frankly, there must be better ways of spending our few dollars.

Surely the aims of this legislation are commendable. But I cannot accept the fact that to fulfill them the government found nothing better than restricting the civil liberties of honest Canadian citizens. In my view, further research should be done on the relationship between guns and violent crime, and the ways and means of fighting violence. Such are the comments I leave on Bill C-83.

• (1440)

[*English*]

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on Bill C-83 because it is so important to Canada and Canadians. As a lawyer and defence counsel I am concerned about the matters covered in the bill and the approach the minister is taking to handle them. I will not speak on all matters of interest to me at this time but will confine my remarks specifically to gun control, electronic surveillance, special crime inquiries, dangerous offenders, and custody and release. Time does not permit me to go into each in depth but only to make what I consider to be relevant points in order to have the best bill possible.

The first part of Bill C-83, dealing with gun controls, is an important part of the peace and security programme as a preventive approach to crime. We have all heard the criticisms of the proposed controls that have been levelled by hunters, sportsmen and other gun owners. These critics regard any form of gun control as an attempt to disarm them and deprive them of a means of protection and recreation. I think this is an unreasoned response to the measures that have been proposed by the government. There is a limited proposal to disarm: first, by providing for an absolute prohibition of weapons that have no legitimate uses in hunting or target shooting, and second, by restricting the possession of all firearms to people who can be relied upon to use them in a responsible manner and only for lawful purposes. A system of licensing firearm owners will not make it impossible for professional criminals to own and use guns, but the conscientious application of these controls will reduce the chances of dangerous weapons remaining in the hands of unreliable people.

A Statistics Canada study of firearms has revealed that 13 per cent of the homicides in 1974 were committed with hand-guns, which have been controlled for some fifty years. In the same year, approximately 30 per cent of the homicides were committed with long guns, which are not now subject to any means of control. The unrestricted availability of weapons obviously has a direct relationship to their use in criminal activities. It is important to bear in mind that, although "professional crime" is increasing in Canada, most homicides are still impetuous acts, committed in moments of extreme emotional stress. Controlled access to firearms could significantly reduce the number of these crimes. The "cooling-off" period built into the licensing system will forestall the train of events that so often ends in misfortune when there is uncontrolled access to weapons.

As the minister said in his remarks opening this debate, "gun ownership is not a right, but a privilege". People with previous convictions for firearm misuse, or with a history of mental instability, should not be granted this privilege. The onus must rest on the person seeking this privilege to show that he is capable of using firearms in a responsible way. To this end, I would like to see the licence application

include an undertaking that the applicant be responsible for the whereabouts of his firearms. He should also be required to show, at the time of the application, that he has the means to store firearms in a safe place where a child or other unauthorized person cannot have easy access to them. I would suggest that administratively the licensing be carried out locally in a similar manner to that already in effect for hunting licence applications in provinces. I would also suggest that some control be exercised with regard to the purchase of ammunition and/or explosives and/or the ingredients required for ammunition, so that authorities would know where any large quantity of ammunition may be found, such as the location of gun clubs and other similar organizations.

● (1450)

In imposing gun controls it is important to recognize that for many people firearms serve a necessary and legitimate purpose. This is a factor that has been admirably recognized by this bill. Being required to prove, at five year intervals, the ability to use and own firearms and to exercise responsibly will not inhibit any person with lawful intentions. I think this is the minimum price that should be required for the privilege of using weapons that have the potential for so much harm.

I fully support the proposed increases in maximum sentences for firearm misuse and for the use of firearms in the commission of other crimes. It will provide a more effective deterrent to the gratuitous use of weapons in criminal activities. However, I do not support the minimum sentence requirement in section 98(1), the proposed section that everyone who uses an offensive weapon, etc., whether or not he causes or means to cause bodily harm to any person as a result thereof, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for not more than 14 years and not less than one year.

I would also suggest that the proposed section should be changed so that the individual could be charged under the section summarily or by indictment. The section refers only to proceeding by way of indictment, which seems rather harsh to me in all circumstances. In my view, the Crown attorney should be able to decide, on the facts available to him, whether to proceed summarily or by way of indictment. Minimum sentence do not provide any stronger deterrent to the commission of a crime, but they tie the hands of the judge responsible for sentencing. He alone is in the position to weigh the circumstances of the individual case and determine a suitable punishment. Appropriate sentencing is an integral part of the crime prevention process. For this reason, I think the sentencing judge should be limited only by maximum penalties.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the question of electronic surveillance. In this section the amendments proposed in clauses 6 to 10 of the bill correct what I feel to be a serious error in the Protection of Privacy Act. The law enforcement authorities must be given sufficient freedom in their powers of investigation to uncover and prosecute the activities of organized criminals. The extension of the allowable period of surveillance is a belated recognition of the fact that crime prevention and detection is a lengthy and painstaking process. If the power to intercept communications is to be an effective one, then the time limit should be subject only to the requirement that the continued necessity of the surveillance be shown at prescribed intervals.

The removal of the exclusionary evidence rule corrects another error in the orignal act that needlessly hampers police investigation. Admitting evidence derived from an illegal interception should not be viewed as an open invitation to unauthorized electronic surveillance. I think that more confidence in the integrity of our law enforcement authorities is warranted. Under the amended section, however, a technical invalidity in the judicial authorization would not cripple the entire investigation. Similarly, removing the requirement to notify the person being investigated will allow the investigation to be persistently developed without prematurely alerting the suspect.

These amendments have already been the object of a great deal of criticism, notably by the Civil Liberties Federation. In the *Globe and Mail* of March 2, the federation is quoted as calling this bill "the most regressive action taken by the government since the imposition of the War Measures Act", and predicting that "Canadians will lose a significant part of their hard won freedoms, while peace and security will still remain an elusive objective". Certainly in its efforts to control crime and reverse the trend of increasing violence, the government must not disregard the civil liberties of the individual. I think it is possible to establish a healthy balance between safeguarding the individual's rights and giving the police enough power to do their job effectively.

Specifically in the matter of electronic surveillance, this balance can best be maintained by requiring stringent judicial examination of every application for authorized surveillance. The grounds for authorizing an interception are set out in clause 7. I think the standing committee should undertake a careful study of this section in or to consider a more precise definition of the grounds for authorization, without, however, limiting their scope.

It is my understanding that when wiretapping and electronic bugging legislation was passed in the United States in 1968 it was actively utilized. In the first year of operation I understand that for 3,500 arrests where "bugs" were used, some 40,000 people were heard in some 500,000 conversations. When you consider the magnitude of such statistics, the whole question of bugging appears to be potentially dangerous to personal privacy.

I think the onus must remain on the Crown to demonstrate why it is necessary in the public interest. Surely it is useful for detection and follow-up concerning organized crime. However, it should only be used where other policing methods and techniques are not considered adequate or efficient. It has been shown in the United States, so I am advised, that there was more success in detecting crime using other conventional methods than when bugging was used. It seems to me that for bugging devices to be used, it must be shown that they are not only useful but indispensable under the circumstances of the case. The burden of showing the necessity of electronic surveillance rests, quite properly, on the official applying for authorization. If this requirement is rigorously applied, the public will not become subservient to the police, as the Civil Liberties Federation has charged. Subjecting each application for surveillance to close scrutiny by a member of the judiciary will do far more to protect the individual's rights than any

requirement that he be notified of the surveillance after the fact.

Another point of concern to me is that the proposed legislation is expanded to include all indictable offences. It includes not only serious crimes but also impaired driving, simple possession of marijuana and even theft of a newspaper. This does not seem to be consistent, to me, or according to the intent and spirit of the ligislation. Surely police authorities do not require electronic surveillance for all indictable offences. Another observation that could be made is that the notification requirement serves as a deterrent to needless bugging, in that the police should only bug where it is absolutely necessary.

The sections dealing with special crime inquiries to be established by the provinces provide a timely clarification of a constitutional issue. The effectiveness of these commissions of inquiry has already been demonstrated and a statutory definition of their powers is appropriate at this time. I have only a minor criticism of this part of the bill. If the commissions of inquiry established by the provinces are to exercise all the powers of a court, then I see no reason to withhold from them the power to cite for contempt. Requiring the citation to be brought by a judge of the superior court simply creates an unnecessary administrative step in the procedure. The commission is to be entrusted with the power to carry out a judicial inquiry, and with the protection of the legal rights of persons being investigated. I think it would be more consistent and expedient to allow the commission to issue contempt citations in connection with its other activities.

Unfortunately, my criticisms of the dangerous offender provisions of the bill are not so minor. It has been recognized for many years that the present sections dealing with preventive or indeterminate sentences have not been successful. The Ouimet report, in 1969, advocated an extensive revision of this part of the Criminal Code since it has been most frequently applied to essentially harmless people who have committed a series of minor property offences.

Similarly, studies of psychiatric services in penitentiaries, carried out by the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), have revealed that dangerous sexual offenders have frequently been wrongly classified. The abolition of this concept is certainly a step in the right direction, as is the serious personal injury offence restriction that is proposed in Bill C-83. However, the existing law allows for an indeterminate sentence to be given only when a person has been previously convicted of an indictable offence on at least three separate occasions and who has been persistently leading a criminal life.

● (1500)

Under the amendments proposed, the requirement for three previous convictions would be replaced by "patterns of behaviour" indicating that the offender is not likely to be subject to restraint. The person could therefore be liable, on his first offence, to prolonged detention perhaps exceeding the maximum term for the crime for which he has been convicted; and the prolonged detention would be ordered on the basis of past behaviour which has not necessarily involved the contravention of any law.

We are dealing here with a departure from the traditional ambit of the criminal law, which punishes or detains only on the basis of proven infringements of clearly defined rules. I think this departure is a potentially dangerous one, requiring scrupulous examination.

[Mr. Robinson.]

The classification of certain offenders on the basis of their potential for dangerous behaviour would be made on the strength of evidence of psychiatrists, criminologists or psychologists. This approach seems to presuppose that practitioners in these disciplines can assess an individual's potential for violent behaviour according to a set of technical and objective criteria. Unfortunately, the behavioural sciences have not reached this stage of accuracy. An error, on the side of "*caution*", in the original assessment of the offender's potential for violence can create a serious injustice; and the error could be repeated, and the injustice compounded, during the periodic reviews that have been provided for. There is also the possibility that a "dangerous offender" could be released within three years, and, regardless of the accuracy of the assessment of his potential for violence, would thereby serve a much shorter sentence than would have been imposed if he had not been deemed a dangerous offender.

C. S. Lewis, writing in "1953 Res Judicatae," warned of the dangers of the "humanitarian theory of punishment", which

> removes sentences from the hands of jurists whom the public conscience is entitled to criticize and places them in the hands of technical experts whose special sciences do not even employ such categories as rights or injustice . . . the first result of the Humanitarian theory is, therefore, to substitute for a definite sentence (reflecting to some extent the community's moral judgment on the degree of ill-dessert involved) an indefinite sentence terminable only by the word of those experts . . .

My objections to the dangerous offender sections should not be construed as an objection to the preventive approach to crime, or to the protection of society from known criminals. But the same result can be achieved by the traditional sentencing methods, without incurring the risks of error and injustice.

The past behaviour of a convicted offender can certainly be used in the judge's determination of the appropriate sentence to be handed down. The repeal of statutory remission of sentence, proposed in this bill, would ensure that any person who demonstrated "unrestrained violent tendencies" would not be released before the sentence was actually served.

The last point I wish to raise has to do with custody and release. The proposed changes to the Parole Act and the laws governing the correctional institutions will provide a much needed improvement in the release of convicted offenders. The increase in the number of National Parole Board members will, as the minister has stated, permit a more thorough review of individual cases for parole. The inclusion of members of the community on the board reflects the legitimate interests of local concerns in the release of inmates. I would like to see this approach carried further in the amendments, and have some assurance that the parole decision will be based, at least in part, on the recommendations of people who are in daily contact with the prisoner, since it is these people who are in daily contact with the prisoner, and since it is these people who are in the best position to assess the individual's chances for a successful return to society.

I have spoken at some length on some of the areas of concern in this bill. There are many other aspects of the bill that should be further considered as well. I would hope that the bill could be moved quickly to the Standing Committee of Justice and Legal Affairs so that each issue raised could be considered in depth and so that Canadians who are interested will be able to take part in the deliberations. I would also hope that the minister has some amendments to make in view of the representations that he has received that he would make them known at the earliest possible time, and certainly as soon as the bill goes to committee.

Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, speaking today on Bill C-83, the peace and security bill, I should first of all like to say that there are many people in Canada who believe this bill relates to capital punishment. This is not their fault. Rather it is the fault of the government which has done a very poor job in explaining that we have two bills before us, one being the peace and security bill and the other bill being on capital punishment.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) spend much time and money advertising on television and radio in an attempt to convince the people of Canada to change their opinions on capital punishment rather than on properly explaining the issues. They have done much to confuse it. Bill C-83 on peace and security contains some 73 pages, half of which are on gun control. The remainder deals with wiretapping, special crime inquiries, custody and release of inmates, crime, and crime prevention measures. These are considered to be more of the housekeeping type of amendments to acts that have already been passed by the House of Commons.

There can be no doubt that this bill should be divided in two, that is, the gun control section split from the remainder of the bill and introduced as a separate bill. It is for this reason that our party proposed a motion asking that the bill not be read a second time, but that it be sent to committee to have the gun control section severed from the rest. I believe this action should certainly be taken and I only hope that our motion will be called before it is sent to the Standing Committee for Study following second reading.

As this comprehensive gun control bill is the first ever to be put before the people of Canada, there is great concern shown by the people over this bill, and they believe that we should have an opportunity to study it, by itself, in committee. There is no doubt that it needs a lot of clarification and much discussion in committee. It does very little to control the criminal elements. In its present form it could be the cause of many innocent people getting criminal records.

Hunters and sportsmen could probably live with such a bill if they could get a licence to own a gun. They are already licensed to hunt, and in many cases they believe that this same licence would be the one that would entitle them to own a gun. But this really is not the case as this bill clearly spells out.

What does legal responsibility in the act really mean? What is safe storage? Is safe storage a person's home, provided it is locked, or does the government really mean that guns have to be kept in a separate locked gun closet? A locked home is often broken into. People who break into a home can also very easily break into the gun closet. Does it mean carrying it in a locked car or locked truck? Surely if one is to transport guns or firearms either to or from the gun shooting clubs or for hunting, this must be done by car or truck. Criminals have no difficulty in breaking into locked cars or trucks.

Getting back to the legal responsibility, if a gun is stolen, how can it be proven whose gun it is? Certainly this legal responsibility can and will only apply to the very innocent. Section 105 (2), "seizure without warrant", alone would start a round of court cases involving people who are innocent of wrong-doing because peace officers would then be allowed to enter homes without search warrants and seize firearms which they feel are out of place. This is often the case when we pass a law such as this without really looking at and studying the ramifications.

The seizure of weapons by police, when the safety of a person is in danger, is probably not too bad or too hard to live with, providing the police do not use this sort of thing indiscriminately. I can think of many times when this should have happened, but because it couldn't the police were unable to perform their duties properly. I would also hope, if a section such as this were passed, it would not allow the police to show their muscle when it was not really necessary.

We already have laws about restricted and prohibited firearms. However, the registration of these is being tightened in this bill. The bill clearly says that the only way that you can have such a restricted firearm, is when there is need for protection of life, lawful occupation, target shooting, or bona fide collecting. This proposed section also needs some clarification so that people are assured that their rights will be protected.

● (1510)

The target shooters and the bona fide collectors are the ones about whom we are most concerned. In many cases the bona fide collector can prove that he has made the gun inoperative by removing the firing pin or other dangerous parts of the gun, and therefore he feels that he should not be discriminated against. As hunting has become more and more limited in the more populated areas in Canada today, target or trap shooting is a very popular form of diversion for the sportsmen. They are therefore able to use their guns in the same manner as they did when they were actually hunting, and this allows them to be participants in sports rather than just being spectators. The fact must be recognized that these people cannot and should not be restricted in this kind of relaxation which they enjoy.

Let us now deal with the section on licensing. This is the section about which, I believe, most people in Canada, certainly those who want to have guns for hunting, are most concerned. This provision says that anyone who wishes to possess guns or firearms must have a licence. To obtain this licence they must have two designated guarantors who are responsible people in the community.

Just who will designate these responsible people? The government in power will, of course. Will they be political appointees? Will they be paid employees? Certainly if they will be paid political employees there will be no problem in

getting them. There are always people standing around looking for these types of positions. However, one must ask what their responsibilities will really be. Will they have any responsibilities apart from guaranteeing that someone should have a licence? If they do, then I do not think there will be many people willing to take on this kind of task.

At any rate in many of the small communities in Canada I do not really believe there will be too many people who will want to take on this kind of chore without having or accepting some other responsibility, and therefore I do not believe it will be very easy to convince people to accept the position of a guarantor for an applicant for a licence to obtain a gun. These guarantors will not be concerned so much about the multitude of people whom they guarantee for licences but rather about the few about whom they are not certain whether they should or should not have a gun.

What about the innocent-type looking person who comes to them for a licence and then later shows that he is not responsible enough to own a gun? How does one determine mental stability? Will someone who has had mental problems at some time or other, especially in his childhood, be forever considered mentally unstable? How do you know that a person has never had any medication for mental instability? In many cases parents have sought help for what they thought were their disturbed children. Are these children to be charged with mental instability for the rest of their lives? For the parents who did not seek help there really is no record, so they do not have to answer for these children. Persons who sought and received help could now have much better mental stability, but now they have a record which will follow them and therefore they might be discriminated against.

A great number of people are now concerned about the cost of the fee for the licence. Just how much bureaucracy will there be in order to licence all these people? This concern is real because under this legislation the cost of the licence will be relative to the operational costs of the bureaucracy. This is not very easy in these times of big governments and Parkinson's law. So this has become a very big issue. Has the government made any study to determine what the cost will be? How will it explain it to people if the cost is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $50 per licence? I understand that the cost of a licence in New York is around $100.

What about people who are moving around Canada? They can get a licence for five years but they must be known for two years in the community in which they reside by the guarantors who have been designated. We all know that workers travel around in different parts of Canada. The recently released report of the Economic Council of Canada shows this very clearly. How can a person have his licence renewed if he is not known in the community?

Another group of people about whom we are concerned are the American hunters coming to Canada. How will they get a licence? This question is being asked by many guides across Canada who have set up a hunting business for American hunters. In general these are not small businesses but big businesses, and answers to these questions must be forthcoming. Will the treatment accorded hunters from abroad differ from that accorded to our own? This matter should be clarified.

[Mr. Whittaker.]

I should like to take this opportunity to read into the record parts of two excellent letters which I have received from my constituents. The first comes from Grand Forks, British Columbia. It reads:

I have been able to exercise my vote for well over 20 years and other than that do not become deeply involved in politics. Over the years, however, many policies, regulations, restrictions, etc. that the government has brought about have been, in my opinion, ridiculous—

However, the purpose of my letter is to express my views on the upcoming firearms regulations. I recently had the opportunity to thumb through the 30 some odd page proposal, some of which makes sense, some is tolerable. The majority, however, is once again, I feel, ridiculous.

I do not wish to pick at individual items as this would involve a 40 page summary, so will take a general approach.

I own some firearms, I thoroughly enjoy the outdoors in every respect and normally get a little hunting in each fall. However, I am not a gun collector nor a hand load buff.

I am familiar enough with firearms and laws to be certain that no one would purchase a gun, register it, try and obtain a carrying permit, then go and commit a crime. Anyone who is capable of bank robbery, murder or whatever, will have no reservation about stealing the gun. If offensive weapons are to be registered then one may list the following, knives of all kinds with blades over three inches, finger nail files, hammers, axes, clubs baseball bats, golf clubs, broken bottles, fists, wrenches, tire irons, etc., etc., etc. The above items are frequently used as a tool to create bodily harm or used in a threat.

The papers and newscasts are constantly reporting people killed in car accidents, plane crashes, drownings, house fires and the like. Everyone that is injured or killed certainly has not been shot—so why pick on guns? Alcohol and drugs cripple, mentally distort, and generate more crimes, so why not attack the source rather than pick on guns? Not long ago some teenage children in an institution held officials captive with broken glass, as a weapon. Just prior to that, inmates in a prison held guards captive at knife point. No guns were involved in these and numerous other cases—

It is our tax dollars that apprehend and convict these people then go on to support all their demands. This adds up to many thousands of dollars per prisoner per year, year after year, after year.

Not long ago a habitual drug user was apprehended with several thousand dollars worth of hard drugs in his possession, for the purpose of trafficking. The volume of drugs in his possession was enough to bend several people out of shape for the rest of their lives. Many weeks and a terrific amount of money, tax money, was spent to give this person a fair trial. I understand he was fined $350 and turned loose to pick up where he left off on the streets.

A great deal of time and money has been spent in the past in legislating laws and regulations. A good many of these are directed at gun control. This is good. I am certainly in favour of laws and regulations that will afford a safe society for my family and I to survive in, but let's take a long hard look at what we have and where the real problems are rather than point a finger at another surface object which generates more legislation, more laws, more tax dollars spent, restricts the "Joe Blow" type and if anything, gives the criminal more protection.

● (1520)

In review I am suggesting that . . . Adequate laws relating to firearms control have been made—so "enforce them" . . . Deal with the crime and criminals in the same fashion that they deal with society—"harshly".

Another letter comes from a lady in Penticton, B.C.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Perhaps the Chair should raise the point, since the hon. member has quoted quite extensively from a letter which was sent to him, that the usual practice in this House in the past under these circumstances has been that the writer of the communication should be identified.

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, I have the letter here, and I would be only too pleased to send it up and have it—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): These letters should be identified by hon. members when they are making their speeches.

Mr. Whittaker: The author of this letter is Mr. Ray Johnson of Grand Forks, British Columbia.

There is another letter from a lady in Penticton, and it reads as follows:

It was interesting to hear the result of your questionnaire, regarding capital punishment and gun control laws. I can understand your confusion . . .

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whittaker: I hear a lot of noise from people on the other side, and because I receive more mail from my constituents than these few which point out in uncertain terms the faults in this legislation, they are becoming very thin skinned. They do not want to hear them. They do not want to hear this type of thing because they are so thin skinned. They cannot take it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whittaker: The reason I quote from these letters is that they are so well written.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to clarify that I read my mail in my office. I get as much mail as the hon. member does, but I do not read it in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): That could very well be a point for debate, but I do not think it is a point of order. The hon. member was good enough to comply with a suggestion made by the Chair with regard to a point he was making in debate, and during most of the morning and afternoon all speakers have been listened to with extraordinary silence.

Mr. Whittaker: I am sorry that the whip of the official opposition is so thin skinned.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I am not the whip of the official opposition.

An hon. Member: You will be.

Mr. Whittaker: The hon. member will be before too long. He does not have as loud a voice as the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs. I only heard the former minister of consumer and corporate affairs. I have great difficulty hearing the voice of the government whip.

Another letter comes from a lady in Penticton, B.C., and reads as follows:

It was interesting to hear the result of your questionnaire, regarding capital punishment and gun control laws. I can understand your confusion when many pro-capital punishment are against gun control measures. As you will note, the fish and game enthusiasts are feeling threatened on this issue and react as they usually do to anything that interferes with their "rights". Perhaps, the issue has been clouded by the knowledge that the judiciary have not made full use of their prerogative to pass appropriate sentences to those convicted of violent crimes.

Measures Against Crime

On reading through the Criminal Code of Canada, it is obvious that the maximum sentences available are probably adequate. In recent years it has become increasingly apparent, to those interested enough to follow the course of a trial to its outcome, that few indeed are judges that give anything but sentences that can only be called minimal (i.e. Steven Scott, convicted of manslaughter (plea bargain) originally charged with murder of Mrs. Mae Arpe, last fall in Penticton, sentenced in January, Kamloops Supreme Court, to five years. A brutal killing, tried in camera so that certain aspects would not be made public. Scott elected for trial by the judge—one small paragraph in Vancouver *Sun* and Penticton *Herald*, in which the judge is quoted as having told Scott that his actions were despicable and he hopes he gets psychiatric help (for his perversions)—along with a sentence for 5 years—(5 years means, 40 months maximum and 18 months—If Mr. Scott plays the game in the prison)—astonishing!

Perhaps the best example, or worst, is the sentence to the man in Saskatchewan, who killed four children last year—each murder conviction allowed a sentence of life imprisonment. The judge passed sentnece appropriately until he said "concurrent"—if he never intended this dangerous person to be free—whatever happened to the term "consecutive"?

I realize the judiciary operates independently from government and this is right and good. As it stands they answer to absolutely no one for their action within the court. From time to time we are told that sentencing reflects the will of the people in any given age—"the mores of the times"—I don't think so at this time in the 20th century.

It is, therefore, the responsibility of government to ensure protection for the public by making certain that minimum sentences are a fact in the Criminal Code too. All the messing around with increasing maximum sentences comes to naught if the judiciary does not make use of these changes.

In these days of plea bargaining, easy bail availability, elopements from mental hospital of persons held under "order-in-council", prison escapes and hostage taking, is it any wonder that the public has begun to question the courts? It seems that sentencing for white collar crimes, involving money, draw more punitive measures than do violent crimes now.

In closing, I must add that gun control measures must come no matter what the macho types amoung us feel. No matter that professional criminals will always have their sources, some measures are in order that some guns will be surrendered (to be destroyed) by those who do not want their responsibility—many will keep the guns they have under a more safe manner. Guns will only be sold under more stringent conditions. This has to be a benefit to the people.

An excerpt from another letter I received from one of my constituents says:

It is my firm belief that the eventual prohibition of all firearms is the aim of this government and when that comes, we will be living in a police state. An omnibus bill is not the way to pass legislation that will affect millions of people, but it is the only way an arrogant or irresponsible government can hope to get unpopular laws passed.

I have just quoted from only three of the many letters I have received from my constituents, but I think they aptly point out what concerns the people in my riding. Many people believe that this bill is designed to confuse and divide the people of Canada, and as we know this government for its great divide and conquer ways I think they are quite right in their concerns. Yes, this bill could be just a tip of the iceberg; it could lead to eventual prohibition of firearms. People who think this way just cannot be ignored. Some of them have seen this in the countries from which they emmigrated. Many are aware of the rights which have been taken away from the people over the years, and they see that this is just another one of these actions.

My involvement with guns has been of long duration—most of my life—and it has also been very complete. I doubt if there are very many members in this house who have used guns more than I have, starting back in the late

twenties. I know guns; I know what they can do. I have seen them used with great discretion, and I have even seen them misused, mainly by people who are inexperienced and have not been trained in their use. But just tell me of anything which can be abused in Canada and which has not been abused, for instance, the automobile, alcohol, drugs, television, and the writer's pen. The easy targets will be those who are underprivileged and unfamiliar with the law.

● (1530)

An hon. Member: There is a lot of difference between the pen and the gun.

Mr. Whittaker: I notice that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) interjects that there is a lot of difference between the pen and the gun, but let me point out that there have been many pens loaded with poison.

Mrs. Holt: They don't blow off a head and they don't knock out hearts.

Mr. Whittaker: I think the hon. member should go and write another book like "Terror in the Name of God".

Mrs. Holt: Maybe you would learn something. Maybe I will write on guns and the dangers of them.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Let him go on reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave): Order, please. The hon. member has the floor and there should not be half a dozen other debates taking place on his time.

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, the easy targets will be those who are underprivileged and unfamiliar with the law. I see the prospect of harassment levelled against innocent people; people who are caught in the web of this law on legal technicalities because of the difficulty they find in adjusting and altering their sports and cultural habits in line with the imposition of this law, which is based on sheer lunacy. This is a form of innocent guilt which is unjust, unnecessary, and inexpedient.

There are areas where steps could legitimately be taken with respect to the use of firearms; for example, the development and administration of an effective safety program, the development of high standards of proficiency amongst sportsmen and hunters. In these respects legitimate sportsmen's organizations throughout the country have never been recognized. Their recommendations have never been acknowledge. They have not been consulted or requested to provide input into the legislation we are considering.

Surely an effective safety program could be worked out jointly between the federal government and the provinces, in consultation with gun clubs, hunters' groups, and fish and game associations. If this legislation is to command the co-operation and support it will need in order to make it work, the minister and the government will have to go to these people and work with them. There are better ways of getting to the core of the criminal problem than using a sledge hammer on the innocent law-abiding citizens of this country. Surely, the hunters, target shooters, and gun collectors are not criminals.

If we dealt with our killers and criminals in a firm, harsh way, it would be the first positive step in stemming the tide of rising murder and violence. The law dealing with those who have threatened violence, or use violence in a criminal act, requires tightening up and firmer enforcement. To that extent I welcome the provisions of this bill.

The legitimate gun owner in this particular case should not be the scapegoat. This bill will do very little to deter the criminal. The section dealing with gun control was the government's response to the emotion and hysteria of an already overloaded and frustrated society. It has addressed itself to that element rather than engaging in a penetrating examination of the root causes of the chronic problem, that of violence in this country.

While there is a general disposition on the part of the public to demand some tightening up in the establishment of control and safety standards, in respect of this bill and to the extent it meets these objectives I must say categorically that I find this piece of legislation exceedingly harsh and very offensive. It seems to me that quite a public relations job is being done here.

The government has utilized a kid glove policy in dealing with the criminal element of this country and it now attempts to take it out on the legitimate gun owner. It has responded to the emotions of hysteria in relation to some dramatic episodes that have taken place in the last year or so. These episodes, involving the use of guns, may have involved the use of some other weapon, such as a bomb. My view is that if a person is bound to kill, or has an absolute desire to kill, he will kill in one way or another, whether it be with a gun, bomb, sledge hammer, knife, or the fist.

This is the core of the problem, and that is the problem to which this bill fails to address itself. I repeat that what is needed is stricter enforcement of existing laws and less coddling of criminals. Stricter gun laws will not cut crime, but proper enforcement of the existing laws will.

The Minister of Justice has now used closure to stop the debate on this bill. He said, in a radio broadcast the other day, that the reason for this was that he wanted to get the bill to committee because of all the mail he has had from across Canada. He now understands that the bill was poorly written, needs much discussion in committee, and has to have many amendments.

In my opinion the minister should be severely censored for bringing a bill to the House of Commons which he now realizes was very poorly written. He also realizes there is going to be a great wave of opinion across Canada against such a bill. He also does not like the speeches that are being made by the opposition against this bill, while knowing full well that his own members cannot stand up or do not stand up and say what their constituents are saying to them about the bill.

Surely this is a poor way to run a government when it has to pull this type of closure on the opposition so that they cannot continue to inform the people of Canada about this bill. Surely, this must be one time they must be informed, knowing that we have not had this form of gun

control legislation brought before us in the history of Canada.

We have legislation concerning guns that will and should control the criminal if it is properly used. Now we see this government of ours bringing in this kind of legislation, wanting it to have as little discussion as possible, so that the people of Canada cannot understand what is really going on. The government wants to get it into committee, of course, because when it is being discussed in committee there is no record for the people of Canada to follow.

It appears to me that the government wants to get it into committee to try to take the heat off, and then maybe it can get some more of its high-pressured advertising going to try to convince the people of Canada that it is right. But I do not think it is going to be able to do so in this case. I believe the people have caught on to the tactics of this government.

At one time, even I was hoping that the government was going to be serious in its presentation of Bill C-83, the peace and security bill, that it would be getting tougher with law and order. But, just at that moment, we had the judges' affair. We found that cabinet ministers were calling judges about court cases. At that same moment we were able to know and understand that the government was not serious. If it had been serious, the Prime Minister would not have hesitated to call a public inquiry into the judges' affair. This would really have demonstrated to the people of Canada that there was some seriousness, but he did not, and so they in turn are not going to take him very seriously.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-83 and Bill C-84 are companion pieces of legislation. Their one basic purpose is an attempt to achieve a society with less violence. One reason I feel very strongly about Bill C-84, and I will just mention this before dealing with C-83, is that to achieve a society with less violence we cannot use violent means. It is for this reason I am an abolitionist. This is not for me a matter of conscience or morality; it is just a fact that you cannot have less violence by using conscious violent means. Bill C-83 is an attempt to reduce violence in our society.

For a few minutes I should like to discuss this general area of violence and the reason for the increase in the use of violence in our society. Let me refer to some statistics.

In 1970 the total number of offences against the Criminal Code committed in Canada was 1.1 million. In the four years from then to 1974 this grew to 1.45 million, or about one criminal offence for every 17 persons in Canada. Of course, that is an incorrect way of phrasing it because some people committed more than one offence. There was an increase in crime in that period of 31.8 per cent. In the same period, violent crimes such as rape, murder and armed robbery, increased by 23.5 per cent. As a percentage of the total amount of crime, violent crimes decreased from 9.2 per cent to 8.7 per cent. However, that does not mean we do not have a problem.

● (1540)

I wish to present another set of figures comparing crime in this country with that of the United States. In the period between 1970 and 1974 violent crime increased by 23.5 per cent in Canada and 24 per cent in the United States. The significant figure is that in 1974, there were 2.6 violent crimes for every 100,000 population in Canada as opposed to 9.7 violent crimes for every 100,000 population in the United States, about four times as much. I state those figures because they are significant when dealing with the whole area of violence which is basically what is dealt with in this bill.

There are many reasons why violent crime is on the increase. First and foremost is the general insecurity of our times. We live in a very unique time. I do not think there is any period in history that can compare with the present time. Things move very rapidly. We have inflation, resource shortages and a whole series of problems. People feel insecure. They live under severe pressure. Change occurs at a very rapid rate.

There is a basic element of conflict in the way we view life in our society. This conflict shows itself in many ways. One is in the whole area of violence. Another is in the increased use of drugs. If one were to analyse these statistics, 23 or 24 per cent over that period of time in Canada, and the same in the United States, one would see that drugs were very much an element in violent crime. However, I see drugs more as a result of the conflict of our times and the difficulties of the period we live in rather than they themselves being the basic problem, although they do present an additional set of problems. The basic problem is insecurity and the times in which we live.

There is another factor of which we must be cognizant, that is the accent in the media, television in particular, on violence. When we compare the figure of 9.7 per 100,000 in the United States as opposed to 2.6 in Canada for violent crimes, we can see that some of this violence flows over through the media, television in particular, into Canadian society from the United States. Young people watch thousands of shootings and killings on television during their formative years. That is another factor that has to be looked at; it is not dealt with in this bill, but it is something we have to think about.

I would like to deal with the educational system. I spent 20 years in it, 17 years as principal of a high school. I am very concerned about something that is happening in our schools which I believe it is contributing to a violent type of society.

I am sure hon. members recall the tragedy in Brampton last spring when one student shot two people and tried to kill a third. A similar incident occurred in an Ottawa high school last fall. We should not look at those two crimes as isolated incidents because there are other forms of violence which do not show up in the courts. For example, the suicide rate in our high schools is very high.

I do not like to oversimplify things, but there is something they are doing in our schools that I consider very dangerous. Our schools have grown large. We have taken the attitude that in a school with an enrolment of 1,800, we can offer more courses and this is good. We have computerized our school system. We have taken individual students

and put them into a timetable straightjacket by means of a computer. This has been done very thoughtlessly.

We have set up what is known as a scattered timetable. In the first period a student may attend an English class with 30 other students. The next period may be mathematics and there may only be two students from the first group. The next could be a French period with no one from the first group. What we have done is take that student away from any possibility of being part of an established group. We have taken him or her away from interacting socially and learning how to adjust to a group.

When I, and I am sure most other members, went to school, we belonged to a home form class. We moved with that class. We were part of that group. The teachers knew the students in that home form class. In the Brampton incident, two teachers were looking for that student on the same day. I am sure both teachers did not know they both taught that particular student.

There is a real problem of identification in the schools because of the scattered timetable. I am perhaps spending more time on this than I should, but it is something I know about, and it concerns me because I think we are creating a very dangerous precedent in our society.

Young people do not learn how to become part of a peer group when they are scattered. When they leave school, and they leave early, partly because they did not become part of a group within the school, they do not know how to adjust within a society. They are in conflict with society. They have not learned the social intercourse which is necessary. We are creating an element in our social policy which will inevitably lead to more violence.

I now wish to deal briefly with the bill. While I have some difficulty with it, I cannot understand the strong opposition to the bill because there are elements of it that are very good. When discussing this bill, the opposition glosses over certain things. There are some basic purposes we have to look at.

This bill attempts to prevent criminals and psychopaths from getting hold of guns. That is not an easy proposition. The bill is perhaps most imperfect in this attempt, but it is attempting to do that.

I do not think that the matter of registering the owner of the gun in the way set out in the bill will be very effective. There are some real difficulties in this area. I do not like the idea of two guarantors. In the many years that I signed passports, all I did when signing was to say that I had known that person, usually a student, for two years. I did not have to say that I approved of that person or that I thought that person was good, bad or indifferent. I just had to say that for two years I had known the person whose name was on the passport.

● (1550)

I think as a guarantor I would not have objected when asked whether a person was or was not a good person, if I had to make some kind of valuation, moral or otherwise, of that person. So I think this is something we have to look at somewhat differently. Yes, I think we should licence the gun owner but in some other way, because, don't forget, the purpose is to prevent criminals and psychopaths from owning guns. But in some way we should be able to

[Mr. McRae.]

register an individual by merely having him apply for a licence and have the licence looked at in some way or other by the police or other authorities, to ensure that he isn't a known criminal or, even more important, that he is not a dangerous psychopath, a person who could use a gun for the purpose we are talking about, that is, for a violent purpose. I think this might be a better approach. That same registration card could then be used to buy ammunition, to buy another gun, and so on.

The second purpose of the legislation has to do with more care in the use of guns. One of the things which has been absent from this debate as far as the opposition is concerned is statistics of the deaths incurred from firearms. In the year 1974, the last year for which I have figures, some 1,500 people in this country dies as a result of the use of firearms. Only 269 were the result of homicides and, as I understand it, close to two thirds of those were homicides caused by people known to the person who committed the murder, So really we are dealing with the use of guns within families. Over a thousand of the deaths caused by the use of guns were by suicide. We are dealing with the use of guns by persons who are not basically criminals.

The person who commits suicide is not a criminal. The person who gets drunk and so on and gets into a fight and kills someone is basically not a criminal when he starts. This is the dangerous use of guns of about which we must be concerned. It represents more than four fifths of all the deaths by firearms. I do not know how we can escape those figures. To me they are extremely important. Whether the bill effectively deals with this aspect I am not certain. I think there may be other things we can do. But to say that we are restricting the law-abiding citizen and ignoring the criminal is to ignore the statistics completely.

I think there are some important things in this bill. For instance, it should be stressed that it is a criminal offence to leave a loaded gun in a home or to leave a gun on the seat of a car. I think that what has to be done in the bill is to specify these things, put them down and say what is a criminal offence in this respect. I hope amendments will be made in this direction.

Another point I should like to make is this: the bill is an attempt to penalize criminals. I think we have all accepted the fact that there is a portion in the bill which would make it automatic that when a gun is used in the commission of a crime the person who uses it should get a sentence in addition to the sentence going with the crime. I think one year is too light. I would make it two years to 14 years rather than one year to 14 years.

Another important feature of the bill is that it does allow the police to remove firearms when there is a very definite sense of danger, when there is danger that can come from the use of those firearms. I think the police must be able to remove those weaspons. When an individual has violent habits, when an individual is drinking, when, for instance in the case of a quarrel between husband and wife the wife feels she is going to be killed with a gun, it is important that the police be able to remove that gun.

I have one other point. I find it difficult to understand the person who says, "If a gun is not available some other weapon would be used." I know of one incident and, I know one individual involved rather well. A person drink-

ing, cut up another person with a knife. The person who was cut up recovered. The person who did the crime was a Korean war veteran, a world war two veteran, an expert in the use of arms. He certainly would have killed that person in that act if a gun had been available. So I think it is important to realize that the gun is an important thing, more lethal then a knife, to be kept under control and I believe the bill does something in this direction.

I will support the measure in principle on second reading. I will insist, however, that there are some amendments which must be made which will strengthen the bill, as well as amendments which will also make it more reasonable, that will not condemn the legitimate hunters and members of gun clubs and people in similar groups who I believe are very, very careful about how they use guns. These are groups which will not permit members to misuse guns; they know that if guns are misused on a shoot somebody is going to be killed. They spend a lot of time and energy training people in gun safety. I hope that when the bill finally goes to committee the advice of the gun groups will be sought and seriously considered especially when we are discussing gun safety.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It being four o'clock, pursuant to the order made earlier this day the House will now revert to Routine Proceedings, specifically, statements by ministers, for the purpose of hearing a statement by the Prime Minister.

● (1600)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON "PATRIATION" OF CONSTITUTION

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank hon. members for allowing me to make a statement at this rather unusual hour. It had been agreed that I would table those papers today because of some events that concern all parties in the House. It was not possible for me to do so at noon, so I think I had to do it before the weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table letters I sent recently to the premiers of the provinces which set forth the essentials of discussions that have been going on during the past year. They are discussions to see if we might find our way out of a constitutional impasse that has frustrated governments of all political persuasions, both federal and provincial, for nearly 50 years. That impasse is the problem of bringing to an end our unique and unenviable distinction as a country of having to go to the Parliament of another country if we want to amend some fundamental parts of our constitution.

[*English*]

I do not intend to go into this problem in any detail. The former leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), raised the matter in the Debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne on October 2, 1974. He said he did not think it was too much to ask that there be agreement "at least on an amendment formula, during the life of this parliament". I agreed with that view. I hope my agreement is shared by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark). It seemed to be shared by virtually all hon. members judging from reactions at that time.

In April, 1975, I had a meeting with the premiers of the provinces to discuss the pricing of oil and gas and related issues. I used the occasion to test whether there might be hope of getting the kind of limited agreement to which the hon. member for Halifax had referred—agreement on an amendment formula on the basis of which we could bring complete control of our constitution into Canadian hands. The premiers agreed that it would be worth trying and I asked the Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations to visit each of them to explore the possibility further. The letters I am tabling report the results of those discussions.

I think there has been some misunderstanding about the way the government, or I personally, approach this matter. Clearly "patriation" or the achievement of a means of amending our constitution are not "urgent" in the sense that the control of inflation or decisions with regard to energy prices are urgent. Nor are they "priorities" in the same sense as many other priorities the government has established for the determination of new policies or programs. But there are "priorities" of a less tangible kind that are important when human societies are buffeted by the uncertainties and the attacks on confidence that we find in the world of today. Affirmations of national will and indications of collective determination to renew and strengthen faith in structures and in values that unite people are symbolic, but they are important.

Such a symbolic affirmation occurred, I think, when the Parliament of Canada adopted our national flag. Does anyone doubt it has strengthened our sense of being "Canadian" or of being united for important purposes? A similar symbolic affirmation could occur if we were seen to attest our faith in our form of government by ending a defect that has flawed it for decades. This is not, perhaps, the kind of thing that should claim a large part of the time of parliament when other things might press. But I, as Prime Minister, make no apology for saying that it is the kind of thing that we should try to do. We should not be seen constantly to be failing as a people in a matter that relates to the central structure of our national fabric. In short, it is well worth some attention from this parliament to conclude this long outstanding piece of national business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Trudeau: It is for these reasons that I have raised the possibility that Parliament might seek to have "patriation" accomplished without provincial consent if that consent seems impossible to achieve. Clearly it would be a last resort and clearly it should not be on a basis that could affect the distribution of powers or the position of the provinces. It must not provide any means by which Parliament could act unilaterally in future in any area where it cannot do so today since that would erode the essence of our federal system. In my letters I explore three ways

Parliament might move for "patriation" without such consequences. I raise these not to recommend them, but rather to explore how we might bring to an end the apparently perpetual impasse. Neither the federal government nor Parliament should accept the proposition that they can do nothing whatever about a matter of such importance to us as a country.

Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table in both official languages letters that I sent on March 31, 1976 to the premiers of all provinces, together with a "Form for a Proclamation of the Governor General" which those letters covered.

Mr. Speaker, I am also tabling another letter dated April 19, 1975. It had been written following the meeting with the premiers I mentioned earlier. I did not ask all premiers permission to table the letter that I wrote to them. However, since the premier of the province of Quebec recently raised the possibility that I table it, I undertook to do so knowing no one would likely object.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I would also suggest that those letters be part of the debates.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of above documents, see appendix.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to express to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and to the House the appreciation of all members on this side of the House for the courtesy in agreeing to delay the tabling of this document and the remarks preceding the tabling until this hour, since some of us had to be absent earlier in order to be present at the funeral services for the late Senator Grattan O'Leary. I am pleased, as are my colleagues, that the letters have now been tabled and will be part of the public record. Certainly I approve of the Prime Minister's suggestion that they be appended to today's *Hansard;* I think that will be generally helpful.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I hope there is no need for the Prime Minister to ask whether I intend to be cooperative or constructive about achieving an amending formula and, indeed, about achieving patriation of the constitution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can achieve both of these goals—and they are not necessarily the same goals—within the life of this parliament. I should say that in the text of a speech which I gave last Friday in my native province, in the presence of the premier of that province—and I might say in passing that it was a speech in which I felt able to keep my shirt buttoned and my tie in place—I was able to make the following statement; namely, that I want to emphasize that our party, and myself as its national leader, are committed to the principle of patriation of the Canadian constitution. Surely it is an anachronism for any country to have to turn to the legislature of another nation in order to amend its most basic statute. We can all agree on that, as we can all support any genuine effort by the government to bring the

BNA Act under the sole control of Canadians and of their legislatures.

That was the position I took then, Mr. Speaker, and I stand by it.

I was a little surprised by a tone that I thought was almost apologetic on the part of the Prime Minister in his statement this afternoon. There are, of course, other very important priorities that face this country, but there is no need to suggest that patriation of the constitution and agreeing to an amending formula are any less urgent than some of the other really urgent matters that face the country. It would be time very much well spent on behalf of the country and by our various governments to achieve these objectives. Certainly I agree that symbolic and substantive successes in building the national fabric are very much what we are all here for.

I think perhaps I can be forgiven also for expressing my pleasure and that of my colleagues that the Prime Minister chose to note that the question of proceeding with patriation of the Canadian constitution in the life of this parliament was first raised by my colleague and predecessor leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield). I would remind the House that he made that suggestion in the course of pointing out the failure of the government to specify that as a goal in the Speech from the Throne. We are very pleased that the Prime Minister has taken up the suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: —and I want to assure the government that it has the good will of the House to try to make progress on this matter, and to try to make that progress during the life of this parliament. However, I think it is fair to say that this House needs some very real indication that the Prime Minister will take to heart an earlier part of the statement of the hon. member for Halifax, which the Prime Minister did not quote, in introducing the subject as reported at page 39 of *Hansard* for October 2, 1974. My predecessor, my colleague from Halifax, said:

● (1610)

If co-operative federalism was at best an imperfect process, its subsequent replacement by confrontation of federalism in this field will be tragic, if continued.

That is a position to which my colleagues and I also strongly adhere. While patriating the constitution would be a constructive, symbolic act, the way that is achieved is of even more symbolic and substantial importance. Patriating the constitution in a co-operative way would be clearly beneficial to our national life. However, achieving that goal in a divisive way which only heightened suspicion across this country would be tragic and unnecessary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: There is an obligation on the part of the government to take very seriously the process of consultation with the provinces on this central question. I would simply express, in passing, a very deep hope and determination on our part in this House to avoid a situation where there might be any suggestion that the provinces are being set up for a subsequent unilateral action by the setting into place of a process of consultation that was not seriously

pursued by the federal government and which would not allow for the kind of agreement we must have if we are to have both the symbol of federation and the reality of having at home in Canada an amending formula and constitution with which we can work.

There are two objectives before us: the symbolic act of patriation, and the substantive task of keeping our constitution contemporary by the on-going process of amendment. This latter task in a federal system can only work by co-operation and general consensus. Therefore it is desperately important that those who would be seen as nation builders pursue the symbolic goal of patriation in a way that expands and does not narrow the climate of trust and comradeship in the confederation.

The Prime Minister noted that the control of inflation and decisions on energy pricing are also urgent. Those problems, as well as constitutional matters, will not be resolved in a spirit of confrontation. We face some very difficult matters in dealing with patriation and the substance of an amending formula. All of us in this House will be interested in the process that will be carried on now that the correspondence is tabled. We firmly hope that progress can be made toward the goal of achieving patriation and the goal of achieving an amending formula as a result of agreement. That is a process in which the government and the provinces can count upon the full support of me and of my party on this side of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has made a statement and has tabled correspondence on the patriation of the Canadian constitution. This party welcomes this statement. For a long time we have believed that a new Canadian constitution was required, not only to exercise the independence of Canada but also because the old constitution, the British North America Act, is in many ways defective and obsolete.

The Prime Minister appears to have adopted the Victoria Charter formula. I am glad to say that we agree with that and believe it is much less rigid than the Fulton-Favreau formula so far as amendment is concerned. We believe it should be acceptable. We agree also that there should be permanent guarantees of language rights, English as well as French, and that such guarantees should be entrenched in the constitution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that the patriation of the constitution and the adoption of the amending formula is only a first step. We believe a new constitution is required. I remind the House and the Prime Minister in particular that the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons reported in 1972 after and not before the Victoria Conference, and made 105 definite recommendations. I hope they will be looked at because we believe many of these recommendations are particularly valuable. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), a very learned man in this field, was the co-chairman of that committee.

I wish to mention just one or two things as illustrations of the sort of recommendations made in very practical fields. It was suggested that it should be made clear that the federal and provincial powers should be concurrent to deal with air and water pollution. We also note the recommendation that Canada's international treaty making powers should be clarified and expanded.

We also urge—and I know the Prime Minister has been very much interested in this subject over the years—that at the appropriate time the new constitution should contain entrenched provisions for the maintenance of the fundamental rights and human freedoms.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: Indeed we think that would be far more effective than the Bill of Rights that we have which was passed by this parliament.

In general, Mr. Speaker, we would recommend the decentralization of government powers in areas touching cultural and social policy, and greater centralization on the other hand at the national level of powers that have important economic effects throughout Canada. I have said that many of the proposals contained in the report of the joint committee are highly practical. I must say that I, and I think many others in the House, deplore the tendency, which seems to be more common, to assert that constitutions do not matter.

In fact a workable distribution of power is essential to the humanity and development of Canada. The Prime Minister's statement seems to contemplate, as I read it, three different methods of seeking patriation. We should like to study these carefully.

We believe that whatever is decided on as the right course should not be too rigid. There is serious danger if the method Canada should adopt would be one of too great rigidity. We believe that the Prime Minister's statement perhaps over-emphasizes the necessity for unanimous consent. In fact this convention, or practice as I think the Prime Minister called it, was not followed at all until about the year 1940. After all there is a difference between a constitutional law, or rule, and part of it is that a mere convention or practice certainly should not be allowed to become too rigid.

We believe with the Prime Minister that the consent of all the provinces to an amending formula in respect of any changes in the distribution of power should indeed be sought. That has been the practice, and certainly should be the practice. However, we do not think that if total unanimity is not possible parliament should be paralyzed in seeking patriation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I also received the document and the letters written to the Quebec premier as well as the proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps a dissenting voice this afternoon in the House because I am completely flabbergasted by the proclamation which the Prime Minister has

just read. I knew that the Prime Minister was a centralist, an emperor, but I did not know that he was such a dictator.

The gesture that he has just made is beyond any precedent in our history. When he read the letter he wrote to the Quebec premier, Mr. Robert Bourassa, in which he stated his intentions of patriating the constitution, I thought that he wanted to court him but at the end of his letter, he merely said that he would act just the same even if he did not get any reply. That, Mr. Speaker, is really a very bad start. In short, the Prime Minister does not refuse to discuss the matter with Mr. Bourassa, but he reserves the right to act as he sees fit. If that is not Russian-type dictatorship, it is no dictatorship at all, Mr. Speaker.

That reminds me of the last meeting between the Prime Minister of Canada and his opposite number from Quebec, Mr. Bourassa when, from the heights of his arrogance, he treated the Quebec premier like a child in kindergarten. But I want to forget what the Prime Minister said.

To my mind, not a single Quebecer will ever forget that insult. Today, the other provinces are being pushed around. There again, the Prime Minister considers the provincial premiers a bit like so many nonentities.

The Prime Minister seems to say this: I am Prime Minister of Canada; I proclaim this or that; whether you are for or against, I could not care less. And should you even deign reply within eight days, I shall consider your silence approval of my insults.

The Prime Minister is forgetting his Canadian history, or perhaps does he want to proclaim himself above all our history to create another Canada which will be far from "strong and free"! In fact, the provinces signed the constitution, through which they gave birth to the federal institution that would take over administration.

● (1620)

It is the provinces which, voluntarily, one after the other, joined Confederation. The best proof the provinces freely decided is that Newfoundland, the last one to join, waited until 1948. The same provinces are still absolutely free to remain within the confederative agreement. The day some province decides to withdraw, either because it finds its rights are infringed on, or because its people are sick of being siphoned off by a never-satisfied central government, that province will have absolute right, and I repeat absolute right, to withdraw and say: "Goodby centralists!"

For that reason, I maintain it is up to the provinces an the provinces alone, to decide on the constitution issue. Today, as he regularly does, the Prime Minister changes roles by substituting his will for that of the provinces. And we Quebecers—will be in for it once more. It is somehow too bad the same sad happening befells us while we have a French Canadian heading Canada.

Such tragic events happened under other French Canadians I do not dare name. I simply stamp out any memory of them. Many ask if we are against patriating the constitution. My answer is "No", to the extent it is patriated by the proper authorities and to the benefit of the provinces. Let them ensure that every province requested it, let them ensure the constitution will come back without any amendment. We support storing that paper in Parliament.

We, especially Quebecers, demand power of veto for our provincial government. We want it to demand not only constitutional guarantees in education, that is French language and culture, but also territorial and every other guarantee. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have no wish to run the risk of going through a second Labrador.

We lost Labrador because the decision was made between Newfoundland and the government of Canada, while under the same circumstances, between other provinces, boundaries were always determined by the two governments concerned. In the case of Labrador, Quebec had no voice. This is why I say we do not wish to go through another Labrador and risk losing more territory without even being consulted.

Reading the proclamation, we see the Prime Minister is basically interested in amending the constitution not in patriation itself. That is the true reason for his unilateral action. He wants the greatest powers to amend the constitution in order to give more of them to Ottawa and less to the provinces. He proposes three methods to amend the constitution, when he knows quite well that Quebec will accept only one, that is its right of veto on anything affecting the interior of Quebec and the unanimous consent of all provinces for anything that concerns Canada.

Why then beat around the bush and try to disguise his intentions. In paragraph (A) of the proclamation, the Prime Minister is again trying to minimize the impact by leading us to believe the British North America Act is not as rigid as the requirements of Quebec. We can read this formula on page 2 of the proclamation, and I shall spare you the reading of this formula.

He talks about a formula which implies the consent of the legislative assemblies of the provinces; but he forgets to say that in practice, and since the adoption of the British North America Act, the unanimous consent of the provinces has always been required. It is a confirmed right. And the Prime Minister tells us—

An hon. Member: By whom?

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): By all the successive governments. And the Prime Minister talks about consultation with the provinces, particularly with Quebec, in a letter to Mr. Bourassa.

Have we not repeated often enough, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a right to be consulted that Quebec needs, but a right of veto on all decisions affecting the province and the unanimous consent of all provinces on the other decisions affecting Canada. It is to that condition, and to that condition only, that we will accept the formula.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I think that the one aspect of the statement made by the Prime Minister that causes slight concern here has to do with the reference to possible unilateral action by the federal government. I think that the statement here today seems to carry a slightly threatening tone. I wonder if the Prime Minister would indicate to the House whether he thinks that his reference to unilateral action as a last resort is necessary as an incen-

tive to achieve agreement from the provinces. Would he also indicate to the House what kind of conditions, in his view, would have to apply before he resorted to what he calls in his statement the last resort of unilateral action?

● (1630)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I should first make it clear that when the Leader of the Opposition talks about the federal government, I understand that he understands, as I do, that we are talking about an action of the federal parliament. Everywhere throughout the documents I talk, not about the government, but about a joint resolution of both houses of parliament. If this is understood, the reason why I talk in there of the possibility of unilateral action is that I am reporting to the premiers of the provinces on a discussion we had about a year ago in which we all agreed we should attempt to do this, as the Leader of the Opposition agrees, by unanimous action.

The question can be asked, and was asked, and it is to that question that I address myself: if there is not unanimity in agreeing to patriate, are we then prevented from acting as we have not acted for the last 49 years? My answer to that is that we are not prevented legally from acting. There is a belief by many people that we would not even be prevented politically. I believe that is the position which has been taken by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

We do not necessarily have to have unanimity. The position of the government is that we will seek agreement to the extent it is possible between all ten provinces, but that we will have to take our decisions in the next couple of years—since the Leader of the Opposition also talks about the life of this parliament—as to whether it cannot be done without the unanimous consent of all the provinces. The advantage of the formula which I spell out in my letters is that it permits patriation—or matriation, as has been suggested by one hon. member—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: —to take place through action by the federal government, but in a way which diminishes in no way the rights of the provinces, in a way which increases in no way the rights of the federal government, and which even suggests that unanimity will indeed be the rule even on amendments until some other formula is agreed to, so in this sense we believe it is possible, legally, and we hope that it is possible politically to achieve this result. That will depend on the will of the provinces, and it will depend on the actions taken by this parliament.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I think I now have clearly in mind the area in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would consider unilateral action by this parliament to be appropriate in the absence of unanimity, but I should just like to make absolutely certain that I understand him clearly. Of course in a sense it is hypothetical because it has not happened, but it is important to be absolutely clear about it because the question of the possibility of unilateral action has been raised.

As I understand it, the Prime Minister has in mind that this parliament might act unilaterally only to the extent of requesting the British parliament to forgo any future right to legislate with regard to our constitution. Is this the extent to which unilateral action is contemplated in the absence of unanimity, and is this precisely what the Prime Minister has in mind with regard to patriation in the absence of any unanimous agreement at this time on an amendment formula?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member for Halifax expressed it admirably. We are not seeking unilateral action in order to increase our powers, or to decrease the powers of the provinces either now or in the future, but unilateral action only to get the British parliament to cease and desist from its present legal powers under the Statute of Westminster to legislate for Canada. That is the simplest hypothesis, and this is the first of the three courses of action which I suggest to the provinces. This is the minimum action. It would result, of course, in a non amendment formula existing in the Canadian constitution or alternatively, as I suggested in the letter, a formula which would only be possible hereafter through unanimity. In other words, the unanimity would continue to be required in order to modify in any way the constitution. I suggest that unanimity is not required in order to get that constitution back to Canada. I just confirm the understanding of the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I understand the distaste of the Prime Minister for the continuing right of Westminster to amend the constitution, and I am sure he will agree with me that simply removing that right constitutes patriation in a sense but does not really take us very far, and I am sure does not go as far as he would like to go, and certainly does not go as far as I would like to see achieved.

However, I should simply like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will give this whole question sufficient priority with a view to attempting to achieve an agreement and understanding on an amended formula. I would regard this as a great personal favour to me during my life in this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I can indicate that it was with that importance in mind—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: —that I indicated in my letter to the premiers the second course which I described and which indeed does include a formula for amendment, a less rigid formula for amendment. It is with that in mind that I wrote our preference and expressed our preference for that course, if indeed we can convince the provinces that it is a desirable one, and I am honoured that the hon. member for Halifax considers that my action there was taken as a favour to him.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister about how this situation is to be followed up. I read the letters he wrote to the premiers, and I do not think they explicity call for any answers, although by implication the Prime Minister seemed to be seeking the views of the premiers on the matters discussed in his

correspondence. Is it proposed to seek from the premiers some definite answer, or is it proposed to call a conference of some sort to see how far unanimity can go in these matters? To put it in a simple way, where do we go from here?

Mr. Trudeau: I made this suggestion in my letter to the premiers that if they wanted further discussion, or further elucidation of the various courses we were indicating, the Secretary for the Federal-Provincial Relations in the Privy Council Office, Mr. Gordon Robertson, would gladly meet the premiers or their officials, as indeed he has been meeting them over the past year, to explain further the contents of the present letter. I also indicated that, if the premiers so desired, at the meeting of first ministers which is planned for early May when we will be meeting to discuss the price of oil and gas, perhaps on that occasion, as was done last April, we might take a short time to seek out the opinions of the various premiers. Therefore, it is possible, and hopeful, that I will be receiving written communications before that, but I think it is to be expected that at that meeting we will take some little time in order to deal with this matter.

Mr. Brewin: If the premiers do respond to these letters and correspondence they have received from the Prime Minister, will this House be informed in due course, either by tabling or by way of a statement by the Prime Minister, so that we in parliament can be aware of the momentum with which this proposal is going forward?

● (1640)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this is indeed in the realm of hypothesis. If there were to be quick agreement and consent by all concerned between now and the early part of May, and if other parties saw fit to adopt such resolutions quickly, certainly we on this side would be prepared to seek time between now and the end of June. I must indicate that this is only on the unlikely hypothesis that everybody is ready, willing, able and anxious to get it done that soon. As one of the premiers suggested last year, it would have been nice had we been able to do it at the time the Queen was in Canada. That did not indicate any kind of deadline on my part. I think this is something we can do just as easily during the next session as during this session, but I am completely in the hands of both houses of parliament and, of course, of those of the premiers as to the most appropriate time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the right hon. Prime Minister has received and read the message addressed to all members of the Canadian Parliament by the Société Saint-Jean Baptiste of the province of Quebec. In this message, we can note the following, and I would like the Prime Minister to comment on this. I therefore quote from this message:

> First, the federal government and the provinces should agree to a review of the present constitution which would recognize Canadian bi-nationalism as one of the constituting elements of the country, clearly establish the respective jurisdictions of the federal and provincial governments, clarify their power to collect taxes and spend money, and create a constitutional court with all guarantees of objectivity.
>
> Second, once this review has been completed, an agreement should be made not only among the ten provinces, but also between the two constituting nations of the country about a process for eventual constitutional amendments.

The last paragraph seems to come close to the idea that the Prime Minister has just expressed.

> Finally, when both these conditions have been met, the British North America Act which constitutes our present constitution can be relinquished and the new constitution can be promulgated, which will patriate our constitution.

These are the wishes expressed in this message.

If the Prime Minister has read this message, could he make some comments on this subject if this is the procedure that he wants to follow?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. I take the liberty of saying to the hon. member for Bellechasse that this is not the view of the hon. member for Roberval, who is the spokesman for the Social Credit Party. He did not mention these matters at all on behalf of his party. Unless I am mistaken, he indicated two essential and fundamental conditions: the right of veto for Quebec and no action by the federal government to amend the constitution without the unanimous consent of the provinces. Those are the only two conditions he spelled out. The hon. member for Roberval nods his head in assent. I am very pleased to let him know that if he carefully reads the formula he will see that I propose these two conditions he rightly finds essential. They are in fact in the proposals I put forward. So I hope I can count on the support of the Social Credit Party for this gesture I want to make.

[*English*]

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question on the most worth while statement he has just made. In view of what all sides here agree to be the fundamental importance of the matter, would the Prime Minister be willing to have parliament, on behalf of the people of Canada, take a further real part in the ongoing discussion he comtemplates with regard to bringing home our constitution and an appropriate amending formula for it, by having the documents he tabled today referred to a committee of parliament for consideration and public hearing, not necessarily immediately, but perhaps after the provincial premiers have made their initial replies, assuming of course, that they do not immediately agree with the government's proposal?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have no strong objection to this course, I would want to point out to the hon. member, however, that I think we would all be mistaken if we thought this problem could be solved by a committee of this House. I believe the studies of the constitution and, indeed, the attitude of spokesmen for various parties, indicates there is strong support for the general course of action being discussed here this afternoon. The next step is to see whether the provinces agree. If they do agree, I suggest that we should then, rather than now, refer it to a committee of the House for further consultation. If they do not agree, I think it might be a mistake but I will certainly consider the suggestion of the hon. member, to create a degree of expectation in the minds of the people of Canada that a committee of this House will in any way serve to get the province to change their minds.

I think the first step is to see whether the provinces agree. If they do agree I take it we will have no difficulty.

If they do not agree, then we should perhaps ask ourselves is parliament to be required to take the course I have suggested, and which I think has been very succinctly and accurately described by the hon. member for Halifax. This would be my preference. If the House wants to spend some time on this matter for other reasons, I have no objection. It would be a matter for the House leaders to see if this has sufficient priority at this time to take up the time of a committee.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, this is a question that is particularly vital to the small provinces, and certainly to my province which was the last to come into Confederation. I should like to ask whether the Prime Minister feels that in the absence of agreement, as a last resort, the Parliament of Canada by an address of both Houses has the right to bring back unilaterally the British North America Act, which is what we are talking about, and then, following that, whether the same parliament of Canada has the right to change the BNA Act?

Mr. Trudeau: No.

Mr. McGrath: If that does not follow, my question to the Prime Minister is this: What is the point in bringing back the constitution unilaterally in the absence of an agreement on an amending formula?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, without wanting to play on words I would say that the proposition as stated by the hon. member does not follow but in a sense it precedes. What I mean is that the Parliament of Canada now has the legal right, and in fact it has exercised that right historically, to act unilaterally in amending the constitution. It has done so in circumstances where provinces in effect have objected to the federal parliament addressing the Parliament of Westminster to change the BNA Act. This has in fact been done.

What I am proposing now is that patriation be followed by a situation where the federal government would not unilaterally have this power. It would only have this power to act, however, with the unanimity of the provinces in a preferred formula, with a certain right of veto to the provinces, but not an absolute right.

The hon. member then proceeds to ask what is the point? That is something which I am afraid I cannot make a satisfactory response to in order to satisfy the member. If he is satisfied with the situation in which for 110 years the constitution of this country has only been amendable by a foreign parliament, I cannot convince him that it is a matter of pride, perhaps, to seek the national purpose which will permit us to demonstrate that in such a basic matter we can act, in deed, and will not have to wait another 100 years.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the province of Newfoundland, which came into Confederation 27 years ago as a dominion under the Statute of Westminster, carried with it certain sovereign rights which are embodied in the BNA Act; for example, offshore mineral rights, and the Labrador boundary which is still not totally acceptable to certain elements in the province of Quebec. This is a matter of some concern to my province. I would therefore ask the Prime Minister, under the proposed formula which he is now presenting to the provinces, what protection would there be of the rights of individual provinces, apart from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which would enjoy veto rights?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it depends on what particular formula is acceptable to and agreed to by the provinces. If it is the Victoria formula to which all provinces agreed, there would be a right of veto to exercise in certain circumstances by a combination of provinces. If it is the first proposition, the most simple one, the one to which I believe the former leader of the opposition referred, there would be an absolute veto by all provinces on amending the constitution. There is where it cannot be amended now.

● (1650)

I must point out to the hon. member there are many areas where the Canadian constitution, and indeed the constitution of the provinces, can now be amended in Canada. This would not change. What would change is that in those fundamental aspects of our constitution which cannot now be amended in Canada, following this action they would be amendable in Canada, however, I repeat, with the guarantees to the provinces which I just discussed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joyal: Mr. Speaker, the letter which the right hon. Prime Minister has sent to the provincial premiers mentions in its first part that the constitutional guarantees which are included in the project and defined in paragraph 38, chapter 4, were requested on the express representations of the Quebec premier. The contents of this paragraph 38 is broad enough to include an extensive definition of the French language and culture. During the discussions which the secretary of the Privy Council had with the Quebec premier, was this concept defined so as to make room for immigration and communication issues?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, naturally the immigration and communication issues were discussed by the representatives of the Quebec and federal governments. The policy written in paragraph 38 does not concern those specific subjects. It is a much broader policy pertaining to the French language and culture as well as everything concerned with the French fact in Canada.

And again, it is a policy which has been adopted after consultation with Quebec. The other issues referred to by the hon. member concerns the division of powers, and as far as this is specifically concerned, we agreed last April that we had better not deal with the subject. It was better to deal with the amendment formula. The premier of Quebec did everything he could. There also had to be constitutional guarantees with regard to the French fact, the French language and culture in Canada, but once again, the April agreement was to the effect of leaving alone the division of powers. And I think the experience of the past 50 years shows that indeed it is better to dissociate the two operations: first to bring it home with or without an amendment formula, and then deal with the question of the division of powers among ourselves, Canadians, rather than thinking that can be achieved more easily because the constitution is still in England.

The Canadian Constitution

[*English*]

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, this is something of a lesson for me, learning about the constitution and its problems. I am hesitant to ask the Prime Minister a question, but I will do so and possibly display my ignorance on the subject.

Assuming the patriation of the constitution and assuming continued difficulties on unanimity for an amending formula, does the Prime Minister envisage that there could be certain individual matters on which there would be unanimity for an addition to, deletion from, or amendment of some sort of the British North America Act after patriation? An obvious example is that there may well be unanimity now on an amendment to the act on the entrenchment of language rights or the Bill of Rights. Does the Prime Minister envisage that being possible? Does he envisage canvassing both houses of parliament and the provinces to make some of those amendments, one at a time, to the legislation after patriation, while we are waiting for agreement on an amending formula?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this is the course which has been followed by this country for the past 110 years. We have taken subjects one by one, and in some cases unilaterally, in some cases acted with unanimity, and in other cases acted as a result of an agreement between the federal government and one or two provinces when only one or two provinces were concerned. The hon. member is really suggesting that we continue "waiting for Godot." This may indeed be what we will have to do. This has been the course in the past 109 or 110 years. It is one which I, of course, would be foolish to reject. What we are attempting to do, however, is to be able to reach agreement on the basic technique, one which will permit us to pursue the course suggested by the hon. member, but without having to make the pilgrimage to Westminster each time we reach some kind of agreement.

Mr. Speaker: For the final question, I recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is more of a point of order than a question of substance. Is it clear that the material to be appended to today's *Hansard* includes the letters which the Prime Minister wrote to the premiers, and the draft proclamation?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the substance of the letters that I tabled. If the House so wills, I think it would be advantageous to have the whole material appended to *Hansard*.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I take it from that response it is safe to assume the House has given its unanimous consent to the suggestion of the Prime Minister that the material be tabled and that it be printed as an appendix to today's *Hansard*.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): All of it.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, all documents tabled by the Prime Minister.

It being five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

APPENDIX

LETTERS FROM THE PRIME MINISTER TO THE PREMIERS OF THE PROVINCES CONCERNING "PATRIATION" OF THE BNA ACT WITH ATTACHMENTS

(Same letter sent to all other Premiers)
CONFIDENTIAL

Ottawa K1A 0A2
April 19, 1975

The Honourable William G. Davis, Q.C.,
Premier of Ontario,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ontario.

My dear Premier:

I was very pleased indeed at the reaction of yourself and our fellow First Ministers, during our dinner on April 9, to my proposal that we should proceed at an early date to the "patriation" of the British North America Act with the amending clause agreed on at Victoria. I am encouraged to believe that, after fifty years of effort, we may finally dispose of the last remnant of our one-time colonial status that is involved in our not being able to amend our own constitution in totality.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of Part IX of the Victoria Charter. As you know, there was no objection to it in 1971 by any government. It was regarded as the best solution that could be found to the difficult problem of making changes in future to those parts of our constitution that cannot now be amended under either Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) of the B.N.A. Act.

There are three Articles in Part IX—Articles 53, 54 and 55—which reproduce the substance of Sections 91(1) and 92(1). These were included at Victoria as a part of the "tidying up" of the constitution that would have been accomplished by the Charter which, of course, covered much more than simply the amending procedure. What I am proposing now, as I made clear, is that we should not, at this time, get into any questions of substance or form at all: we should simply "patriate" with an amending clause to cover those parts of the B.N.A. Act that are not now covered. This would mean that we would not now act on Articles 53, 54 and 55 since they involve amendment of Section 91 and 92 of the B.N.A. Act. We would move simply with regard to the other Articles of Part IX. We would leave for future action under the new amending procedure whatever changes of form or of substance we or future governments may want to accomplish in the Canadian constitution.

The procedure for "patriation" was discussed at the Working Session of the Constitutional Conference on February 8-9, 1971. It is outlined in pages 399 to 402 of the Secretary's Report on "The Constitutional Review, 1968-1971". As you will see, the procedure contemplates three main steps: approval by the legislatures of the provinces and by both Houses of Parliament; legislation by the British Parliament and, finally, the issue of a Proclamation by the Governor General. The legislation by the British Parliament would provide the legal validity for the Canadian proclamation and its provisions about the procedure of amendment. It would also provide that no future British law should have application to Canada and would make consequential repeal or amendment of British statutes affecting the Canadian constitution. The issuance of the proclamation by the Governor General would coincide with the effective date of the British legislation. Once all this had been done, we would have full and complete capacity to deal with our constitution in Canada and the British Parliament would no longer continue to have the powers it still legally has to deal with the law and constitution of Canada.

I was particularly taken with the suggestion at our dinner that it might be desirable to accomplish the "patriation" of the B.N.A. Act just before the Olympic Games in 1976. The Queen will be visiting Canada for the formal opening of the Games. It would be most appropriate if she could be here for some suitable ceremony in the National Capital, attended by all the First Ministers of Canada, to complete this historic process relating to our constitution. Another alternative would be to hold the ceremonies on July 1. To meet either of the suggested times, it would mean that the resolutions of the legislatures and the Joint Address of Parliament would all have to be passed at an early point in their respective sessions in 1976. The British Parliament would then have to legislate in its 1976 session, probably by May or June if that could be accomplished. This would leave time to plan the ceremony for the proclamation and whatever other formal arrangements seem appropriate. While all this would require prompt action, the substance of what is to be approved by the legislative bodies is brief and simple. I would hope that we could meet the schedule that would make the events of 1976 and the visit of the Queen especially historic.

I have asked Gordon Robertson to communicate with your office to arrange a convenient time to call on you on my behalf to discuss all aspects of what is proposed. He plans to have Frank Carter, the Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations, accompany him with the thought that they could use the occasion of the visit also to discuss with you, your Ministers or your officials any other questions pertaining to federal-provincial relations that you think could usefully be explored with them.

I was very glad to have had the occasion on April 9-10 to join with you and the other First Ministers in the discussion of the important problems that were before the Conference. It may well be, however, that the history books of the future will regard the discussion at our dinner on April 9 as a more memorable part of our meeting.

Sincerely,

P. E. Trudeau

PART IX

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Art. 49 Amendments to the Constitution of Canada may from time to time be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada when so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assemblies of at least a majority of the Provinces that includes.

(1) every Province that at any time before the issue of such proclamation had, according to any previous general census, a population of at least twenty-five per cent of the population of Canada;
(2) at least two of the Atlantic Provinces;
(3) at least two of the Western Provinces that have, according to the then latest general census, combined populations of at least fifty per cent of the population of all the Western Provinces.

Art. 50 Amendments to the Constitution of Canada in relation to any provision that applies to one or more, but not all, of the Provinces may from time to time be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada when so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assembly of each Province to which an amendment applies.

Art. 51 An amendment may be made by proclamation under Article 49 or 50 without a resolution of the Senate authorizing the issue of the proclamation if within ninety days of the passage of a resolution by the House of Commons authorizing its issue the Senate has not passed such a resolution and at any time after the expiration of the ninety days the House of Commons again passes the resolution, but any period when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved shall not be counted in computing the ninety days.

Art. 52 The following rules apply to the procedures for amendment described in Articles 49 and 50:

(1) either of these procedures may be initiated by the Senate or the House of Commons or the Legislative Assembly of a Province;
(2) a resolution made for the purposes of this Part may be revoked at any time before the issue of a proclamation authorized by it.

Art. 53 The Parliament of Canada may exclusively make laws from time to time amending the Constitution of Canada, in relation to the executive Government of Canada and the Senate and House of Commons.

Art. 54 In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to the amendment from time to time of the Constitution of the Province.

Art. 55 Notwithstanding Articles 53 and 54, the following matters may be amended only in accordance with the procedure in Article 49:

(1) the office of the Queen, of the Governor General and of the Lieutenat-Governor;
(2) the requirements of the Constitution of Canada respecting yearly sessions of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures;
(3) the maximum period fixed by the Constitution of Canada for the duration of the House of Commons and the Legislative Assemblies;
(4) the powers of the Senate;
(5) the number of members by which a Province is entitled to be represented in the Senate, and the residence qualifications of Senators;
(6) the right of a Province to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of Senators representing the Province;
(7) the principles of proportionate representation of the Provinces in the House of Commons prescribed by the Constitution of Canada; and
(8) except as provided in Article 16, the requirements of this Charter respecting the use of the English or French language.

Art. 56 The procedure prescribed in Article 49 may not be used to make an amendment when there is another provision for making such amendment in the Constitution of Canada, but that procedure may nonetheless be used to amend any provision for amending the Constitution, including this Article, or in making a general consolidation and revision of the Constitution.

Art. 57 In this Part, "Atlantic Provinces" means the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and "Western Provinces" means the Provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

(Same letter sent to Premier Schreyer, Premier Hatfield, Premier Moores, Premier Regan, Premier Davis, Premier Campbell, Premier Blakeney.)

CONFIDENTIAL

Ottawa K1A 0A2
March 31, 1976

The Honourable Peter Lougheed,
Premier of Alberta,
Legislative Building,
Edmonton, Alberta.

My dear Premier:

I had been hoping to be in touch with you well before this to advise you about progress in the exercise we started last April, with our discussion at 7 Rideau Gate, for "patriation" of the B.N.A. Act. Since then, all of you, with the exception of Premier Bennett, have received Mr. Gordon Robertson who has discussed the project with you on my behalf. Those discussions took place between May and mid-July of 1975. Premier Barrett was unable to arrange a meeting prior to the election in British Columbia but Mr. Robertson will be meeting Premier Bennett in early April. Discussions with Quebec have taken a good deal of time and it was not until March 5th that I had the opportunity of reviewing the question with the Premier of Quebec. I thought it essential to know his attitude before proceeding to further action.

You will recall that we started with agreement in principle on the desirability of "patriating" the B.N.A. Act and, at the same time, establishing as law the amending procedure that had been agreed to in Victoria in 1971. We also agreed that we would not, in the present "patriation" exercise, consider substantive changes to the B.N.A. Act itself since any entry on that course would, as the discus-

sions from 1968 to 1971 had shown, make early action impossible. Mr. Bourassa indicated, however, that it would be difficult for his government to agree to this, unless the action also included "constitutional guarantees" for the French language and culture. We agreed that our general acceptance of the plan, in principle, would be subject to more precise exploration and definition, and this was the purpose of the discussions Mr. Robertson had with you on my behalf. I should first report on what developed in the course of those discussions, although the Premiers Mr. Robertson saw later will be generally aware of the way in which our original proposal grew.

It quickly became apparent in Mr. Robertson's discussions that the action for "patriation" and establishment of the amending procedure would be more meaningful for, and more acceptable to, a number of provinces if certain other alterations in our constitutional situation could be established at the same time. Most of these alterations, with the exception of Mr. Bourassa's "constitutional guarantees", were among the things that had been included in the Victoria Charter. They included the provision for consultation with the provinces about appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada and the special handling of cases arising from the civil law of Quebec. They included also the provision concerning the reduction of regional disparities. Certain of the western provinces wanted to have the amending procedure itself modified so that the requirement with regard to consent from the four western provinces would be the same as that for the four eastern provinces. This would mean deletion of the population provision respecting the western provinces that was inserted at Victoria.

The main problem was the definition of the "constitutional guarantees" to which Mr. Bourassa had referred at the outset. Mr. Robertson found that the Premiers he spoke to after the initial discussions with Mr. Bourassa in May had no objection in principle to "constitutional guarantees", although all made it clear that they would want to consider them in detail once they had been worked out with Quebec and reduced to writing.

I will not go into all the difficulties that are presented by the concept of "constitutional guarantees"; they are many and complex. Discussions with Mr. Bourassa's representatives finally led to a formulation that was included in a document sent to him in November, 1975. I am enclosing a copy of the full document herewith. I would draw your attention especially to Parts IV and VI. The formulation of the principal "constitutional guarantee" is Part IV (Article 38). It is buttressed by Part VI (Article 40) and also by the provisions concerning language in Part III.

As I have mentioned, the "constitutional guarantee" was a concept raised by Mr. Bourassa and stated by him to be essential. Articles 38 and 40 attempt to cover the points made by his representatives. Mr. Bourassa knows that my colleagues and I share some concern about the Articles, and he understands that it will fall to him to explain them to his fellow Premiers, in the light of the facts relating to the position of the French language and culture in Canada.

I should emphasize that the document, while it is styled a "Draft Proclamation", was put in this form simply to show with maximum clarity what the result would be if all the proposals, as they had emerged in the course of Mr. Robertson's consultations, were found acceptable by all governments. It should not be regarded as a specific proposal or draft to which anyone is committed at this stage, since there has not been agreement to the totality of it by anyone. It is rather in the nature of a report on the various ideas, including Mr. Bourassa's "constitutional guarantee", as they developed in the course of the informal discussions from April to November, 1975.

As I stated earlier, most of the "Draft Proclamation" consists of provisions of the Victoria Charter which various Premiers have asked to have included in any action we take. In some cases there are adjustments of the Victoria provisions in order to take into account altered circumstances since 1971 and to benefit by some hind-sight. The new parts of this "report" are the Parts IV and VI to which I have already referred. For ease of reference the main elements are:

(a) A Preamble. This is entirely new and is simply an idea of the way a total presentation might look.

(b) Part I is the amending formula contained in the Victoria Charter made applicable to those parts of the Constitution not now amendable in Canada. Thus Articles 49, 50, 51, 52, 56 and 57 of Part IX of the Victoria Charter are included, while Articles 53, 54 and 55, which were designed to replace Articles 91(1) and 92(1) of the British North America Act, are not. The amending formula has not been modified to take account of the views expressed by certain Western Premiers concerning the population qualification for agreement by the Western provinces. I suggest that this might be a matter that, in the first instance, the four Western Premiers might attempt to solve among themselves.

(c) Part II, which is Part IV of the Victoria Charter concerning the Supreme Court, with a final Article (included in another Part of the Victoria Charter) to protect the status of Judges already appointed.

(d) Part III, which is a modified version of Part II of the Victoria Charter concerning language rights. It would entrench the constitutional status of the English and French languages federally. It would not affect the provinces, but it would permit a province, under Article 35, to entrench its own provision if it so wished.

(e) Part IV, which is the "guarantee" designed to protect the French Language and culture against adverse action by the Parliament and Government of Canada.

(f) Part V, which is essentially Part VII of the Victoria Charter on Regional Disparities. The presentation has been slightly altered but there is no change in substance whatever.

(g) Part VI, whcih is a new Article designed to indicate the spirit in which Governments may enter into agreements. In two of the three areas specifically mentioned, major agreements with Quebec have been concluded over the past two years (family allowances and consultation on immigration).

Mr. Bourassa advised me in our conversation on March 5th that the things he considers to be necessary might well go beyond what we, in the federal government, have understood to be involved in the present exercise. In part

they might relate to the distribution of powers. I advised him that the Government of Canada, for its part, feels that it can go no further as part of this exercise than the constitutional guarantees that are embodied in the document and that indeed even they might find difficulty of acceptance in their present form. To go further would involve entry upon the distribution of powers, with the consequences to which I have referred. We must, then, consider three alternatives that are open to us in these circumstances.

Let us begin with the simplest alternative. The Government of Canada remains firmly of the view that we should as a minimum, achieve patriation" of the B.N.A. Act. It is not prepared to contemplate the continuation of the anomalous situation in which the British Parliament retains the power to legislate with respect to essential parts of the constitution of Canada. Such "patriation" could be achieved by means of an Address of the two Houses of the Canadian Parliament to the Queen, requesting appropriate legislation by the British Parliament to end its capacity to legislate in any way with respect to Canada. Whereas unanimity of the federal government and the provinces would be desirable even for so limited a measure, we are satisfied that such action by the Parliament of Canada does not require the consent of the provinces and would be entirely proper since it would not affect in any way the distribution of powers. In other words, the termination of the British capacity to legislate for Canada would not in any way alter the position as between Parliament and the provincial legislatures whether in respect of jurisdictions flowing from Sections 91 and 92 or otherwise.

However, simple "patriation" would not equip us with an amending procedure for those parts of our constitution that do not come under either Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) of the B.N.A. Act. To meet this deficiency, one could provide in the Address to the Queen that amendment of those parts of the constitution not now amendable in Canada could be made on unanimous consent of Parliament and the legislature until a permanent formula is found and established. In theory this approach would introduce a rigidity which does not now exist, since at present it is the federal Parliament alone which goes to Westminster, and the degree of consultation of or consent by the provinces is a matter only of convention about which there can be differences of view. In practice, of course, the federal government has in the past sought the unanimous consent of the provinces before seeking amendments that have affected the distribution of powers.

A second and perhaps preferable alternative would be to include in the action a provision that could lead to the establishment of a permanent and more flexible amending procedure. That could be done by detailing such a procedure in our Joint Address and having it included in the British legislation as an enabling provision that would come into effect when and only when it had received the formal approval of the legislatures of all the provinces. The obvious amending procedure to set forth would be the one agreed to at Victoria in application to those parts of our constitution not now amendable in Canada. (Part I of the attached "Draft Proclamation"). This could be with of without modification respecting the four western provinces. (On this last point, the federal government would be quite prepared to accept the proposed modification and it is my understanding that the other provinces would equally agree if the western provinces can arrive at agreement.)

If we took the above step, we would achieve forthwith half of our objective of last April—"patriation"—and we would establish a process by which the other half—the amending procedure—would become effective as and when the provincial legislatures individually signify their agreement. Over a period of time, which I hope would not be long, we would establish the total capacity to amend our constitution under what is clearly the best and most acceptable procedure that has been worked out in nearly fifty years of effort, since the original federal-provincial conference on this subject in 1927. Until full agreement and implementation had been achieved, any constitutional changes that might be needed, and which did not come under Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) or which could not otherwise be effected in Canada could be made subject to unanimous consent. This would impose an interim rigidity for such very rare requirements for amendment, but, as I have said, the practice has, in any event, been to secure unanimous consent before making amendments that have affected the distribution of powers.

A third and more extensive possibility still, would be to include, in the "patriation" action, the entirety of the "Draft Proclamation" I am enclosing. In other words the British Parliament, in terminating its capacity to legislate for Canada, could provide that all of the substance of Parts I to VI would come into effect in Canada and would have full legal force when, and only when, the entirety of those Parts had been approved by the legislatures of all the provinces. At that point, we would have, not only "patriation" and the amending procedure, but also the other provisions that have developed out of the discussions thus far. Here again, of course, until all the Provinces had approved the entire Draft Proclamation, any constitutional change which did not come under Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) would be subject to unanimous consent.

As you can see, there are several possibilities as to the course of action now to take. So far as the federal government is concerned, our much preferred course would be to act in unison with all the provinces. "Patriation" is such a historic milestone that it would be ideal if all Premiers would associate themselves with it.

But if unanimity does not appear possible, the federal government will have to decide whether it will recommend to Parliament that a Joint Address be passed seeking "patriation" of the B.N.A. Act. A question for decision then will be what to add to that action. We are inclined to think that it should, at the minimum, be the amending procedure agreed to at Victoria by all the provinces, with or without modification respecting the western provinces, and subject to the condition about coming into force only when approved by the legislatures of all the provinces as explained above.

The implications of the different possibilities are complex, and you will undoubtedly want to consider them with care. To facilitate consideration, Mr. Robertson would be glad to come to see you, at a convenient time, for such

discussions as you might wish to have. When opportunity offers at an early meeting, we might also discuss the matter together.

I would welcome your comments. Mr. Robertson will be in touch with your office to see if you would wish to have a meeting with him and, if so, what time would suit.

Prior to my meeting with Mr. Bourassa, I did not feel that I was in a position to place any documents before Parliament, but I now feel it proper to do so. I would like to table copies of this letter, as well as of the "Draft Proclamation" that is enclosed. If you have any objection, could you please advise me forthwith. If I do not hear to the contrary, I shall plan to table on April 9th. Should you wish to do the same in your legislature, I would of course, have no objection.

Sincerely,

P. E. TRUDEAU

CONFIDENTIAL

Ottawa K1A 0A2
March 31, 1976

The Honourable W. R. Bennett,
Premier of British Columbia,
Parliament Buildings,
Victoria, British Columbia.

My dear Premier:

I very much enjoyed meeting you during my recent visit to British Columbia and having the opportunity of raising with you, among other things, the matter of the "patriation" of the British North America Act. You will recall that I mentioned that I had discussed such an exercice with the Premiers of the other provinces at 7 Rideau Gate last April. At my request, all the Premiers with the exception of Mr. Barrett held preliminary discussions with Mr. Gordon Robertson, the Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations, acting on my behalf. Further discussions with Quebec took a good deal of time and it was not until March 5th that I had the opportunity of reviewing the question with the Premier of Quebec. I thought it essential to know his attitude before proceeding to further action.

We started with agreement in principle on the desirability of "patriating" the B.N.A. Act and, at the same time, establishing as law the amending procedure that had been agreed to in Victoria in 1971. We also agreed that we would not, in the present "patriation" exercise, consider substantive changes to the B.N.A. Act itself since any entry on that course would, as the discussions from 1968 to 1971 had shown, make early action impossible. Mr. Bourassa indicated, however, that it would be difficult for his government to agree to this unless the action also included "constitutional guarantees" for the French language and culture. We agreed that our general acceptance of the plan, in principle, would be subject to more precise exploration and definition, and this was the purpose of the discussions Mr. Robertson had with the other Premiers on my behalf. I should like to inform you of what developed in the course of those discussions.

It quickly became apparent in Mr. Robertson's discussions that the action for "patriation" and establishment of the amending procedure would be more meaningful for, and more acceptable to, a number of provinces if certain other alterations in our constitutional situation could be established at the same time. Most of these alterations, with the exception of Mr. Bourassa's "constitutional guarantees", were among the things that had been included in the Victoria Charter. They included the provision for consultation with the provinces about appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada and the special handling of cases arising from the civil law of Quebec. They included also the provision concerning the reduction of regional disparities. Certain of the western provinces wanted to have the amending procedure itself modified so that the requirement with regard to consent from the four western provinces would be the same as that for the four eastern provinces. This would mean deletion of the population provision respecting the western provinces that was inserted at Victoria.

The main problem was the definition of the "constitutional guarantees" to which Mr. Bourassa had referred at the outset. Mr. Robertson found that the Premiers he spoke to after the initial discussions with Mr. Bourassa in May had no objection in principle to "constitutional guarantees", although all made it clear that they would want to consider them in detail once they had been worked out with Quebec and reduced to writing.

I will not go into all the difficulties that are presented by the concept of "constitutional guarantee"; they are many and complex. Discussions with Mr. Bourassa's representatives finally led to a formulation that was included in a document sent to him in November, 1975. I am enclosing a copy of the full document herewith. I would draw your attention especially to Parts IV and VI. The formulation of the principal "constitutional guarantee" is Part IV (Article 38). It is buttressed by Part VI (Article 40) and also by the provisions concerning language in Part III.

As I have mentioned, the "constitutional guarantee" was a concept raised by Mr. Bourassa and stated by him to be essential. Articles 38 and 40 attempt to cover the points made by his representatives. Mr. Bourassa knows that my colleagues and I share some concern about the fellow Premiers in the light of the facts relating to the position of the French language and culture in Canada.

I should emphasize that the document, while it is styled a "Draft Proclamation", was put in this form simply to show with maximum clarity what the result would be if all the proposals, as they had emerged in the course of Mr. Robertson's consultations, were found acceptable by all governments. It should not be regarded as a specific proposal or draft to which anyone is committed at this stage since there has not been agreement to the totality of it by anyone. It is rather in the nature of a report on the various ideas, including Mr. Bourassa's "constitutional guarantee", as they developed in the course of the informal discussions from April to November, 1975.

As I stated earlier, most of the "Draft Proclamation" consists of provisions of the Victoria Charter which various Premiers have asked to have included in any action we take. In some cases there are adjustments of the Victoria provisions in order to take into account altered circumstances since 1971 and to benefit by some hind-sight. The new parts of this "report" are the Parts IV and VI to which

I have already referred. For ease of reference the main elements are:

(a) A Preamble. This is entirely new and is simply an idea of the way a total presentation might look.

(b) Part I is the amending formula contained in the Victoria Charter made applicable to those parts of the Constitution not now mendable in Canada. Thus Articles 49, 50, 51, 52, 56 and 57 of Part IX of the Victoria Charter are included, while Articles 53, 54 and 55, which were designed to replace Articles 91(1) and 92(1) of the British North America Act, are not. The amending formula has not been modified to take account of the views expressed by certain Western Premiers concerning the population qualification for agreement by the Western provinces. I suggest that this might be a matter that, in the first instance, you and your three Western colleagues might attempt to solve amongst yourselves.

(c) Part II, which is Part IV of the Victoria Charter concerning the Supreme Court, with a final Article (included in another Part of the Victoria Charter) to protect the status of Judges already appointed.

(d) Part III, which is a modified version of Part II of the Victoria Charter concerning language rights. It would entrench the constitutional status of the English and French languages federally. It would not affect the provinces, but it would permit a province, under Article 35, to entrench its own provision if it so wished.

(e) Part IV, which is the "guarantee" designed to protect the French language and culture against adverse action by the Parliament and Government of Canada.

(f) Part V, which is essentially Part VII of the Victoria Charter on Regional Disparities. The presentation has been slightly altered but there is no change in substance whatever.

(g) Part VI, which is a new Article designed to indicate the spirit in which Governments may enter into agreements. In two of the three areas specifically mentioned, major agreements with Quebec have been concluded over the past two years (family allowances and consultation on immigration).

Mr. Bourassa advised me in our conversation on March 5th that the things he considers to be necessary might well go beyond what we, in the federal government, have understood to be involved in the present exercise. In part they might relate to the distribution of powers. I advised him that the Government of Canada, for its part, feels that it can go no further as part of this exercise than the constitutional guarantees that are embodied in the document and that indeed even they might find difficulty of acceptance in their present form. To go further would involve entry upon the distribution of powers, with the consequences to which I have referred. We must, then, consider three alternatives that are open to us in these circumstances.

Let us begin with the simplest alternative. The Government of Canada remains firmly of the view that we should, as a minimum, achieve "patriation" of the B.N.A. Act. it is not prepared to contemplate the continuation of the anomalous situation in which the British Parliament retains the power to legislate with respect to essential parts of the constitution of Canada. Such "patriation" could be achieved by means of an Address of the two Houses of the Canadian Parliament to the Queen, requesting appropriate legislation by the British Parliament to end its capacity to legislate in any way with respect to Canada. Whereas unanimity of the federal government and the provinces would be desirable even for so limited a measure, we are satisfied that such action by the Parliament of Canada does not require the consent of the provinces and would be entirely proper since it would not affect in any way the distribution of powers. In other words, the termination of the British capacity to legislate for Canada would not in any way alter the position as between Parliament and the provincial legislatures whether in respect of jurisdictions flowing from Sections 91 and 92 or otherwise.

However, simple "patriation" would not equip us with an amending procedure for those parts of our constitution that do not come under either Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) of the B.N.A. Act. To meet this deficiency, one could provide in the Address to the Queen that amendment of those parts of the constitution not now amendable in Canada could be made on unanimous consent of Parliament and the legislatures until a permanent formula is found and established. In theory this approach would introduce a rigidity which does not now exist, since at present it is the federal Parliament alone which goes to Westminster and the degree of consultation of or consent by the provinces is a matter only of convention about which there can be differences of view. In practice, of course, the federal government has in the past sought the unanimous consent of the provinces before seeking amendments that have affected the distribution of powers.

A second and perhaps preferable alternative would be to include in the action a provision that could lead to the establishment of a permanent and more flexible amending procedure. That could be done by detailing such a procedure in our Joint Address and having it included in the British legislation as an enabling provision that would come into effect when and only when it had received the formal approval of the legislatures of all the provinces. The obvious amending procedure to set forth would be the one agreed to at Victoria in application to those parts of our constitution not now amendable in Canada (Part I of the attached "Draft Proclamation"). This could be with or without modification respecting the four western provinces. (On this last point, the federal government would be quite prepared to accept the proposed modification and it is my understanding that the other provinces would equally agree if the western provinces can arrive at agreement.)

If we took the above step, we would achieve forthwith half of the objective of last April—"patriation"—and we would establish a process by which the other half—the amending procedure—would become effective as and when the provincial legislatures individually signify their agreement. Over a period of time, which I hope would not be long, we would establish the total capacity to amend our constitution under what is clearly the best and most acceptable procedure that has been worked out in nearly fifty years of effort since the original federal-provincial conference on this subject in 1927. Until full agreement

and implementation had been achieved, any constitutional changes that might be needed, and which did not come under Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) or which could not otherwise be effected in Canada could be made subject to unanimous consent. This would impose an interim rigidity for such very rare requirements for amendment, but, as I have said, the practice has, in any event, been to secure unanimous consent before making amendments that have affected the distribution of powers.

A third and more extensive possibility still, would be to include, in the "patriation" action, the entirety of the "Draft Proclamation" I am enclosing. In other words the British Parliament, in terminating its capacity to legislate for Canada, could provide that all of the substance of Parts I to VI would come into effect in Canada and would have full legal force when, and only when, the entirety of those Parts had been approved by the legislatures of all the provinces. At that point, we would have, not only "patriation" and the amending procedure, but also the other provisions that have developed out of the discussions thus far. Here again, of course, until all the Provinces had approved the entire Draft Proclamation, any constitutional change which did not come under Section 91(1) or Section 92(1) would be subject to unanimous consent.

As you can see, there are several possibilities as to the course of action now to take. So far as the federal government is concerned, our much preferred course would be to act in unison with all the provinces. "Patriation" is such a historic milestone that it would be ideal if all Premiers would associate themselves with it.

But if unanimity does not appear possible, the federal government will have to decide whether it will recommend to Parliament that a Joint Address be passed seeking "patriation" of the B.N.A. Act. A question for decision then will be what to add to that action. We are inclined to think that it should, at the minimum, be the amending procedure agreed to at Victoria by all the provinces, with or without modification respecting the western provinces, and subject to the condition about coming into force only when approved by the legislatures of all the provinces as explained above.

The implications of the different possibilities are complex and you will undoubtedly want to consider them with care. I understand that Mr. Robertson has made arrangements to go to see you on April 13th to discuss these matters. When opportunity offers, you and I might also discuss the matter together. I would welcome your comments.

Prior to my meeting with Mr. Bourassa, I did not feel that I was in a position to place any documents before Parliament, but I now feel it proper to do so. I would like to table copies of this letter as well as of the "Draft Proclamation" that is enclosed. If you have any objection, could you please advise me forthwith. If I do not hear to the contrary, I shall plan to table on April 9th. Should you wish to do the same in your legislature, I would of course, have no objection.

Sincerely,

P. E. Trudeau

[*Translation*]

Ottawa, K1A 0A6
March 31, 1976

The Honourable Robert Bourassa
Premier of Quebec
Parliament Buildings
Quebec City, Quebec

My dear Premier,

As I told you on March 5th, I did not want to speak to the other Premiers about our discussions on the subject of "patriation" of the British North America Act before getting a clearer idea of your feelings. I have sent them a letter today of which you will find attached a copy in English and French.

All of the letters are identical, except for the one I sent to Mr. Bennett in which I took account of the fact that he had not attended our meeting in April 1975 and that Mr. Robertson has not yet had the opportunity of meeting with him. I trust you will find that the letters represent the facts accurately. Please let me know if you have any objection to my placing the attached letter to the Premiers and the draft proclamation before Parliament on April 9th. It is understood that I would have no objection to you doing the same thing in Quebec.

Sincerely,

(signed) P. E. Trudeau

DRAFT

CONFIDENTIAL

November 10th, 1975.

Form for a Proclamation of the Governor General

WHEREAS it is fitting that it should be possible to amend the Constitution of Canada in all respects by action of the appropriate instrumentalities of government in Canada acting separately or in concert as may best suit the matter in question;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to make more specific provision respecting the constitutional status of the English and French languages in Canada and to ensure that changes in the Constitution, interpretation of its provisions or action by the Parliament or Government of Canada should not endanger the continuation and full development of the French language and the culture based thereon;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that the Parliament and Government of Canada and the Legislatures and Governments of the Provinces act effectively to promote equality of opportunity and an acceptable level of public services among the different regions of Canada;

THEREFORE it is desirable to establish among other things:

(a) A method for the amendment in Canada of those parts of the Constitution of general interest and concern that cannot now be amended in Canada in which the consent will be required of the Legislatures of Provinces respresentative of both the official language groups of Canada as well as of the Legislatures of Provinces in all of the geographical regions of Canada;

(b) means by which Provinces can participate in the selection of persons to be appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada; and

(c) principles to guide the Parliament of Canada in the exercise of powers allotted to it under the Constitution of Canada and to guide the Government of Canada in the exercise of powers conferred upon it by the Constitution of Canada and by laws enacted by the Parliament of Canada;

NOW THEREFORE We.....do proclaim as follows:

Part I

Amendments to the Constitution

Art. 1 Amendments to the Constitution of Canada may from time to time be made by Proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada when so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and the House of Commons and of the Legislative Assemblies of at least a majority of the Provinces that includes:

(1) every Province that at any time before the issue of such Proclamation had, according to any previous general census, a population of at least twenty-five per cent of the population of Canada;

(2) at least two of the Atlantic Provinces;

(3) at least two of the Western Provinces that have, according to the then latest general census, combined populations of at least fifty per cent of the population of all the Western Provinces.

Art. 2 Amendments to the Constitution of Canada in relation to any provision that applies to one or more, but not all, of the Provinces may from time to time be made by Proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada when so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assembly of each Province to which an amendment applies.

Art. 3 An amendment may be made by Proclamation under Articles 1 or 2 without a resolution of the Senate authorizing the issue of the Proclamation if within ninety days of the passage of a resolution by the House of Commons authorizing its issue the Senate has not passed such a resolution and at any time after the expiration of the ninety days the House of Commons again passes the resolution, but any period when Parliament is prorogued or dissolved shall not be counted in computing the ninety days.

Art. 4 The following rules apply to the procedures for amendment described in Articles 1 and 2:

(1) either of these procedures may be initiated by the Senate or the House of Commons or the Legislative Assembly of a Province;

(2) a resolution made for the purposes of this Part may be revoked at any time before the issue of a Proclamation authorized by it.

Art. 5 The procedures prescribed in Articles 1 and 2 may not be used to make an amendment when there is another provision for making such amendment in the Constitution of Canada, but the procedure in Article 1 may nonetheless be used to amend any provision for amending the Constitution, including this Article, or in making a general consolidation and revision of the Constitution.

Art. 6 In this Part "Atlantic Provinces" means the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and "Western Provinces" means the Provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Art. 7 The enactments set out in the Schedule shall continue as law in Canada and as such shall, together with this Proclamation and any Proclamation subsequently issued under this Part, collectively be known as the Constitution of Canada, and amendments thereto shall henceforth be made only according to the authority contained therein.

Part II

Supreme Court of Canada

Art. 8 There shall be a general court of appeal for Canada to be known as the Supreme Court of Canada.

Art. 9 The Supreme Court of Canada shall consist of a chief justice to be called the Chief Justice of Canada, and eight other judges, who shall, subject to this Part, be appointed by the Governor General in Council by letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada.

Art. 10 Any person may be appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada who, after having been admitted to the Bar of any Province, has, for a total period of at least ten years, been a judge of any court in Canada or a barrister or advocate at the Bar of any Province.

Art. 11 At least three of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada shall be appointed from among persons who, after having been admitted to the Bar of the Province of Quebec, have, for a total period of at least ten years, been judges of any court of that Province or of a court established by the Parliament of Canada or barristers or advocates at that Bar.

Art. 12 Where a vacancy arises in the Supreme Court of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada is considering a person for appointment to fill the vacancy, he shall inform the Attorney General of the appropriate Province.

Art. 13 When an appointment is one falling within Article II or the Attorney General of Canada has determined that the appointment shall be made from among persons who have been admitted to the Bar of a specific Province, he shall make all reasonable efforts to reach agreement with the Attorney General of the appropriate Province, before a person is appointed to the Court.

Art. 14 No person shall be appointed to the Supreme Court of Canada unless the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General of the appropriate Province agree to the appointment, or such person has been recommended for appointment to the Court by a nominating council described in Article 16, or has been selected by the Attorney General of Canada under Article 16.

Art. 15 Where after the lapse of ninety days from the day a vacancy arises in the Supreme Court of Canada, the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General of a Province have not reached agreement on a person to be

appointed to fill the vacancy, the Attorney General of Canada may inform the Attorney General of the appropriate Province in writing that he proposes to convene a nominating council to recommend an appointment.

Art. 16 Within thirty days of the day when the Attorney General of Canada has written the Attorney General of the Province that he proposes to convene a nominating council, the Attorney General of the Province may inform the Attorney General of Canada in writing that he selects either of the following types of nominating councils:

(1) a nominating council consisting of the following members: the Attorney General of Canada or his nominee and the Attorneys General of the Provinces or their nominees;

(2) a nominating council consisting of the following members: the Attorney General of Canada or his nominee, the Attorney General of the appropriate Province or his nominee and a Chairman to be selected by the two Attorneys General, and if within six months from the expiration of the thirty days they cannot agree on a Chairman, then the Chief Justice of the appropriate Province, or if he is unable to act, the next senior Judge of his court, shall name a Chairman;

and if the Attorney General of the Province fails to make a selection within the thirty days above referred to, the Attorney General of Canada may select the person to be appointed.

Art. 17 When a nominating council has been created, the Attorney General of Canada shall submit the names of not less than three qualified persons to it about whom he has sought the agreement of the Attorney General of the appropriate Province to the appointment, and the nominating council shall recommend therefrom a person for appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada; a majority of the members of a council constitutes a quorum, and a recommendation of a majority of the members at a meeting constitutes a recommendation of the council.

Art. 18 For the purpose of Articles 12 to 17 "appropriate Province" means, in the case of a person being considered for appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada in compliance with Article 11, the Province of Quebec, and in the case of any other person being so considered, the Province to the Bar of which such a person was admitted, and if a person was admitted to the Bar of more than one Province, the Province with the Bar of which the person has, in the opinion of the Attorney General of Canada, the closest connection.

Art. 19 Articles 12 to 18 do not apply to the appointment of the Chief Justice of Canada when such appointment is made from among the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Art. 20 The judges of the Supreme Court of Canada hold office during good behaviour until attaining the age of seventy years, but are removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

Art. 21 The Supreme Court of Canada has jurisdiction to hear and determine appeals on any constitutional question from any judgment of any court in Canada and from any decision on any constitutional question by any such court in determining any question referred to it, but except as regards appeals from the highest court of final resort in a Province, the Supreme Court of Canada may prescribe such exceptions and conditions to the exercise of such jurisdiction as may be authorized by the Parliament of Canada.

Art. 22 Subject to this Part, the Supreme Court of Canada shall have such further appellate jurisdiction as the Parliament of Canada may prescribe.

Art. 23 The Parliament of Canada may make laws conferring original jurisdiction on the Supreme Court of Canada in respect of such matters in relation of the laws of Canada as may be prescribed by the Parliament of Canada, and authorizing the reference of questions of law or fact to the court and requiring the court to hear and determine the questions.

Art. 24 Subject to this Part, the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada in all cases is final and conclusive.

Art. 25 Where a case before the Supreme Court of Canada involves questions of law relating to the civil law of the Province of Quebec, and involves no other question of law, it shall be heard by a panel of five judges, or with the consent of the parties, four judges, at least three of whom have the qualifications described in Article 11, and if for any reason three judges of the court who have such qualifications are not available, the court may name such *ad hoc* judges as may be necessary to hear the case from among the judges who have such qualifications serving on a superior court of record established by the law of Canada or of a superior court of appeal of the Province of Quebec.

Art. 26 Nothing in this Part shall be construed as restricting the power existing at the commencement of this Proclamation of a Provincial Legislature to provide for or limit appeals pursuant to its power to legislate in relation to the administration of justice in the Province.

Art. 27 The salaries, allowances and pension of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada shall be fixed and provided by the Parliament of Canada.

Art. 28 Subject to this Part, the Parliament of Canada may make laws to provide for the organization and maintenance of the Supreme Court of Canada, including the establishment of a quorum for particular purposes.

Art. 29 The court existing on the day of the coming into force of this Proclamation under the name of the Supreme Court of Canada shall continue as the Supreme Court of Canada, and the judges thereof shall continue in office as though appointed under this Part except that they shall hold office during good behaviour until attaining the age of seventy-five years, and until otherwise provided pursuant to the provisions of this Part, all laws pertaining to the court in force on that day shall continue, subject to the provisions of this Proclamation.

Part III

Language Rights

Art. 30 English and French are the official languages of Canada, but no provision in this Part shall derogate from

any right, privilege, or obligation existing under any other provision of the Constitution.

Art. 31 A person has the right to use English and French in the debates of the Parliament of Canada.

Art. 32 The statutes and the records and journals of the Parliament of Canada shall be printed and published in English and French; and both versions of such statutes are authoritative.

Art. 33 A person has the right to use English and French in giving evidence before, or in any pleading or process in the Supreme Court of Canada and any courts established by the Parliament of Canada, and to require that all documents and judgments issuing from such courts be in English or French.

Art. 34 An individual has the right to the use of the official language of his choice in communications between him and the head or central office of every department and agency of the Government of Canada.

Art. 35 A provincial Legislative Assembly may, by resolution, declare that provisions similar to those of any part of Articles 32, 33 and 34 shall apply to the Legislative Assembly, and to any of the provincial courts and offices of the provincial departments and agencies according to the terms of the resolution, and thereafter such parts apply to the Legislative Assembly, courts and offices specified according to the terms of the resolution; and any right conferred under this Article may be abrogated or diminished only in accordance with the procedure prescribed in Article 2.

Art. 36 A person has the right to the use of the official language of his choice in communications between him and every principal office of the departments and agencies of the Government of Canada that are located in an area where a substantial proportion of the population has the official language of his choice as its mother tongue, but the Parliament of Canada may define the limits of such areas and what constitutes a substantial proportion of the population for the purposes of this Article.

Art. 37 In addition to the rights provided by this Part, the Parliament of Canada may, within its legislative jurisdiction, provide for more extensive use of English and French.

Part IV

Protection of the French Language and Culture

Art. 38 The Parliament of Canada, in the exercise of powers allotted to it under the Constitution of Canada, and the Government of Canada, in the exercise of powers conferred upon it by the Constitution of Canada and by laws enacted by the Parliament of Canada, shall ge guided by, among other considerations for the welfare and advantage of the people of Canada, the knowledge that a fundamental purpose underlying the federation of Canada is to ensure the preservation and the full development of the French language and the culture based on it and neither the Parliament nor the Government of Canada, in the exercise of their respective powers, shall act in a manner that will adversely affect the preservation and development of the French language and the culture based on it.

Part V

Regional Disparities

Art. 39 Without altering the distribution of powers and without compelling the Parliament of Canada or the Legislatures of the Provinces to exercise their legislative powers, the Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of the Provinces, together with the Government of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces, are committed to:

(a) the promotion of equality of opportunity and well-being for all individuals in Canada;

(b) the assurance, as nearly as possible, that essential public services of reasonable quality are available to all individuals in Canada; and

(c) the promotion of economic development to reduce disparities in the social and economic opportunities for all individuals in Canada wherever they may live.

Part VI

Federal-Provincial Agreements

Art. 40 (1) In order to ensure a greater harmony of action by governments, and especially in order to reduce the possibility of action that could adversely affect the preservation and development in Canada of the French language and the culture based on it, the Government of Canada and the Governments of the Provinces or of any one or more of the Provinces may, within the limits of the powers otherwise accorded to each of them respectively by law, enter into agreements with one another concerning the manner of exercise of such powers, particularly in the fields of immigration, communications and social policy.

(2) Nothing in this Article shall be held to limit or restrict any authority conferred either before or after the coming into force of this Proclamation upon the Government of Canada or the Government of a Province to enter into agreements within the limits of the powers otherwise accorded to it by law.

SCHEDULE

This Schedule is NOT final, subject to confirmation.

Enactments

British North America Act, 1867, 30-31 Vict., c. 3 (U.K.).

An Act to amend and continue the Act 32 and 33 Victoria chapter 3; and to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba, 1870, 33 Vict., c. 3 (Can.).

Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting British Columbia into the Union, dated the 16th day of May 1871.

British North America Act, 1871, 34-35 Vict., c. 28 (U.K.), and all acts enacted under section 3 thereof.

Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting Prince Edward Island into the Union, dated the 26th day of June, 1873.

Parliament of Canada Act, 1875, 38-39 Vict., c. 38 (U.K.).

Order of Her Majesty in Council admitting all British possessions and Territories in North America and islands adjacent thereto into the Union, dated the 31st day of July, 1880.

British North America Act, 1886, 49-50 Vict., c. 35 (U.K.).

Canada (Ontario Boundary) Act, 1889, 52-53 Vict., c. 28 (U.K.).

Canadian Speaker (Appointment of Deputy) Act, 1895, Session 2, 59 Vict., c. 3 (U.K.).

Alberta Act, 1905, 4-5 Edw. VII, c. 3 (Can.).

Saskatchewan Act, 1905, 4-5 Edw. VII, c. 42 (Can.).

British North America Act, 1907, 7 Edw. VII, c. 11 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1915, 5-6 Geo. V, c. 45 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1930, 20-21 Geo. V, c. 26 (U.K.).

Statute of Westminster, 1931, 22 Geo. V, c. 4 (U.K.) in so far as it applies to Canada.

British North America Act, 1940, 3-4 Geo. VI, c. 36 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1943, 7 Geo. VI, c. 30 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1946, 10 Geo. VI, c. 63 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1949, 12 and 13 Geo. VI, c. 22 (U.K.)

British North America (No. 2) Act, 1949, 13 Geo. VI, c. 81 (U.K.).

British North America Act, R.S.C., 1952, c. 304 (Can.).

British North America Act, 1960, 9 Eliz. II, c. 2 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1964, 12 and 13, Eliz. II, c. 73 (U.K.).

British North America Act, 1965, 14 Eliz. II, c. 4, Part I, (Can.).

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 12, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL INQUIRY INTO AWARDING OF LEASE TO SKY SHOPS OF DORVAL AND MIRABEL—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of increasing evidence of improper interference with normal tendering procedures relating to leases and concessions, which cannot be fully explored within the narrow confines of a police investigation, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn):

That the government appoint forthwith an independent judicial inquiry into the awarding of the lease extension for Sky Shops and the operations of its duty free concessions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR MEASURES TO REDUCE INTEREST RATES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on an urgent and important matter.

Considering that the Pepin Board has not seen fit to control interest rates, particularly debit and credit rates, considering that the gap now exceeds 4 per cent, which is the largest in recent years, and considering also that current interest rates are really very high, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert):

That this House instruct the Minister of Finance to take every necessary step to bring back interest rates at the level they were when the economic development was quite satisfactory, that is a normal rate of 6 per cent, and to avoid that in future Canadians be forced to contract loans at current interest rates which is one of the first causes of inflation.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the hon. member's motion.

Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Since there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

* * *

INCOME TAX

REQUEST FOR PROVISION FOR DEDUCTIBILITY OF PROPERTY TAXES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion of urgent and pressing necessity.

Considering that municipal property and school taxes keep increasing and have become a burden which is likely to discourage access to property, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne):

That this House request the Minister of Finance to consider an amendment to the Income Tax Act providing for the deductibility of property taxes and that this be taken in account in the preparation of the next budget.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion may not be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MINISTER'S VIEW OF POSSIBILITY OF GENERAL STRIKE—EFFORTS TO PERSUADE LABOUR TO AWARD CONFRONTATION

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, of which I have

given notice. On Saturday Mr. Dennis McDermott, director of United Auto Workers, reversed the position he took in January and said that a general strike is a distinct possibility. However, he went on to warn against any rash action. In view of the fact that an illegal national strike might prove to be not only rash but in the long run work against labour's legitimate aspirations, can the minister tell the House, first, whether he or his officials now believe a national strike is a real possibility and, second, what steps if any the minister has taken to persuade the CLC to avoid this kind of confrontation, not just with the government but with the Canadian public?

● (1410)

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, to answer the last part of the hon. member's question first, what we are doing is having ongoing discussions with labour bilaterally and with the national organization itself as well as with the Canadian public generally and the rank and file generally. As to whether I should conjecture with regard to a general strike being a possibility, I do not believe that would be particularly helpful at this time. I am convinced that the majority of the rank and file of the labour movement in this country are still satisfied it is in their best interests to support the anti-inflation program on the basis that run-away inflation has never been helpful to the rank and file in this country.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that approximately 175,000 federal public servants are affiliated with the CLC can the minister advise whether these public servants are prepared to support a general strike and if so what steps the government is prepared to take to prevent an illegal walkout or to prosecute those who take part in an illegal walkout?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I believe a significant element in the labour leadership in this country believe in obeying the law and I trust they will keep to that position.

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE TO MEET LABOUR OFFICIALS TO TRY TO PREVENT GENERAL STRIKE

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the primary concern of both labour and all members of parliament ought to be the public interest, would the minister support the establishment of an all party committee of members of parliament to meet with officials of the CLC in order to try to avoid the threatened general strike and to negotiate a basis for labour's return to the Canada Labour Relations Council and the Economic Council of Canada?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, any technique would be helpful, but I wonder whether escalating the matter at this stage is a good thing in view of the fact that Mr. McDermott himself said it would be a rash action at this time.

[Mr. Fraser.]

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO HAVE LABOUR REPRESENTATIVES RETURN TO ECONOMIC AND LABOUR RELATIONS COUNCILS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that it is important something be done in respect of bringing back the tripartite agency, would the minister indicate what he is doing to clarify this or is he just sitting there in the hope that there will be a pleasant outcome?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think labour was fully aware there were significant gains to be made under the tripartite relationship, and if at the present time they do not wish to participate in this way, the opportunity is there for them to participate with management to carry on some of the programs and I believe that aspect is being explored.

HALL REPORT—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON REACTION OF PARTIES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, in respect of the Hall report, which is in keeping with the questions we are asking, the minister on Wednesday, April 7, 1976 in response to a question put by the hon. member for Vancouver South indicated that he would be able to comment with more exactitude tomorrow on the length of time it would take to determine whether the conclusions of Mr. Justice E. Hall were acceptable. Now that the union committees have met has the minister received any indications from either side concerning the decision either side will take with regard to the report?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say that both sides are examining it very closely. There has been no rejection of this as yet. I might add that I asked Mr. Justice Hall, which is within my power under the code, to clarify one or two aspects which could lend themselves to an ambiguous interpretation. He is doing this now and I will be able to respond more specifically to the hon. member in a couple of days after I receive that clarification.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, apparently Mr. Justice Hall indicated that the unions had agreed to live within the spirit of the anti-inflation guidelines. Is this one of the matters of confusion which has been placed before Mr. Justice Hall, because apparently the union in question does not go along with that conclusion? Did the minister bring this to the attention of Mr. Justice Hall?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not one of the areas within the specific interpretation of some of the recommendations. If Mr. Justice Hall says that, my inclination would be to accept it because as we all know he has a high degree of credibility and accuracy in dealing with these matters.

ENERGY

NUCLEAR REACTORS—ALLEGED LICENSING NEGOTIATIONS WITH ITALY AND RUMANIA AND FOR SECOND UNITS IN ARGENTINA AND SOUTH KOREA

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The *Globe and Mail* of March 30 reports Mr. G. T. Leaist, manager of nuclear power marketing at Atomic Energy of Canada Limited as having said:

> We're in licensing negotiations with Italy and Rumania . . .
>
> There's the prospect of second units in Argentina and South Korea.

I ask the minister to confirm, first, if negotiations for licensing arrangements are under way with Italy and Rumania, and, if so, with which companies or government agencies are these negotiations being conducted; second, if negotiations for the sale of a second nuclear reactor to both Argentina and South Korea are under way?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions with agencies and parties in Italy and Rumania. I do not have details as to what agencies these are, but will be pleased to provide the hon. member with that information. As to the second question, is AECL negotiating the sale of a second reactor to Argentina or Korea, I am unaware of such negotiations but am aware that both countries have expressed from time to time an interest in acquiring a second nuclear reactor.

NUCLEAR REACTORS—SAFEGUARDS UNDER LICENSING AGREEMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister fully realizes what activities are being carried on by AECL without his knowledge. May I direct a supplementary question either to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources or to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs? Recognizing the difficulty of imposing adequate safeguards in cases where Canada makes a direct sale of a nuclear reactor, I ask how the government proposes to meet the much more complicated difficulty of imposing safeguards in cases where we licence a firm in another country to produce the CANDU reactor? What types of safeguards will the government impose in cases where licensing arrangements are entered into between AECL and a foreign country?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, our safeguards fully comprehend that eventuality.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the minister says that our safeguards fully comprehend that eventuality. How does the minister propose to cover the contingency alluded to? Since the companies or agencies in foreign countries which will produce CANDU reactors under licensing arrangements with AECL will be under the sovereign jurisdiction of another government, will the agreement be with the company and with the sovereign government of the country in which the manufacturer manufacturing under licence is located? I am sure the minister can give the House some information rather than telling us that safeguards are adequate, because safeguards for licensing have never been announced nor, so far as I know, even formulated.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I said our safeguards fully comprehend that eventuality. In other words, they provide for that kind of situation arising.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON NEW INTEREST RATES

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Finance.

Considering that the Pepin board has not seen fit to control interest rates, particularly debit and credit rates, considering that the gap now exceeds 4 per cent, which is the highest in recent years, considering also that current interest rates are really very high, could the minister provide the House with more information on that?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we indicated in the past that in a free money market, it was impossible to control interest rates in Canada. Rather we emphasized controlling profits of institutions such as banks and credit unions whose profits originate from loans, rather than controlling the level of interest of loan interests.

AUTHORITY OF ANTI-INFLATION BOARD TO REGULATE CREDIT

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary.

Since banks are allowed to generate credit 10 or 12 times higher than their customers' deposits, could the minister tell the House whether or not the Pepin board is authorized to rule over credit in this country?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we have published guidelines for banks and other financial institutions which indicate the method of controlling their profits.

* * *

● (1420)

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—KNOWLEDGE OF PRIME MINISTER OF ROLE OF MINISTERS AND OFFICIALS IN GRANTING CONCESSIONS

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. He will recall that last week he was going to be seeking a briefing from the RCMP. Has he now received that briefing and, as a result of it, can he assure the House that none of his ministers had any knowledge whatsoever of the activities of their personal ministerial staffs with regard to securing the extension of

the Sky Shops lease, in direct contradiction with stated departmental policy in the Ministry of Transport?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I gave that assurance last week about ministerial knowledge or lack of knowledge. I am seeing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police this afternoon to ask them to tell me what they feel they can tell me about any involvement of ministers. I gave the assurance last week that I knew there was none because the police would have told me earlier if there had been. However, I am having this meeting to reassure the opposition since they thought it was important for me to see the police. I would appreciate from the hon. member or other members opposite what else they would like me to ask the police about any other minister or any other member of this House. I use this occasion to ask about questions hon. members would like me to put.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

DIRECTIVES CONCERNING PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES BY PERSONAL STAFFS OF MINISTERS

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I was not necessarily asking about ministers, but about their personal staffs. Perhaps the Prime Minister could take that subject up with the RCMP when he sees them. However, that gives rise to my supplementary question. Can the Prime Minister tell the House whether he has ever issued any directives to his ministers with regard to the conduct while in office and performing official duties of their personal staffs? If he has given such directives, is he prepared to table them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have given conflict of interest guidelines regarding personal staff. They were, I believe, made public in the House a couple of years ago. All these directives have been carried out in the sense that those members of staff who have knowledge of confidential or secret matters and who are in a position to advise on policy follow the conflict of interest guidelines and set up blind trusts or frozen trusts and so on, just as other members of the civil service. These guidelines have been issued. In so far as more general guidelines apply, the ones that Mr. Pearson issued in 1964 apply to ministerial staff.

Mr. Nielsen: Can the Prime Minister inform the House whether he accepts the proposition that as a cardinal tenet of responsible government, ministers must ultimately answer for the conduct of their personal staff appointees who are not subject to any other form of accountability?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, that is, as the hon. member puts it, a cardinal principle. I think it has to be applied in the usual common sense way that a minister must be responsible for those he hires and keeps on his staff. However, this does not make him responsible in the same sense as a member of the staff involved in any wrongdoing. If in the course of any wrongdoing, it is discovered that it is a member of the staff, that member would either be chastised or fired, depending on the gravity of the offence.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ROLE OF MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE IN CONNECTION WITH GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS IN QUEBEC

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Again, a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the now public admission in the matter of the extension of the Sky Shops lease that the then minister of DREE was allowed input into the question as Quebec leader, although this lease was not within his departmental jurisdiction, could the Prime Minister now tell the House whether the policy and practice of the government is that all contracts for the Province of Quebec, whatever their departmental origin, are currently vetted through the Minister of National Health and Welfare in his capacity as head of the Quebec Troika?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not sure what the hon. member is implying when he says there was input by the minister responsible for DREE. I think it has been quite clear from the minister that he was not involved in any way with the Sky Shops matter and therefore I think the hon. member, if he made that allegation, should be prepared to withdraw it or substantiate it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I made no allegation with respect to the involvement of the minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I asked a simple question—whether with respect to the extension of the Sky Shops lease, the minister for DREE, as he then was, was allowed input into the matter and whether in terms of contracts of this nature or, indeed, of any nature in the Province of Quebec, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, in his capacity as head of what I call the Quebec troika makes a similar input today.

Mr. Trudeau: It is not that simple. I shall be subject to correction, of course, on reading the blues, but I thought the hon. member said it is now generally recognized that the minister did have input. This is something different again, and I am telling him, if it is now recognized I want to know by whom and on what he bases that recognition; and if he does not have any basis he should withdraw it.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I put a very simple question to the Prime Minister. Did the then minister for DREE make such input? I think the answer would either be yes, or no.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member still has not withdrawn and I shall wait for him to do so.

* * *

SPORTS

REASON FOR WITHHOLDING AID TO OLYMPIAD FOR PHYSICALLY DISABLED

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Health and Welfare; it is one of which I have given him notice. Can he inform the House as to the reasons for withholding promised federal aid for the physically disabled Olympiad

scheduled to be held in Etobicoke this summer, thereby jeopardizing the dreams and hopes of some 2,000 kids in wheelchairs from around the world?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the explanation is quite simple: there is no reason whatsoever to jeopardize the hopes of all those taking part in the physically disabled Olympiad, except for the South African team. The government's policy has been very clearly established for many years regarding the apartheid policy in South Africa, and the government's position has been to withhold its financial aid to sporting events involving South Africa, because of its apartheid policy. I personally wrote to the president of the Olympiad asking him to assure me that South Africa will not be represented, and if such is the case, there will be no problem. Funds will be made available for the Olympiad, and I am sure it will be very successful.

[*English*]

REASON FOR ALLEGED DOUBLE STANDARD IN DEALING WITH SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): A supplementary to the Prime Minister. With the minister's answer in mind and bearing in mind, also, the fact that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce maintains at least two trade offices in South Africa, which makes it quite clear that the government of Canada does, indeed, recognize that state, at least as a trading partner, would the Prime Minister explain the obvious double standard the government is once again following, especially as South Africa has taken all necessary steps to eliminate any racial discrimination which might have existed in the past?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: He means in sports.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am afraid the hon. member is not well informed about the policy of South Africa.

Mr. Jelinek: A final supplementary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Might I remind him that in past years the Canadian government did, in fact, fund Canadian teams for the purpose of competing against teams from South Africa. In view of this situation, can the minister explain the reason for the inconsistent attitude adopted by his department?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I would appreciate the hon. member giving me a particular instance and I will investigate it. The only answer I can give the House is that if it has ever occurred it was against the policy of the government and was without my knowledge. As far as instances brought to my knowledge are concerned, the officials have followed the guidelines established by the government. The federal government is not subsidizing sports events in which South Africa participates.

• (1430)

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

CONTRACT WITH COMPUTING DEVICES FOR SAMSON PROJECT—DATE FOR DELIVERY OF TERMINALS—POSSIBLE RECONSIDERATION OF CONTRACT

Mr. Pau Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. On March 25, as reported at page 12136 of *Hansard*, I inquired whether or not the Samson program office associated with his department had at any time indicated to Computing Devices that they did not need the terminals until September 1976, to which the minister replied on April 8 in a handwritten letter "No". I should like to inquire of the Minister of Supply and Services whether or not he knew that on Friday, January 30, 1976 a meeting took place between Computing Devices and officials of his department at which the officials of his department indicated that they had a minimum requirement of 45 units of which they did not need delivery until September 1976 and that they could have been supplied. In view of that, would he now reconsider the contract with Computing Devices?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, as far as the first part of the question is concerned, I think the answer I gave the hon. member was no; the details might have differed somewhat, but the substance of the answer is no.

With respect to the latter part of the question, namely whether I shall revise my decision to cancel our contract with Computer Devices Ltd., my answer is also no. I do not intend to revise my decision since it was based, as I indicated to the House, on the fact that the delivery was to be delayed. Second, while we had called for tenders and agreed on a firm price, the company wanted to revise its price and increase it substantially. Third, the project submitted included major deficiencies; therefore the client department, the Department of National Defence, did not accept the product.

[*English*]

TERMINALS FOR SAMSON PROJECT—POSSIBLE CONTRACT WITH UNITED STATES COMPANY RATHER THAN CANADIAN

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of Supply and Services whether or not he has made alternate arrangements for getting the material requested and whether this has been done through the Teletype Corporation of the United States. If so, does that not breach the very objectives of the program which wanted Canadian manufactured goods?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, indeed we are going to deal with the company which filed the second lowest tender; it is an American company, but I do not believe that Canadians necessarily expect us to deal with Canadian companies, at any cost and under any circumstances. We must act intelligently and first try to get the product we need.

[*English*]

Mr. Dick: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the opening paragraph of the form says that the primary objective of this procurement is to obtain maximum benefit to the Canadian economy consistent with the objectives of the program, and in view of the fact that purchase of equipment from a U.S. firm would not be of any benefit to the Canadian economy, can the minister tell me whether delivery will be made by this secondary manufacturer, or could he not get an alternative from a Canadian producer just as quickly?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is no other fully Canadian supplier like the first one. It is indicated that we prefer to buy Canadian. It is fairly obvious that we would like to do so, but not at any cost. It is not to be expected that we will conclude agreements which will go against the interest of the customer department, that is getting the desired product of good quality.

As for the delivery date, I could not say when that will be but I will gladly look into it for the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

TELEVISION SERVICE FOR TESLIN, YUKON TERRITORY—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Jack Pearsall (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications. Can the minister indicate when she hopes to clear up the controversy concerning CBC television service to the community of Teslin in the Yukon Territory?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the controversy, if that is the way the hon. member chooses to put it, is over. An agreement has been reached between Telesat and the Yukon Territory on the question of a broadcasting station in Teslin. The problem has been solved to the satisfaction of all parties concerned, and this will allow the community to have six low-cost broadcasting stations of good quality and which allows for respect of the integrity of the system.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

HIRING OF TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES THROUGH PRIVATE AGENCIES—POSSIBLE INCLUSION IN AUSTERITY PROGRAM

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. On April 1 I raised a question to the President of the Treasury Board concerning the government's policy of hiring temporary secretarial and clerical help through private employment agencies which take a percentage of the worker's pay. There seems to have been some confusion in the answer given by the minister in that he referred not to temporary employees hired through private employment agencies but to casuals. Specifically referring to temporary employees hired through private employment agencies, were these persons included in the government's austerity program which was to have limited growth in the civil service to 1.5 per cent this year?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I answered the other day that, under the guidelines, government casual employees must be included in the moneys already allocated to every department for the number of man-years that they are allowed. As fas as I am concerned, I will look whether there is a distinction between the words "casual" and "temporary", but I have not seen any as yet in Molière's French.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

INTENTIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONCERNING COMMUNICATIONS PROBLEM BETWEEN MONTMAGNY AND ISLE-AUX-GRUES

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Can the minister tell the House whether, since the Ottawa-Quebec agreements were signed, the Quebec Minister of Transport presented a special project for study which would cover the problem of Montmagny-Isle-aux-Grues communications and access roads to the Montmagny wharf?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I know that proposals have been filed with my officials for discussion, but I am not in a position to give the hon. member specific details on those proposals. They are numerous and have been the subject of discussions for months, even before the agreement was signed last week. I could perhaps in a private interview give the hon. member additional information after I have looked into the matter.

POSSIBLE ESTABLISHMENT OF ALUMINUM PLANT ON SOUTH SHORE OF ST. LAWRENCE

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Would the minister advise the House whether or not a survey is being conducted by his department's officials and representatives of the Quebec government in view of setting up an aluminum plant on the south shore?

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. So far as I know, this project which has been mentioned in the media has not, up to now, been discussed by my department.

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTION THAT FLOODING OF SOURIS RIVER BE INCLUDED IN TERMS OF REFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION OF GARRISON DAM

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. In view of the extensive flooding of the Souris River on both sides of the border in recent days and the recommendation of the governor of the state of North Dakota regarding the terms of reference of the IJC investigation into the Garrison dam project, would the hon. gentleman when he meets with the U.S. ambassador tomorrow to discuss the Garrison dam project recommend to the ambassador the extension of the terms of reference to include flooding of the Souris River?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member was not here on Friday when I made a correction to *Hansard* to the effect that I was not meeting with the United States ambassador tomorrow but had met with him. I intend to meet with my American counterpart in the coming weeks, but I do not know exactly when. As fas as the Garrison diversion is concerned, this is in the hands of the IJC. I could very well look at the suggestion being made, but I know at this moment the problem is quite under control.

* * *

● (1440)

FLOODS

SOURIS RIVER AREA—POSSIBLE DECLARATION AS DISASTER AREA

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I should like to direct to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has he received a request from the government of Manitoba to declare this area a disaster area, as has occurred on the United States side of the border?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any request from the government of Manitoba.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—KNOWLEDGE OF MR. JAMIESON OF ROLE OF MR. CHATWOOD IN CONNECTION WITH SKY SHOPS LEASE

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in view of the answers by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to questions about correspondence of the staff of the Department of Transport as recorded in *Hansard* at page 12609, will he now inform the House whether he is aware of those actions, as related to Sky Shops, taken by Mr. Andrew Chatwood, and will he report to the House on his findings?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what I said on Thursday. I indicated then I had been advised and made aware informally of the existence of this correspondence, but I have not seen it, nor do I know anything more about it than I mentioned at that time.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably incumbent upon the minister to apprise himself of the circumstances relating to his personal staff. Since the minister has informed us that he knew nothing of Mr. Chatwood's activities in this matter, can he inform the House whether he was even aware that a prolonged squabble had been going on for sometime regarding this particular lease extension and, if he was, what was his position vis-à-vis a non-tendered lease renewal for Sky Shops Export Limited?

Mr. Jamieson: In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I was aware of it. In any event, I question very much whether it would be appropriate for me at this point in time to go beyond the comment I made on Thursday. In terms of the substance of the question, so there will be no doubt that I am seeking to answer, at least to the limit the Chair would permit, I am not aware of any such squabble.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

ARRANGEMENTS FOR RATIFICATION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It arises from a question I asked the hon. lady two or three weeks ago about arrangements for ratifying the United Nations Charter on Human rights. Have these procedures now been put in place with the provinces, or must we wait longer for the breakthrough to occur which we were promised on December 11?

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the answer ready on my mind. I have not heard that we have formally ratified the international instruments mentioned by the hon. member, but I hope as he does that it will be done at any moment; I shall inquire at my department.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY BANKS REDUCING NUMBER OF SMALL BUSINESS LOANS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Noting that tighter credit conditions are being felt by business as a result of higher interest rates and the Bank of Canada's efforts to control monetary expansion, will the minister undertake to ascertain whether the chartered banks are reducing lending activity under the Small

Businesses Loans Act as a method of rationing funds to borrowers?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact it is always the little guy, whether an individual or a small businessman, who is hit the hardest by more stringent credit conditions, and who is unable to protect himself by such actions as borrowing abroad, will the minister tell the House whether the Governor of the Bank of Canada is prepared to use moral suasion in order to ensure that banks do not cut off small business?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to discuss that with the governor.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

EFFECT OF PROPOSED GUARANTEE OF SUPPLY TO MILK PROCESSING PLANTS ON DECISION ON CROCUS FOODS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion on our favourite subject, Crocus Foods. In view of the Manitoba government's recent decision not to go ahead with Crocus Foods, can the minister indicate whether the special provision that his department placed before the Manitoba government, namely, that the government should guarantee that the present milk processing plants would continue to receive the same milk supply at their present levels, was a condition the Manitoba government could not meet?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member whether the conditions contained in the offer led the government to decide against going ahead with the project. I would be rather inclined to think instead that the overall situation influenced its decision. I could not say that it was one specific reason or another. Of course, there is the general state of the market; there are surpluses at the present time; perhaps there are other reasons the hon. member is probably aware of as well as I am, if not more so, which forced the government into the decision it took.

[*English*]

ALLEGED ABANDONMENT OF CROCUS FOODS' PLANT—POSSIBILITY OF NEW APPLICATION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision by the Manitoba government, has the DREE offer to Crocus Foods now lapsed, and if a new project were to be undertaken by the Manitoba government would an entirely new application have to be made to the department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, there are legal technicalities involved, and I think that I shall refrain from making any comments. Obviously, first we must wait for people directly informed or involved, that is to say the Manitoba Dairy Producers' Marketing Agency, who are supposed to communicate officially their decision to me. The information we have had to this date is that which was given by the Manitoba agriculture minister himself when he replied to a question in the legislative assembly of Manitoba about ten days ago. For my part, I have not received from the minister involved official confirmation that the project as such had been abandoned other than the information that he gave himself to the press and the legislative assembly. I must therefore wait to see what will happen next.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ACTION TO OPPOSE ARREST OF DR. EMILIO DI IPOLA AND HIS WIFE IN ARGENTINA

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and in his absence, I would like to address it to his parliamentary secretary.

First, does the Secretary of State for External Affairs intend taking particular measures to protest against the arrest of two eminent professors of the United Nations University in Argentina, Dr. Emilio di Ipola and his wife, which arrest violated the International Bill of Rights and greatly disturbed French universities in Canada, especially in Quebec, where the two eminent professors have taught?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleague that the Department of External Affairs was informed of this matter by Canadians last Friday and that a note expressing our concern about an act apparently committed by terrorists against these people has been sent to the chargé d'affaires for Argentina in Ottawa.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

PRODUCTION OF SWINE 'FLU VACCINE IN CANADA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, since Canada had representation at the meeting of influenza experts, convened by the World Health Organization in Geneva last Thursday, concerning swine flu, and in view of the fact the experts at the meeting indicated that vaccine would be available in some countries only in small quantities and in some countries not at all, would the Minister of National Health and Welfare indicate whether as a result he may be reconsidering his decision not to produce very much vaccine in Canada, and at least on moral grounds will he reverse that decision to produce in order to increase the world supply of this product?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have almost become desperate

about making my hon. friend understand the situation as it stands. I never took the position that Canada should not produce any such vaccine. That is a ridiculous statement.

[*English*]

SUGGESTED CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES OTHER THAN VACCINATION TO CONTROL SWINE 'FLU

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the same meeting declared that vaccination alone would not prevent the spread of this disease, and that other measures must be considered, would the minister indicate whether Canada has prepared any contingency plan for adopting existing health services in the potentially exceptional situation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, we have a priority at the moment, and it is to make sure that enough vaccines are available to meet the needs of all Canadians in the months ahead. If other steps are required, they will be announced in due time.

* * *

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF STUDY ON MOVEMENTS OF LIVE CATTLE AND BEEF—PROPOSAL TO EQUALIZE FREIGHT RATES ON LIVE CATTLE AND BEEF

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport. The latest annual report of the Canadian Transportation Commission states that the CTC carried out a study at the request of the Ministry of Transport task force, namely, and I quote: "the regional development implications of the freight rate structure for movements of live cattle as against movements of beef". I should like to ask the minister if he is prepared now to table this study so that we may all see what is in that particular CTC study, and if he could outline very briefly to the House some of the general recommendations that came out of the study.

● (1450)

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I will certainly look favourably upon the first request, and I think that at that point it would be better if the member took a look at the study rather than if I outlined it.

Mr. Murta: It was over a year ago, on January 28, 1975, that the minister said in the House of Commons that the freight rate equalization program would have the effect of reducing freight rates for dressed beef vis-à-vis live beef and that the government will in due course be putting forward the specific proposals they have for bringing about equity with regard to these matters. In view of the fact that there appears to be a study now tabled by the CTC, can the minister inform the House when he envisages introducing specific proposals to end this anomaly?

Mr. Lang: A number of measures are required, and one in particular would be required which calls for legislation. As was indicated in the House before, it is our hope to put that legislation before the House in the near future.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR TARIFF PROTECTION FOR LOCAL PRODUCTION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Each year, just when the local crops are ready for the market, the same kind of products manage to come across the border at prices below the cost of local production. These local farmers are almost facing extinction. Would the minister not concentrate on this problem long enough to work with the Department of Finance to raise the tariffs during the harvest season long enough to protect the local farmers?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, these tariffs are generally agreed upon with the Canadian Horticultural Council which has always been the adviser to the government on the situation, in addition to what the members of parliament tell us. We have acted in the past when it was feasible to put on tariffs when the product is in production in Canada.

Mr. Friesen: I recognize the fact that the minister negotiates with the Canadian Horticultural Council but that has to do with levels, not the timing.

* * *

FINANCE

ALLEGED IMPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FROM UNITED STATES AT BELOW COST OF PRODUCTION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. He has received a letter from Royal City Foods Ltd., dated March 10, in which they say that products are coming in from the United States at prices reported to be lower than actual cost in the United States. They say that if protective action is not taken against distress selling of foreign products into our domestic markets, our industry will not survive. Has the minister taken any action on this matter?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, action is provided for under the law. However, I will make a further investigation of the current status of the investigation.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ALLEGATION AIR CANADA CONTRACTING OUT WORK OF FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES AT WINNIPEG—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister

of Labour. Is the minister in a position to report to the House on the talks which he said he would have with Air Canada regarding its labour relations with its finance branch employees, and in particular has he been able to persuade Air Canada to desist from the practice of farming out finance branch work looking toward a possible lock-out of the employees of that branch?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): The other day when I said I would be meeting with Air Canada officials I thought it would take place this morning. It will take place this afternoon. After I have had those meetings I will be in a better position to respond to the hon. member, perhaps tomorrow.

* * *

INCOME TAX

DEDUCTIBILITY OF COURT ORDERED COSTS FOR MAINTENANCE—SUGGESTED EXTENSION OF PLAN BEYOND COURT ORDERS

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. Under the present legislation maintenance costs as decreed by courts as a result of a family break up are tax deductible. However, if the court decreed a $100 maintenance cost and the husband pays $150, the $100 is tax deductible but the $50 is not. Would the minister agree that the government should be encouraged to support estranged families, even beyond court decrees rather than—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Paproski: Ask the minister in caucus.

Mr. Anderson: Would the minister agree that the government should encourage support for estranged families even beyond court decrees rather than penalizing them, and can the House expect a favourable response and attitude by the minister?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): We administer it as it is handed to us. We will take the hon. member's suggestion to the Minister of Finance for his consideration.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

COW-CALF STABILIZATION PROGRAM—DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Ever since last year the Minister of Agriculture has promised a program for the cow-calf operators. Since the first announcement of his intention many of these calves have become heifers capable of being bred. So far cattlemen know where the bull is—it is contained at this time. Since it will soon be time to turn the cattle loose on the pasture and turn the bull loose with them, would the minister do his part at this time and produce?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the bulls and the cows will do what is natural regardless of what I have to say.

Mr. Korchinski: I am talking about the policy.

* * *

TOURISM

GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO STIMULATE

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Having regard for statistical information which indicates that in the area of the tourist industry which has traditionally enjoyed a trade balance in our favour, we are now experiencing a trade deficit of about $700 million annually, can the minister inform the House whether his department is aware of this fact and if any programs, promotional or incentive, are being planned which would alleviate or reverse this situation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker, quite a number. I undertook to make them available to the committee studying my estimates in detail. I will be glad to send them to the hon. member. They also involve encouraging Canadians to see more of their country because that helps the deficit, as well as encouraging more visitors to come here. But I will be glad to make the whole program available to the hon. member.

* * *

FINANCE

EFFECT ON INTEREST RATES OF LARGE BORROWING BY GOVERNMENT—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF TOTAL BORROWINGS TO END OF 1978

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the government is considering borrowing $300 million from our chartered banks for the purchase of the Orion and the fact that there are other reports of further government intentions to borrow from the commercial lending sector, can the minister tell the House what effect such government borrowings will have on interest rates and the effect such sizeable borrowings from commercial banks will have on the credit available to the private sector?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): We anticipate no difficulties in that regard.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. Does he have an estimate of the total borrowings that the government will be requesting of the commercial banks to the end of 1978, and can the Minister of Finance explain why an organization with a $42 billion cash flow has to even consider borrowing from the commercial sector?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me that the government of Canada, like any other organization, should

take the best means possible to finance its continuing operation and go for a variety of forms of credit.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF LEGAL ACTION AGAINST MR. HAYMOUR FOR HOLDING EMPLOYEES OF EMBASSY IN BEIRUT HOSTAGE

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice, or perhaps one of their parliamentary secretaries who could take it as notice at least. It is a complicated question in that it concerns Mr. Eddie Haymour, the Canadian of Lebanese extraction who held a number of members of the staff of the Canadian embassy in Beirut hostage about six weeks ago. I am wondering whether the minister can say if legal action or medical sequestration is being contemplated against this individual for the crime he committed against the Canadian law on Canadian territory overseas?

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall take this question as notice in order to check the facts.

* * *

● (1500)

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

ENTRY TO CANADA OF MR. HAYMOUR WITHOUT INVOLVEMENT OF LEGAL ACTION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, perhaps at the same time the parliamentary secretary could find out whether the person in question, Mr. Eddie Haymour, was under a court order in Lebanon before he left, and if so, how he managed to get into Canada without some sort of legal action being invoked.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Acting Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as Acting Minister of Manpower and Immigration, I shall inquire and give an answer to the hon. member tomorrow, if necessary.

Order Paper Questions

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE POST-RETIREMENT EMPLOYMENT ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING EMPLOYMENT OF SENIOR PUBLIC SERVANTS AFTER RETIREMENT

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-434, respecting the conditions under which public servants may accept employment upon leaving the public service.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, this bill ensures that retiring senior public servants are not able to take undue advantage of their former positions in obtaining new employment or acting as lobbyists. Guidelines are set forth to enable the governor in council to make the judgment as to when post-retirement employment of senior public servants with a particular firm or person is appropriate and when it is not.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,617, 4,951, 4,952, 4,991 and 5,007.

[*Text*]

CMHC—LOANS FOR STUDENT HOUSING, CHAMPLAIN COUNTY, QUEBEC

Question No. 4,617—**Mr. Matte:**

1. In 1975-76, did Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation grant loans under the Student Housing Programme in the Constituency of Champlain and, if so, in what amount?

2. What (a) are the names of the municipalities and agencies who received such grants, (b) rate of interest was charged?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows: 1. CMHC did not make loans for student housing projects in Champlain County in 1975.

NOTE: The fiscal year of CMHC is the calendar year. Data on operations under the NHA are compiled by CMHC on the basis of municipal counties in Quebec, not on the basis of federal electoral constituencies.

Order Paper Questions

2. Not Applicable.

HMCS "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 4,951—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Was HMCS *Bonaventure* sold and, if so (a) on what date, (b) to whom, (c) at what cost?

2. What are the names of (a) agents, (b) brokers, (c) lawyers who acted for the persons involved?

3. Was a contract to tow the *Bonaventure* to its ultimate destination let and, if so (a) to whom, (b) on what date, (c) in what amount?

4. (a) What was the route taken in delivering the *Bonaventure* to the purchaser, (b) what were the ports of call along such route?

5. (a) What is the name of the dockyard where the *Bonaventure* was broken up, (b) on what date did it arrive at the dockyard, (c) on what date was the scrapping completed?

6. (a) What was the date of the final refit of the *Bonaventure*, (b) what was the cost, (c) at what location was it refitted?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Yes; (a) August 17, 1970; (b) N.W. Kennedy Limited, Vancouver; (c) $851,700.

2. (a) Crown Assets Disposal Corporation and N.W. Kennedy Limited; (b) none; (c) none.

3. A condition of sale was that the preparation for departure and provision of any necessity required to move the vessel is the responsibility of the purchaser or his authorized agent.

4. (a) and (b) The purchaser was responsible for accepting delivery of the vessel at the HMCS Dockyard, Halifax.

5. (a) Kaohsiung Port; (b) March 15, 1971; (c) January 31, 1972.

6. (a) Work commenced on the 25 April 1966 and was completed 1 September 1967; (b) $10,290,090; (c) Davie Shipbuilding Ltd., Lauzon, P.Q.

HMCS "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 4,952—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What is a description of the work done on the aircraft carrier HMCS *Bonaventure* in its final refit?

2. Was new equipment installed and, if so (a) what is a description of such equipment, (b) what are the names and addresses of the suppliers?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. The description of the work done on the aircraft carrier HMCS *Bonaventure* was as described in the contract and in accordance with the specifications, drawings, material lists and documents pertaining to: (a) The maintenance and repair of the vessel, (b) The improvement of vessel systems, and (c) as amended during the life of the job. Generally it included: the repair, refit and maintenance of the vessel's hull, its machinery and equipment; changes to such systems and services as ventilation, heating, de-icing wiring, fuel and ballasting; updating the operational and fighting equipment; improvements in electronic equipment, e.g., the replacement of the existing medium range air warning radar, installation of a closed control and modulating radar set; replacement of outdated navigation and communication equipment; the standard of habitability was updated by re-arrangement of accommodations and improvements in domestic systems, laundry and sanitary facilities; improvements also included the re-arrangement of the Action Information Office; updating NBCD arrangements and modifications to existing air-conditioning, lighting and aircraft landing systems.

2. Yes. (a) As described in the Contract and in accordance with the specifications, drawings, material lists and documents referred to in 1. (a), (b) and (c) above. (b) The department does not have the manpower required to carry out the lengthy research necessary to determine the names and addresses of suppliers. In this regard it should be noted that more than ten years have elapsed since the commencement of the project and that equipment and material was provided by a number of sources, i.e., by the contractor, Davie Shipbuilding, through direct purchases (sub-contracts); and by the Government from Supply Depot stocks or through DSS purchases on behalf of DND.

MEMBERSHIP OF TARIFF BOARD

Question No. 4,991—**Mr. Jones:**

1. Do vacancies exist in the membership of the Canadian Tariff Board and, if so (a) what are they, (b) on what date did they become vacant, (c) for what reason?

2. Will the vacancies be filled and, if so (a) on what date, (b) by whom?

3. What are the rates of pay for the (a) Chairman, (b) First Vice Chairman, (c) Second Vice Chairman?

4. What is the full membership of the Canadian Tariff Board and what are their names?

Hon. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): On the part of the Tariff Board: 1. Yes (a) Chairman, Second Vice-Chairman; (b) December 31, 1975, August 14, 1975; (c) retirement.

2. Yes (a) As soon as possible; (b) Will be announced when appointments made.

3. (a) $41,000 to $54,000; (b) $35,500 to $47,500; (c) $31,500 to $41,500.

4. Five members: W. J. Landreth; R. Labelle Q.C.; G. Deachman; A. C. Kilbank; K. C. Martin.

PRIVATE RAILWAY CARS

Question No. 5,007—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. What is the cost of maintaining the two train cars at the Ottawa Station for the use of the Governor General and the Prime Minister?

2. Do any other persons have use of the cars?

3. Are there any full-time employees whose exclusive duty it is to look after the two cars?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): 1. April 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975, $56,850; April 1, 1975 to February 28, 1976, $56,100.

2. The two car set assigned to the Governor General can be used only by the Governor General or visiting royalty. The car designated for use by the Prime Minister can be used by other Cabinet Ministers, on request by External Affairs for visiting foreign delegations and for business purposes by the Canadian Transport Commission.

3. No. Stewards are assigned as required to any of the four rail cars under Transport Canada jurisdiction.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Friday, April 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have not been here in recent days to follow the debate, but I have read *Hansard* most carefully. There are only two or three matters with which I should like to deal, because generally speaking the entire field has been canvassed and considered in part. That leads me to mention that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has done a particularly effective job in connection with this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: He has a fine record at the bar. Moreover, it is appropriate today for me to point out that this is his sixtieth birthday, so he has a long time to go.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: On a matter as important as the variety of questions dealt with in this bill, it surprises me that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) are not present. However, that is not too surprising because it is just further evidence of the degree with which the members of this government treat the House of Commons with a contempt which I have not known in the years I have been here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), I should like to indicate that the Minister of Justice has been present for most of the debates in the House, and he certainly was here much more often than the hon. member who is now speaking. Such innuendoes are highly improper because, as most members know, both these ministers have participated fully in this particular debate.

[*English*]

Mr. Poulin: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman indicated that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is not here today, but he spoke at some length in the House on this matter on Thursday. He has given this legislation great attention and has attended often in the House. Today he is attending to commitments, on behalf of the government, in Scarborough, Toronto.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Only parliamentary secretaries could possibly give such an absurd reason as that just given under the guise of a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: This bill is either important, or it is not. The absence of the ministers would indicate that while they applied closure to force the end of the discussion, they really do not regard the opposition as capable of making suggestions which would make this legislation workable. Here we are, after 17 months of the present session of parliament, in the disgraceful situation of having this session continue since September 4, 1974. In other words, the government is trying to bring about legislation by exhaustion. Why does the government not bring in a Speech from the Throne and begin a new session?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: They are afraid.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is not for me to ascribe lack of courage. It is simply a fact that the government does not know what to bring in, and therefore wants to delay starting a new session as long as possible.

This bill in its present form represents, to me, another step in misleading parliament as to the intentions of the government and in tightening the noose around the throat of freedom. The government brings in closure after interested parties have been denied the opportunity to present their views. The Canadian Wildlife Federation clearly set out its views in the representations it made in March. It said the following, which is particularly interesting:

● (1510)

Despite the fact that one of its main features would impose a licensing requirement on some two million Canadians, there has been no meaningful consultation with interested groups, and the over-all approach the government intended was a matter of mystery until the bill was tabled.

The CWF offered to explain its position. It offered to help in the collection of relevant information, but its offer was not even accepted. This is an organization which represents 200,000 Canadians. These people are sportsmen who believe in conservation and the preservation of our wildlife. They also believe in fairness and in justice under the law. It is of interest that this is the day of the week that was set aside, I believe in 1947, as Wildlife Week to honour, in particular, the memory of Jack Miner, that great conservationist who wrote the name of Canada all over the world by his contribution to the preservation of animal life.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why is this session being continued? Is the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) trying to establish a record to compete with the despicable record of the long parliament in the reign of Charles I? Is it because this government hates parliament? I underline that. I have sat here under several prime ministers who, while we disagreed on the facts in respect of many matters of legislation, agreed—until the present administration—that parliament is supreme.

I laughed when I read of the visitation in Cuba when the Prime Minister cuddled up to Castro. Having regard to the way in which parliament is being treated and controlled, I can only say that the Prime Minister of Canada would certainly be able to give some lessons to Castro, provided that gentleman ever set up a democratic government. We go on and on. Why is there the delay? It is simply because the government does not know what it is doing and does not have the legislation ready.

That brings me to the matter of the control of parliament. Today we had evidence of the endeavour to intimidate members of parliament. When members of the opposition ask a question which implies anything to which the government objects, the Prime Minister—as he did today—rises and says, "State a charge". The Prime Minister adds words to this effect, "Does the hon. member believe in what he has said, for unless he can establish it, his seat is in jeopardy." In other words, if one says anything critical of this government, then that is wrongdoing and in that case the member must resign.

Mr. Speaker, that is the greatest nonsense I have ever heard. It has no basis in the Parliament of Canada or in the Parliament of Great Britain, the mother of parliaments. It is merely an endeavour to intimidate by threat. If I say anything in the nature of a threat, I would be glad to be number one to come under the bat of the Prime Minister. Going on from there, the Prime Minister says that if anyone makes a statement in the nature of a charge, he must prove it. All I have to say about that is that naturally the matter would be submitted to a committee of the House with a majority of Liberal members. I would like to know what the result would be. I do not want to predict. Even with the integrity, knowledge and wisdom of Liberal members, I doubt whether they would vote exculpation, regardless of the evidence.

Before I went into the question of this childish, transparent endeavour to intimidate, I called the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He has sat in parliament for many, many years. He is recognized everywhere as an authority on parliamentary government and the rules. This morning I asked him whether I was correct in my assertion that this type of childish threat had no basis in our parliamentary system. Fortified by his view, I think the majority of the members of this House will now agree that this matter has been brushed aside and no longer requires to be acknowledged even by way of childish condemnation.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, did you ever see such a hodgepodge of legislation together in one bill? This is indeed an example of the degree to which the government brings together a number of subjects which are in no way joined one to the other. This legislation contains some subjects with which the opposition will agree, and others in respect of which the strongest argument can be made to the contrary. Yet we are placed in the position that unless the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North is accepted, we must vote on a bill that contains everything from alpha to omega, all joined together without regard to similarity or any other basic reason.

I will deal with one or two of these matters in an endeavour to bring some light out of the darkness that surrounds that composition. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

agree with me that this is a wonderful government when it comes to covering up and concealing the truth. It is one of the most interesting phenomena that when members of this government produce their semi-truths and get caught, they fall over, they stumble, they get up and go on as if nothing had happened. That is the position they have adopted throughout. What is this legislation? What is the reason for it?

I have come to the conclusion it is a cover-up to divert the thinking of Canadians from matters such as the mess in which we find the economy, the waste and extravagance of this government which still continues unabated. There is the falling trade, to which reference was made this afternoon, the tremendous deficit in the balance of payments, the industrial anarchy which exists in this country with a government that does not want to act and a government which internationally is suspect all over the free world. In addition, there is the crime which is multiplying. One of the reasons for the dilettante manner in which crime has been treated by this government is the fact that it has been a continual lawbreaker ever since it brought in the legislation which divided murder into two types, non-capital and capital. The Prime Minister, the Solicitor General and others are opposed to capital punishment. They have made that clear.

● (1520)

I have strong views on the subject. When I was prime minister, if a verdict of guilty was rendered and there were no extenuating circumstances or a recommendation of mercy, then, much as I hated to sign what amounted to the death sentence, we followed the law. But this government continues to break the law. Showing the utmost cynicism, the Prime Minister the other day said something like this: "I guess we will have to hang somebody because of public opinion." Could any statement be more cynical?

How will the government implement the gun control sections? I say immediately that I am in entire agreement with the objective, reducing crime by gun. Anyone arguing to the contrary would not have much basis from which to argue. But the means whereby the objective is to be attained, as set out in the bill, indicates a wishy-washy attitude on the part of the government. This plan will not work, and cannot work. It will require a multitude of bureaucrats for registrations and considerations, almost judicial on the part of examining and licensing officers. They will need to discover if the applicant is an alcoholic, if his mind is not as it should be, and so on and so forth. Implementation will require a great deal of examination, and the government knows it.

On page 11 of the little booklet prepared by the combined intelligence of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General we are told: "It is estimated there are about three million gun users in Canada. Because of this large number, it is intended to phase in the licensing scheme over a three-year period." Let us understand what that means. The government knows that it would take an army of bureaucrats to register. Mind you, thay are not registering guns; the government would not do that. The bureaucrats are to register the individual. The booklet goes on to say: "Various alternatives are being considered including implementation on a region by region basis." That is the first public recognition by this government of regional

disparity. Then we are told: "For example, the first year, could see the scheme implemented in Ontario." The registration scheme is to begin here, in Ontario, not in any other part of Canada.

Then we are told that in the following year the scheme will be implemented in western Canada and the territories. Clearly, there is to be open season for guns for a whole year in the western provinces and the territories until the gun law applies to those parts of the country. We are told that in the final year the scheme will be implemented in Quebec and the maritimes.

I have just referred to the last paragraph on page 11 of the "Peace and Security" booklet. Did you ever hear such nonsense? What will be a crime in Ontario in 1976 and part of 1977 will not be a crime elsewhere because the law will apply in Ontario but not to western Canada through to the Pacific coast. There will be no registration requirement there for the first year. There is to be one law for Ontario and a different law for all the other provinces and territories. The paragraph ends with these words:

This breakdown roughly divides the national population into three regional groups. Any implementation scheme would be subject to consultation with the provinces.

I have never seen a more asinine division of responsibility under law than that set out in the pamphlet purporting to deal with questions and answers regarding proposed gun control legislation. The government knows how costly this scheme will be. At first, 900 inspection officers will be needed. Who will pay for them?

An hon. Member: Ontario.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is an imposition upon taxpayers and another way of imposing a tax. It is a way most indirect, yet it will directly affect all. The three million gun users must get licences. Sir, the government did not consult the Canadian game federations; they did not solicit the views of 200,000 members, decent, responsible Canadians who are anxious to support an effective law.

In this country there are ten million rifles and shotguns, 700,000 revolvers and pistols, and approximately 2,800,000 gun owners. How long will it take to register them and to secure that full information to which I have referred? This is a preposterous bureaucratic plan which cannot work. I have already said it will be brought in piecemeal. What is to happen to the man who carries a gun during the commission of an offence? That is where the government should strike. We are after the criminal who carries a gun. That is the man we are trying to go after. How will the gun law affect thugs? In February, 1975, I tried to bring before the House a bill to amend the Criminal Code. It was a simple bill and provided in proposed section 83.1 of the Criminal Code as follows:

Every one who carries or has in his possession a firearm for the purpose of or while committing an indictable offence, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for not less than five years.

That provision would suffice. Wherever similar provisions were brought in, the "gunsters" ran for cover—except the desperate ones; they are in a different category. The sort of plan now before the House has not worked in New York. Decent people register, but do you think thugs are going to register the gun and give names of two responsible citizens as references? Does that not show how ridiculous this proposal is? When I brought my proposal to the attention of the then minister of justice, who has since been promoted to a higher sphere as Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), he brushed it aside. It shocked his finer sensibilities. I point out that under my bill the five-year sentence would not be subject to parole. But the government would not accept that idea; they would not borrow it because that would have been taking an idea from the opposition.

If you let thugs know that they are going to get five years on top of any other sentence they may get, you will strike terror into their hearts.

An hon. Member: Remember what the Law Reform Commission said?

Mr. Paproski: Are you for the thugs?

Mrs. Holt: Don't forget what the Law Reform Commission said.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has the floor.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not interfering with any of the hon. gentlemen's friends. Thugs fear punishment.

Mr. Poulin: What does the bill say? Read the bill.

Mr. Korchinski: You had better read it in both languages.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have never seen so many on the Liberal side of the House protecting the wrongdoer. Such solicitude deserves special mention.

Mrs. Holt: You obviously don't know the bill.

An hon. Member: Simmer down, Simma.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The cost of the scheme will be tremendous. Do you know what the government has provided? It says that if you carry a gun in the commission of an offence, or attempted offence, you will be liable for from one year to ten in prison.

● (1530)

An hon. Member: Fourteen.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right, make it 20. But one year is the minimum. What terror that will strike in the hearts of wrongdoers! They would get a year. What is that in a life? Why does the government not act directly in accordance with the recommendation of game associations and also the experience in the United States that that type of legislation is ineffective?

I go from there to summarize this bill. I am not going into detail because I have already said that it has been well covered. I repeat, it will not work. It is an additional tax. It

will not get the thugs. Has it any support from the mounted police and those in authority? I have spoken to one after the other, and I did not do it by dialling policemen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Without exception, including former RCMP commissioner Nicholson, they are all agreed that it is simply a joke. It is designed to allay public fear that crime is multiplying, and at the same time it brings in a system that cannot be effective. One may ask what can be done. The Fish and Game Association made a very reasonable and responsible presentation. This is general across the country of that great organization. I quote:

> The policy of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation as regards to firearms legislation, is to:
>
> 1. Oppose legislative programs that prohibit or unnecessarily discourage the ownership and use of firearms by responsible citizens.
>
> 2. Support legislative programs that provide stringent and mandatory punishment for the criminal misuse of firearms.
>
> 3. Encourage the development of programs concerned with gun safety and with legitimate recreational uses of firearms.

Going on from there, we come to the next phase dealing with the legalization of provincial crime commissions. The Quebec crime commission has done the most effective work that I have ever known, on the part of any commission, to meet the problem. What happened? The authority of the province of Quebec to set up the commission was challenged and it went to the Supreme Court. Where did the Government of Canada stand? Where did the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice stand? They joined with the thugs in arguing in the Supreme Court of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: They argued that what was done was not within the jurisdiction of the provincial government or the legislature of Quebec. A howl went up. It did not take long. The government then said it would bring in legislation to legalize that which it said was beyond the legislative authority of the province. In the meantime, the Quebec crime commission has virtually been made inert. This is not the first time they have done that. I have never known a government that can argue one way in the House of Commons and a different way in the Supreme Court of Canada. The first example was in the Drybones case. An order was made. Drybones had been discriminated against by that wonderful judge in the Yukon who is now about to retire.

Mr. Nielsen: Northwest Territories.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Northwest Territories judge. The government said it did not believe in discrimination. Lo and behold, when the case came to the Supreme Court of Canada the lawyers for the government of Canada argued that what had taked place was not discrimination and that in any event it did not come within the purview of the Bill of Rights. What manner of nonsense is this?

An hon. Member: Liberal nonsense.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Liberal nonsense? It is no longer a Liberal government; it is a Trudeau government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is tremendously interesting to see what stand the government took with reference to women. This has been women's year, when they were showing their best—and I am referring to the government. A woman in Alberta had worked for years building up for her husband a very tidy amount of land, cash and the like. She was foisted out. When she asked for a fair share, where did the Government of Canada stand? They argued in that case that she was not entitled because, constitutionally, it was not appropriate or proper. Where are we going, is the question I ask.

I have other things I could deal with, but I am not going to deal with them except to say this. No one of responsibility that I know in the Mounted Police is for this gun legislation in its present form. Goodness knows, this government does not like the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I know that argument will not gain any sentimental support because they tried to get rid of "Royal Canadian". When I raised this last year and said they were removing it, the Prime Minister said that was all wrong, they had never even thought of it. When it was pointed out by tens of thousands of people all across the country that mounted police barracks, detachments and the like had "Royal Canadian" removed, then even the government could see. They then decided that they would not remove the words "Royal Canadian".

However, there are still some ministers opposite who do not have that affection for the mounted police which one would expect. I think of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) when he was minister without protfolio last November. He has gone from transition to transition. After saying he was sure that the RCMP tipped off the press in advance that they would be meeting with him on Thursday—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that we are debating Bill C-83. The hon. member is discussing quite a different matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, there are none as blind as those who cannot see.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. member really wants a recommendation to be a minister, I will give it to him, because he has all the qualifications of many others around him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister said, last November:

> The RCMP are using public opinion to get a strength they would not get otherwise . . .
>
> I do not want to see another CIA (the U.S. Central Ingelligence Agency) in Canada.

That shows the attitude of some ministers of this government. To the credit of the Solicitor General, the next day he said, "My cabinet colleague was unfair and unjust in his allegations about the RCMP." But they do not like the RCMP—and that applies to quite a few who sit opposite. They are really deeply disturbed by Sky Shops and other

shops of that kind. They do not like the RCMP, and that applies especially to two of the ministers; each of them is showing an interest in something else at the moment.

● (1540)

I have nothing more to add. I have tried to show that this legislation is wrong in its present form. I have not dealt with wire tapping. What happened there is that they smuggled in this wiretapping section. I could not find it in my search at first. Everything else has a heading. That wiretapping thing was turned down in 1974. We said it was wrong. The then minister of justice, now Minister of Transport, fought bitterly to have it included. He did not get away with it, so they brought it in along with the other stuff.

An hon. Member: Under the table.

Mr. Diefenbaker: From under the table, where it was hidden away, they produced this. As long as that provision is there, you have the danger of a police state.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The point was well covered by my hon. friend from Calgary North who I understand has an amendment he intends to bring forward to make the proposal acceptable. But, on the face of it, what colossal impertinence on the part of a government to put all this stuff together with no relationship between one thing and another, and to say to us, "You must vote for it because you believe in certain parts of it." Not at all. This should have been divided up.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will say no more other than that I fear for my country when you have a government which so cavalierly tries to restrict the rights and freedoms of individuals. They will not put the noose around the neck of a criminal who is guilty of premeditated murder, but they are putting the noose around freedom whenever they have an opportunity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, today is the last day under the provisions of Standing Order 75C allocated to the discussion of Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime. This legislation deals of course with the registration of firearms. Similar legislation has been enacted in several countries throughout the world, yet without bringing about any real change in the situation regarding crime. In North America, for example, one could read the following not so long ago, and I quote:

[*English*]

"The new Boston gun control law has little effect".

[*Translation*]

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of Bill C-83 is to have us swallow the next bill, Bill C-84. It is an attempt to convince the people that gun control will prevent or stop crime which is becoming more and more serious in Canada. If they can get enough citizens and members to agree on gun control, then they will have them swallow the abolition of capital punishment through the adoption of Bill C-84.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill C-83 does not surprise me. Two ministers are needed to support this bill, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). They act in collusion to have us believe that crime will be reduced if revolvers, guns, ".22's" and ".303's" are registered. It may be. However, Mr. Speaker, are we to believe that thieves and criminals will register their weapons before committing their crimes?

Recently, when the Brink's truck was attacked in Montreal by gangsters armed with a machine-gun, do you think they informed Brink's of the licence number of the machine-gun before stealing $2,800,000? As late as last night, murders were committed in Montreal. Are we to believe that bandits will register their weapons to put an end to crime? Those who will laugh at the government measures and the ministers involved in this bill are the bandits who do not care the least about the government and the ministers. For instance, if an honest man keeps a shot-gun in his car trunk, whether it be a ".22" a ".300", a ".303" or a ".410", a bandit will not go and get a licence before stealing it. He steals the gun and then uses it against honest people or to commit a crime, perhaps a murder.

We all have received numerous letters from the province of Quebec and from all the provinces that strongly oppose the passage of Bill C-83. I received letters from British Columbia, from the constituency of my good friend from—

An hon. Member: Kenora.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Kenora, that is in Ontario; I have also received some from there. I also received several from the Windsor and St. Catherine areas and from the Quebec City area. I should like to quote a few of the letters I received, including one from the Quebec Wildlife Federation, Quebec region, as well as a copy of a letter sent to the Prime Minister, copy of which has been sent to every party leader in this House. The leader of the official opposition, the two ministers concerned, the Solicitor General, the Minister of Justice, the leader of the New Democratic Party, the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and myself also received this letter. It is signed by Raymond Pelletier, the acting secretary of this association, the Quebec Wildlife Federation.

● (1550)

During the regular meeting, the executive of the Quebec Wildlife Federation (Quebec area) which represents 26 associations with a membership of about 25,000 unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Considering that the amazing increase in crime in the country is due more to a bad administration of the law than to a lack of legislation;

Considering that a forty year old legislation requiring the registration of handguns (pistols and revolvers) is not implemented, Mr. Allmand having stated a year ago that 40 per cent of these guns were not registered in the country;

Considering that it would be better to amend the act in order to remove criminals from society instead of worrying a whole group of sportsmen;

It seems to me that this makes a lot of sense. Criminals should be removed from society, but not by registering guns, revolvers, pistols and so on. Come on! The Solicitor

General (Mr. Allmand) never net any sportsmen or knows nothing about the use of firearms. Do you think a criminal will care about Bill C-83? He keeps on laughing while we discuss it here, and murders are committed in Montreal and all across the country. So instead of eliminating criminals they try to bother a whole group of sportsmen, not only sportsmen but honest people to boot.

Considering that we should never lay the blame on the object, but on the one who uses it;

This is what is important. The guy who uses it is the very one we should catch. The object in itself, registered or not, does not change anything much.

I resume the quotation:

We propose that the highest authorities in the land be asked to see to it that all bills introduced by Messrs. Ron Basford and Warren Allmand be withdrawn which are designed to amend the Criminal Code of Canada in such a way that all owners of sporting guns and rifles be required to have a permit to keep them, that said permit be renewed every five years, that to obtain a permit the applicant be required to produce the statement of two guarantors, that persons of less than 18 years be required to have a special permit signed by two guarantors, or otherwise, to restrict hunters and sportsmen generally.

The association recommends that those things be deleted in the bill.

In the hope that you will act to implement our recommendations, I am

Yours truly,

Acting Secretary
Quebec Wildlife Federation
Raymond Pelletier

I do not know whether the right hon. Prime Minister has replied to that letter, but I feel the letter is entirely proper and logical. The adoption is recommended of an act that would not create problems for sportsmen, hunters and other honest people, but would instead be designed to keep criminals out of circulation.

When one sees how justice applies to criminals today, one wonders. Fellows appeared before the Commission of Enquiry into Organized Crime, whose constitutionality has just been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada, bandits, in Montreal, guys who admitted having killed. At one point, they were released on bail, they were allowed to go about freely in Montreal, to everybody's knowledge. Is that justice? We wonder then—

At any rate when I hear the Solicitor General declare that there are other ways to protect our society than capital punishment, I ask which are they? Is Bill C-83 supposed to reassure the public? The head of the Commission of Inquiry into Organized Crime, Justice Dutil, has even been heard tell witnesses: Do not worry, do not be afraid, you are protected by the commission. We shall protect you against any aggressor. Since that time, at least half a dozen people have been assaulted and killed, even though Justice Dutil had promised them the protection of justice.

The Solicitor General is an inconsistent dreamer who does not understand anything about the problems of public security. The people are shocked and rising against the irresponsibility of the Solicitor General of Canada. He has to hide to shun police associations as well as other groups of citizens who want justice to prevail. The Solicitor General declared: Before I give up, I shall resign. I held an inquiry in my riding recently, I have data which were made available last week end. On Bill C-83, as on other legislation regarding capital punishment, out of 813 answers from all kinds of people, Liberals, Progressive Conservatives, Social Crediters, 706 out of 813 favour restoring capital punishment and 87 are against.

Not too long ago on television, I watched on CBC or a private station an interview with the hon. member whose name of the riding I ignore, the one containing Mirabel not far from Montreal, Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes I believe, who said that the whole population there was in favour of maintaining capital punishment, but that he was against it. It is his business to be against, but when you represent a population, I think you must take into consideration the feeling of that population—

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is giving his own summary of what I said, but they are not my exact words. If by any chance he was interested in receiving the complete account of the proceedings at the Liberal convention, maybe he could be invited in the future. I will take pleasure in sending it to him. His ideas might be broadened, and the report itself might tell him exactly what took place at that time.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member's word but I saw him being interviewed on television. People were being questioned on the street, voters of his riding who were categorically in favour of maintaining the death penalty. And, I saw the hon. member reply on the air that he was personally in favour of abolishing the death penalty and that he was going to vote according to his conscience and not that of the voters of his riding. That is what I heard.

Mr. Fox: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out once again to the hon. member that I am very glad to see that he listens to me with so much attention when I speak. That is very nice; perhaps I should tell him that I personally made a survey and that on this side of the House we have members as hard working and valiant I think as those who follow the leadership of the hon. member and that in my riding the question that was asked was whether people were in favour of replacing the death penalty by a minimum term of imprisonment of 25 years. In my riding and several others, to the question put in that way, the percentage of people in favour of the death penalty was little over 50 per cent.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): The parliamentary secretary might let me finish my speech and then say the trifle things he just used to suggest that he does not say what he is but admits nevertheless that a majority of people in his riding are in favour of maintaining it. We are outside the subject, and I will come back when we discuss Bill C-84. Mr. Speaker, I am out of order now because we are discussing Bill C-83, but I simply want to draw your attention to the fact that the registration of firearms does not bother me at all. It is mainly a harassment for honest people, those who practice a sport or those who may use a gun or a firearm, for instance, in self-defence. These people may be bothered.

But the criminal, as I say, will not be upset in any way. When a thug is determined to kill somebody, no need to

worry—by the way, the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) recognizes there will still be criminals, since he wants to register firearms under the pretence of protecting society. What a nice way of protecting society! That is why Canadians are opposing this government's legislation.

I have another letter from a professional engineer, Lee G. Morrison, from Calgary, Alberta. I was astonished at receiving a letter in perfect French from Calgary; that is quite remarkable.

An hon. Member: This shows what the Liberals' policy is!

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): No, it is rather our policy, that of the Social Credit Party. We have been advocating this way of understanding one another throughout the country for a long time.

Mr. Morrison stated in his letter, and I quote:

Dear Sir:

Though you are not my member of Parliament, I am writing to you in the hope, perhaps ingenuous, that the matter of gun control will be subject to a free vote following a rational debate, regardless of the political affiliation of each of you.

The proposal to give bureaucrats the authority to determine who may or may not possess a firearm is an alarming example of the philosophy that "all that is not compulsory must be prohitited." If this measure is to become law, it is not difficult to predict that within a few years firearms in Canada will be restricted to a privileged few and that these arms will all be registered with their serial number. Subsequently it would be easy for a megalomaniac government to seize all rifles under the pretence of emergency measures and therefore secure the submissiveness of the people. If you think that the present government's policy is indeed very moderate and my fears exaggerated and unjustified, or even paranoiac, let me remind you that facism is like cancer: if they are not restrained from the very beginning, they can completely destroy our system.

I do not want to suggest that this government is already on the way to dictatorship, however each time we take one more step towards a larger control by the government we are going towards a future where our children will have no hope.

There is no proof that firearm control can effectively reduce the rate of crime except in a totalitarian state. Of course, with a total lack of freedom and with the support of relentless police forces there is not much violent crime but having lived and worked in some of those peaceful paradises I do not hesitate to take the moderate risks and responsibilities involved in living in a free society even if it is armed.

In its Ottawa Report dated June 20, 1975, the hon. Otto Lang said clearly that

[*English*]

● (1600)

It would be a mistake . . . to initiate any legislation . . . which would impose unnecessary red-tape upon the law-abiding citizens.

[*Translation*]

If we force, without logical reason, three of four million Canadians to obtain firearm licences it will merely cause more red tape. In the same report, Mr. Lang admits that the registration of guns will not prevent criminals from obtaining one and will not save the life of those that could be murdered by people who, in the past, have demonstrated no criminal tendency. It seems that the hon. Warren Allmand also accepts such a reality. If the registration of firearms is not beneficial to law and order how, in the name of reason, could the issuance of licences to firearm owners help us? What is the government trying to prove?

I have not had a gun or a rifle for many years but I find it comforting to know that I can buy one as easily as a boy scout hatchet. If my government is not afraid of me, in return I will have no reason to fear that same government. If this moderately repressive measure becomes a law, I will begin getting afraid.

This letter is signed by Mr. Lee Morrison.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one here who has received statements of this kind. I repeat, almost all members of this House have received strong protests against that bill from fish and game associations. The government knows so well that I am right that it has to resort to Standing Order 75C to accelarate the passing of this bill because there are many other members who would have liked to debate this iniquitous bill which does not respect the population's views. In my constituency, for instance, I have received views from the Fish and Game Association of Temiscamingue of which Jean Routhier of Ville-Marie is the president. I quote:

The Temiscamingue's Fish and Game Association is anxious to tell you of its dissapproval of the new bill, that is registration of hunting guns and we invite all other organizations in this area to assist us in sending a petition to Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

We would like you to support us yourself if possible.

Of course, I support Canadians of all parts of the country who object to Bill C-83 being passed.

In my opinion, the government is making a mistake and the ministers do not take requests and people's opinions into account. It is time for the government to take its responsibilities. Once again, I say that if this bill convinced us that it would reduce the crime rate and eliminate murderers, bandits and criminals, then not one member of Parliament would vote against Bill C-83. But we are convinced that this bill will not prevent a single criminal, a single murderer from committing his offenses, and his crimes because it would seem that he has it in him, and then, be will gain even greater satisfaction out of the fact that he can steal duly registered weapons and use them to continue his destructive or criminal actions.

Mr. Speaker, if according to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand), registration can ensure greater protection for society, if there are other methods to protect the population, I am convinced that it is not this method that will protect people in Montreal, people who want peace, justice and order. The vast majority of the people want this. Instead of becoming softer, instead of having a marshmallow backbone, Mr. Speaker, I believe that crime legislation should be stricter. We say: Instead of condemning this man to death, we shall put him in prison for 25 years. He will cost the country from $15,000 to $20,000 a year for 25 or 20 years, after which he will be released on the pretext that he will be rehabilitated. At that time, because nearly all the doors will be closed to him, he will have only one thing to do, the same thing that he did 25 years earlier.

When a minister or a government cannot clearly understand this issue, they should go where such things happen and they will see that criminals can rehabilitated in certain cases. But there are hardened criminals who will not be afraid and who do not fear Bill C-83. They will certainly enjoy stealing nice guns, duly registered with the registrar of firearms or with the mounted police and then, the criminal will not be bothered with the serial number. When someone holds up a bank, does the cashier ask him: "Show me your registration certificate." Nobody even asks him what kind of a handgun he has or what type of .22 he is using. All you can do is give up the contents of the drawer, and you shake like a leaf because you are afraid of being killed. Some holdups ended with murder, that is the point.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the government must take its responsibilities, it must stop beating about the bush, it must stop playing like a fool with bills such as this one. It must start devising for Canada a system which will respect justice and order, protect security but with individual liberty. And to secure all this, we must get rid of all the criminals in our country, in order, first, to promote justice, and then order, which is closely associated with justice.

[*English*]

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I welcome very much the opportunity to participate in this debate on Bill C-83. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) who took part in the debate earlier this afternoon was at his parliamentary and political best. I would only comment on one reference he made to the effect there has not been consultation with the Wildlife Federation and other groups representing gun owners. The fact is, there has been input from the Wildlife Federation and other groups in respect of this bill. The question is, how much.

We all know very well that consultation today has taken on a somewhat different meaning, depending on who is using the word and what he is speaking about. What most groups are talking about when they say there has been no consultation, or inadequate consultation, is that the group, or whoever it is, has not talked long enough with the government to get it to agree with exactly that group's point of view. If that has not happened, then the charge, of course, is no consultation or inadequate consultation. As I say, that statement of implication by the hon. member was an incorrect one in the sense that there has been consultation, even though the legislation before us may nor coincide with the feelings or the express wishes of the wildlife people. As a matter of fact, in many respects there is not very much difference between the principle put forward by many of the wildlife groups, and others, and that of the government as expressed in this bill.

● (1610)

A great deal has been said—I will probably fall heir to that, too—and many good suggestions have been put forward in this debate. I think the interest displayed, not only by members of the House but as shown in the volume of mail that many of us are receiving from across the country, is indicative of the concern and interest of Canadians in the criminal justice system.

Much of the criticism which has been directed at the bill has been on two fronts: criticism for what is not in the bill, and criticism of some of the provisions that are in the bill, in this case the gun control provisions. The bill has been criticized because it does not deal with drug or alcohol abuse, television violence and half a dozen other fields of genuine concern to a good number of people. On the other hand, it has been criticized because of the seemingly restrictive, all-inclusive nature of some of the provisions relating to gun control. This bill is one of a package put forward by the government to try to meet the very legitimate expressions of concern by Canadians all across the country. In this respect the incidence of crime and violence in this country which, although not as great as, for example, in the United States, is certainly a matter of concern. The government is not using the fact that our crime rate is below that of the United States and other countries as an inducement for taking no action to meet the concerns of the vast majority of Canadians.

I think Bill C-83 contains some new approaches which our courts and law enforcement people may employ, for example, in dealing with dangerous offenders. I think the legal people in the House and elsewhere can deal with these provisions and, indeed, have dealt with them better than I can, but it seems to me that this is a new approach well worth the consideration and support of members of the House.

I am sure that my constituents are no different from Canadians in other parts of the country in that they are concerned about their own safety and security and that of their families and communities. Generally speaking, their knowledge of the workings of the criminal justice system in this country is based upon local experiences and what they hear and read in the news media as reported from other parts of this country. Here they only hear of the failures of the system. Successes are not reported because they do not make news. For example, the bail system was referred to by the hon. member who preceded me, the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). I think the bail system we have in this country is a good case in point, although I realize that this bill does not deal specifically with it. The vast majority of people charged and subsequently released on bail live up to their commitment. They show up for their trial and stay out of trouble in the meantime. It is the 1 per cent or 2 per cent of people who do not which generates apprehension and concern about the entire system in the eyes of the great majority of the public.

In this respect, I am sure many hon. members noted with interest last week a question raised in the House by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds). His complaint—quite a legitimate one—related to a constituent of his being held in a Mexican jail without bail for some weeks before his case was even brought to trial. That is the other side of the coin, the other system under which there is no bail at all. Surely it is a much simpler system from the point of view of administration, but it does not constitute what we in Canada consider to be justice. Certainly, human judgment as well as the law itself is very much part of our system. Not only juries, but judges, prosecutors, psychologists and others are continually making personal judgments, not only in sentencing but in granting parole, in rehabilitation of accused persons, as well as in dealing with those already convicted. There are bound to be some errors.

There is a feeling, certainly among my constituents—and in this respect I think they are no different from Canadians elsewhere—that in order to ensure fair treatment of the individual charged with a criminal offence, and even of those convicted, the entire system over the last few years has leaned too far in the direction of protecting the rights of the accused as opposed of the rights of citizens, innocent victims, families thereof, law-abiding citizens, and so on. On the surface, they would appear to be correct in that assumption. I am no lawyer or sociologist, but in listening to and reading reports of people with more experience in crime control, I did not find that I was able to judge

whether indeed that is the case. But, as I say, it is a very widely held view that the system does not pay enough attention to the victims of crime.

We have heard in this debate, also, that all we really need is stricter enforcement and application of the present laws. I do not accept that premise in its entirety. I believe, for example, that some of the changes contained in this bill are good and necessary. For example, the parole provisions, the strengthening of the Parole Board, the abolition of statutory parole, the inclusion of local people on the Parole Board when dealing with specific cases, and the inclusion of two people from the community where the offence was committed are good measures and ones that are long overdue.

The wiretapping provisions represent an effort by the government to try to combat organized crime that all of us talk about and all of us lament about; but on the other hand, none of us can really come forward with any specific answers. I am aware of the fact that opinion is divided on the question of expanding the wiretapping provisions, but it seems to me that the essential part here is that strong safeguards be maintained to protect the personal privacy of individuals in this electronic age. I believe that the bill provides that particular assurance.

Provisions dealing with guns have undoubtedly been the subject of greatest controversy. All the present sections of the act dealing with guns and gun control have been written and revised with major new additions in principle. What are the main provisions and principles with which we are dealing in this bill? On the other hand, what are the main concerns that have been expressed to me and other members by the majority of gun owners who are law-abiding citizens?

● (1620)

In his remarks, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Martin) outlined the main provisions of the bill. Firstly, I believe everyone can support higher maximum sentences for most crimes involving guns. Secondly, a mandatory additional sentence of from one to fourteen years for those convicted of using an offensive weapon. I oppose the suggestion put forward earlier by the right hon. member for Prince Albert that a rigid, mandatory five-year sentence be imposed in all cases. I think that one to fourteen years, or two fourteen years—all owing some flexibility—is certainly desirable in a measure of this kind.

Third, the proposal that police have authority to seize weapons without a warrant in an imminently threatening situation deserves the support of all of us. Fourth, the list of prohibited weapons will be enlarged to include such things as sawed-off shotguns. Fifth, there will be a tightening of the present laws with regard to the registration of hand-guns, which we have had for many years. Hand-guns are known as restricted weapons. Sixth, a licensing system is proposed for gun owners which is similar to driver's licences, hunting licences and trapper's licences, which we have had for many years, except that in this case there will have to be two local guarantors, as is now the case with passport applications.

There are provisions and measures in the gun control section of this bill which need to be changed in committee. There are clauses which need to be clarified and clauses which need to be narrowed in their scope, and their broad application needs to be much more limited. I do not wish at this time to deal with all the clauses which require amendment, but I do not want to touch on some of them.

My major personal criticism of the bill is its structure. I am not satisfied that there is sufficient flexibility in the bill to acknowledge the different traditions which exist in various parts of this country. In this bill dealing with gun control which we will be, and should be, legislating is an umbrella type of law which can be adapted to the traditions which have been established throughout the years in different parts of Canada. It will take two or three years before some of these provisions will be implemented. I suggest that we should give the minister, his staff, provincial attorneys general and others adequate time for provincial and local involvement in the development of regulations which are sensible for every area of the country. In this respect, I suppose we are faced with the age-old and usual Canadian dilemma, namely, developing a bill which fits all areas of our country fairly, a bill which can be tailored to regional and local needs, and a bill which fits not only the north and the south but also the east and west and the rural and urban areas.

The people of my constituency and my province appreciate and understand the need for stricter controls, especially in large urban centres. That is true whether it be in Toronto, Vancouver or Regina. In many respects, guns are too easily accessible; so how do we go about the problem of screening out irresponsible gun owners or those who should not be allowed to buy guns? As hon. members from the province of Saskatchewan are aware, in rural Saskatchewan gun ownership has been part of the country since it was opened up before confederation, just as was the right to own land, to break it and to farm it. These were some of the main reasons many people came to that province from all over the world and from all over the rest of this country. Owning guns has been part of that tradition, whether they were owned for shooting coyotes, gophers, or the old herd bull—to which the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) referred today—with a broken leg out in the pasture. Guns were, and are, part of the normal tools of the trade, just as are plows, saddles and other equipment.

The people in my province and constituency want that tradition maintained. I, personally, believe that the principle of issuing a licence to a gun owner will give him the opportunity to maintain that tradition. In the same way that drivers' licences set out minimum requirements for operating a motor vehicle, surely this system and the principle embodied therein can be made to work. It must be made to work. I agree with the points made by many hon. members of this House, on both sides, that it must be made to work without any great additional bureaucracy and without any great additional expense. In this respect, I feel that the expense should not be borne only by gun owners. We are implementing this provision for the benefit of society as a whole, and all Canadians should help pay for it.

We need some assurances with respect to a number of the clauses in this bill. We need specific answers as to how some of these proposals will be applied. Modifications are

required to ensure that some of the legitimate concerns of sportsmen and others are recognized and satisfied.

I should like to take a few minutes to point out that representations from gun owners and sportsmen's groups in this country have not all been entirely critical of this bill. Many have been quite constructive. The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation is an example of such a group. It is a large, representative and widely dispersed group of gun owners and sportsmen from that province. It is a responsible organization and has already done a great deal to promote safety and training courses in hunting. It has worked to promote greater responsibility in the handling of firearms generally and in training youngsters. They work to promote good conservation practices and good land owner-hunter relationships.

The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation has examined this bill and enumerated a number of specific objections. I should like to touch on the main ones. First, the federation objects to the licensing system largely because of the great possibility of red-tape. I believe the government can accommodate them in this respect. Second, the federation objects to granting wide powers to the governor in council. Third, with regard to the provision with respect to possible fines or sentences for careless storage and handling of firearms or ammunition, the federation is concerned about the implications and application of this particular clause.

Fourth, it objects to a clause which makes reference to the fact that citizens are bound, under penalty of up to five years, to turn in a report to the police or the local firearms' registrar upon finding an empty cartridge abandoned in a field. If there ever was a nonsense provision in a bill, this has to be it. If there ever was a provision in a bill which would make people uneasy about government bureaucrats, it would be this kind of provision. Certainly, changes must be made.

The fifth point raised by the federation is that under this bill we will not be able to teach or instruct youngsters the basics of gun safety until they are 14 years of age. It will be illegal for anyone under the age of 14 to handle a firearm under any circumstances. I sincerely believe that that limit should be lowered to at least 12 years of age. The 12-year limit is now applied in Saskatchewan and in other provinces. I have a son who took that course three years ago. For the past two years he has been taking cadet courses in this city. He will be 14 this month. It seems to me that we are being unduly restrictive. I support the federation in their objections.

At the same time, to demonstrate their responsibility and concern in the field of gun handling and gun controls, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation also spelled out its ideas of what would constitute a good, sensible gun control program. It has put forward alternatives to some of the provisions which are in this bill. I ask hon. members to note carefully the great similarity of principle in the points made by the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation and the points aimed for in Bill C-83.

What are the alternatives? The federation suggests the following steps; first, that all persons convicted of violent crime be placed under a lengthy order of prohibition barring them from possessing any firearm; second, that all persons who pose an identifiable threat due to mental instability or alcoholism be placed under a similar order of prohibition; third, that persons on bail or suspended sentence following arrest or conviction for any violent crime should be prohibited from carrying a firearm, while a person on parole after imprisonment for such a crime might have a similar prohibition imposed as a condition of parole; fourth, that all new hunters and marksmen pass a provincial competence and knowledge test; fifth, that gun dealers be required to keep a record of firearms' sales and open it for police inspection.

● (1630)

The sixth recommendation is that any licensing system designed to cover the sale of firearms and ammunition should be a provincial system with authority to license business operations and sale and purchase transactions. The seventh recommendation is as follows:

That firearms or ammunition be sold, loaned, given, etc., only to a person in possession of either:

(a) a valid hunting or trapping licence, with several years experience, and competency in firearm's handling or

(b) a certificate of competency from a recognized firearms' safety course; or

(c) a membership card from a recognized marksmen's club, or

(d) a special police permit for a valid requirement not covered by (a), (b), or (c) above;

(e) land owners.

When one looks at the variety of membership cards and licences referred to there, it seems to me that in the seventh point put forward by the federation one of the alternatives may be some kind of a simplified, universal uniform type of licence.

There are features of this bill which this organization very much supports, such as the banning of fully automatic firearms, increased penalties for the illegal use of firearms, and extended authority to the courts and the police to seize firearms in the interest of safety when serious incidents arise from domestic trouble or mental instability. As I say, this is the kind of constructive criticism we receive from responsible sports and gun clubs in the country.

The Wildlife Federation of Saskatchewan does oppose Bill C-83 in its present form. I support the federation in most of its concerns. Yet it should be obvious to anyone who examines the government's objectives, the federation's objectives and the alternatives, that there really is not that much difference in principle. It is in the method of implementation of those principles that the differences occur. I think the bill has had ample time for debate at the second reading stage.

Mr. Korchinski: You are kidding.

Mr. McIsaac: Further study can certainly be handled at the committee stage: my hon. friend is well aware of that. I accept the minister's word that he is prepared to consider amendments at the committee stage. For that reason, I will certainly support the bill at second reading stage.

One final point in respect of this bill which I would like to repeat again is that we need flexibility in respect of the proclamation of the sections relating to the kind of licensing provisions. The proclamation should be on a provincial basis, despite the fun the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) made of that this afternoon.

They should be proclaimed in each province when the provincial, municipal and other governments within each province have indicated their readiness, and that full and adequate consultation has taken place with the interested groups to ensure that these provisions are adaptive to the best interests of the people of that particular province.

I think that in general Bill C-83 deserves the support of members and should be sent to the committee where further details can be studied and further very necessary amendments can be made to the several clauses of the bill which require consideration.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, the strictest security failed to save the lives of several United States presidents, writes Frank Arnie from Preeceville, Saskatchewan, a constituent of mine. I think he summarizes in one little sentence what many of us think. I have followed this debate very carefully in this House.

The bulk of the concern in respect of Bill C-83 is with reference to the gun legislation. This is the particular section about which I am concerned. I would like to separate the other sections so far as surveillance is concerned. The people who live in rural areas know all about surveillance, having party lines. In many parts of my area the people do not even have a telephone; they still use the radio to communicate from one community to another, and everybody listens in.

This legislation which has been drafted by a bunch of city slickers for the conditions in the cities will do nothing but harass the rural areas. It may be valid in respect of the metropolitan areas of Toronto and Montreal. As my friend from the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) said, "My God; do I ever see a need for it in Montreal!" We must understand the real danger in trying to apply a set of laws drafted by city people who have probably never lived outside the city limits and who have no idea what rural life is like.

I think the government has lost its credibility in respect of running this country. It does not have the pulse of the nation; it does not know what the people really want. As the member who just spoke said, this is umbrella-type legislation. I know that time will never allow me to say the many things I want to say in objection to this piece of legislation, particularly as it applies to gun control.

As I said, I have listened to this debate very intently. I listened to the speech of the Créditiste member, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau). When he made his remarks, I said to myself that I could endorse what he had to say. His concern had to do with the registration of guns and the affect this had had in central Europe and Cuba where governments have been overthrown because of the confiscation of weapons and because of registration. Perhaps I should also mention Russia, because I have been to Russia and I could tell a story that would make your hair stand on end about how I was treated by the bureaucracy there. Mr. Speaker, one might say that that cannot happen here. I know the type of concern the people have, because I have been to Russia. The local registrar could become the local commissar. This is the kind of thing I am concerned about because of my own personal experience, not because I have read it.

I have referred to the speech of the hon. member for Shefford. Now I should like to refer to the speech made by the member of the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth). I wish to endorse entirely his comments. My area adjoins his territory. I have northern people in my riding; I have northern Indian settlements. The situation in my area is entirely different from the situation in the cities. I have trappers and I have fishermen. In the middle of the winter, if one goes ice-fishing one carries a gun.

Now I should like to go to the government side of the House and say that I endorse almost entirely the speech made by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) except for the one point where he came to the conclusion that perhaps this type of restriction would help curb the incidence of crime. I understand the situation in respect of the sad case we had here in Ottawa. I know the people of Ottawa are now pretty well convinced that gun control is required in order to prevent similar instances.

From a reading of the brief presented by the Alberta Wildlife Federation, I understand that that poor lad in his sad frame of mind broke at least four firearms' laws which presently are on the books. Will additional laws solve the problem? I tell you, in all sincerity, that additional laws would not have prevented that tragic incident. I mention it because the government emphasizes too much what additional laws may achieve.

● (1640)

This second reading debate is to end with closure. Why are the gun provisions wrong, Mr. Speaker? We have heard that you have to be a chairman, president, active or retired, to be considered. I tell you, not many farmers belong to gun clubs. Not many trappers belong to gun clubs. For them, the gun is an essential tool. You must distinguish between the man who uses his gun occasionally for pleasure and the man who needs it as a tool. Some people might take their guns out once a year to go trap-shooting. In my area we do not go trap-shooting; we shoot muskrat. Our youngsters learn how to use guns. I first used a gun when I was about 12. I was much younger than my counterparts in the city who might use guns. Occasionally I brought home supper, partridges or jackrabbits. Occasionally we had rabbit stew. I carried a gun when I was 12. Our youngsters learn to respect a gun. I earned my first 15 cents when I went into the bush near our pasture to shoot some bush rabbits. They were fetching five cents each. I walked four miles into town to make 15 cents. The situation in our rural parts is not the same as in the city.

The same bunch who drafted this bill will be responsible for drafting regulations. And do not tell me you can change a bill in committee. I remember what the former minister of Justice, the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, did to some proposals I brought forward. I proposed some amendments in the agriculture committee and they were acceptable to the committee, but the minister who accepted them reversed his position. He would not accept the amendments I proposed in committee and they were voted down in the House. Therefore, do not tell me his committee members reverse themselves. How easy it is to change a bill in committee!

This situation reminds me of a child at table. The mother says, "Eat your borsch," and the child says, "But, momma, I don't like the beans." If the mother allowed the child to

separate the beans from the rest of the soup, all would be well. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is saying just that. He is saying, "We like the soup, but don't like the beans. Why do you not let us put the beans to one side?" He wants the beans to be separated from the soup. In the case of the child, if the mother agrees and the beans are taken out, the child can eat the soup and absorb the nourishment. If she does not agree and makes the child swallow the beans, the child can bring up, and it will be pretty messy.

The government is trying to create a mess. We can eat beans, of course, but not everything is digested. We absorb what is good. We shall absorb the good parts of this bill and you will hear no more about it. But after we eat, there is some excretion. If I know this government, it will either leave it alone, or flush it down. This legislation reminds me of the digestive process, because just as hydrochloric acid does not break down all foods ingested, so the committee system as now set up will not enable us to extract from the bill what is bad and unnecessary. This little parable is meant to show you that it is impossible to refine; you will not end up with good legislation.

As I said before, the hon. member for Shefford made a fine speech. He was concerned about the registration program. All must register, but nobody knows the regulations. Nobody seems to be much worried about them. The government merely says, "Register." That brings to mind my experience in Russia. I could tell you stories that would make your hair stand on end. I was holed up in a little hotel in a small village. They had an administration there, and I was dragged before a kangaroo court. They tried to hold me there. That was all part of the workings of bureaucracy. Then the army was alerted at the railway station and soldiers ran up to my compartment with fixed bayonets. Yes, this all happened to me. I am not telling you something I heard; it actually happened to me.

I have a friend in Endeavour, Saskatchewan, by the name of A. J. Kobe. In May of this year he sent me a document which reads in part as follows:

> In May of 1919 at Dusseldorf, Germany, the allied forces obtained a copy of some of the 'Communist Rules for Revolution.' Nearly 50 years later, the reds are still following them. After reading the list, stop after each item and think about the present day situation where you live—and all around our nation—

The first item on the list is this:

> A. Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex—

Television is doing a good job in that area. I continue:

> B. Get control of all means of publicity, thereby:
>
> 1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics . . .
>
> 2. Divide the people into hostile groups . . .
>
> 3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders . . .
>
> 4. Always preach true democracy . . .
>
> 6. Incite unnecessary strikes . . . encourage civil disorders—

I draw attention particularly to paragraph C, which says:

> Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

That document came to light in 1919. Deny that what it recommends could not happen here. Will any say it could not happen here? Do you remember what happened in the Quebec crisis? All who owned guns were willing to give them up. All would have been willing to register if there had been provisions for registration. We were told there was an apprehended insurrection. Then we discovered that the trouble-makers were few in number and most of them ended up in Cuba. That is the place our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) visited recently and, boy, was he ever chummy with Castro. He was so close to Castro that you did not know which was the one with natural hair or which was the one who wished he had some. That shows how chummy they were. And you say it couldn't happen here!

I remember when the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) acted in a different capacity. He set up what was later referred to as the Goyer goon squad: he set up what amounted to a parallel police force. I know that the Prime Minister, despite the protests of the former minister of finance, set up a sort of parallel government. People tell me, "Watch this man." I am saying this because I have watched him and drawn my own conclusions. Yes, people tell me, "Watch this man; he is dangerous." Now the government wants a central registry of guns. I say, watch it! They say it could not happen here. Remember what happened in central Europe, Russia and Cuba? When I was in Europe I thought it was sad to have soldiers standing in front of public buildings. I thought, "Thank God I live in a better country." Several years later I found the same situation in this country. Ministers were being protected by military men with guns. Given the right set of circumstances, it can happen here.

● (1650)

My time is rapidly moving on. There are many things I would like to say. I will, however, make this proposal. If registration is necessary, it should be by enabling legislation, enabling each province to register. The provinces should be given that right. I know that provinces have given some rights to the federal government, the federal government has given certain rights to them, and so on. Therefore, it is possible to give the provinces the right to register. In that way there would at least not be a central registry. Even though there is a daily erosion, the preservation of democracy is important. By having registration in the various provinces it will be up to them to draw their own regulations and apply them as conditions warrant. Segregate the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. Some of those people have had certain freedoms provided to them over the years.

The explanatory note is a farce; it is phony. It makes me sick to think that people are being led to believe there will be a measure of protection. For the record, I think the explanation should read as follows:

> A bill to provide for registration and confiscation of guns; the provisions for a licence for murder; the creation of a bureaucracy and for greater protection of the government;
>
> Further, to provide the illusion of security and the removal of certain freedom to natives provided under the Treaty of Paris;
>
> The implementation of certain laws to equate the law-abiding citizen with the criminal element;
>
> The implementation of laws which will guarantee an increase in lawbreakers.

That is the way the explanatory note should read, because that will be net effect. I have mentioned the

Créditistes and the NDP. I endorse the speech made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers) as well as that made by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) with regard to the absurdity that will exist if this type of regulation is put into effect.

If you start with the wrong principle, I do not see how in the world it can then be improved by sending it to committee. I am going to have to make a decision with regard to this bill. I feel very strongly about it. In so doing, I want to remind every newspaper man and commentator in this country that I am not opposing my party. My party does not have anything to do with this bill. I am opposing a stupid piece of legislation. I want to be able to separate the beans from the rest. I have that right. As Richard Lovelace said:

Stone walls do not a prison make,
Nor irons bars a cage;
Minds innocent and quiet take
That for an hermitage;

My party does not inhibit me. That is the kind of thing that happens. Too many times there is a wrong answer by the wrong person on the wrong thing. Given the power of their persuasion in the media, they often make a big thing out of nothing, and nothing out of a big thing.

I said that this bill was drafted by a bunch of city slickers for city conditions. In all the years I have walked the streets of the city, outside of a police officer I have never seen a man carrying a gun. However, I have seen a lot of people in rural areas carrying guns. I have never seen a patrol car in the city stopping a series of cars, but in the rural areas they stop you to check your driver's licence, brakes, lights and that sort of thing. The only time that is done in the city is when there is a traffic violation. Therefore, you can see where the harassment will be. The cities want this legislation. It is the rural people who will be harassed by it.

I will sum up in a few words what I think is going to happen. I could draw several parallels. No one thinks that a gun is a necessary tool for the farmer. A gun is required for humane slaughter. City slickers have never seen a pig being slaughtered; they would not know how it is done. You take careful aim with a .22 and fire a shot at the middle of the pig's forehead. That stuns it. You can then proceed to slaughter. You leave your gun while slaughtering. You do not have time to carry the gun to relative safety. After 1½ or 2 hours you are finished a with a good job. You then go in to wash up. If a police officer had come along and seen the gun and the shells, in the course of his duty he would have had to charge the farmer because the gun was not carefully stored.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Labour Conditions—Proposed resumption of negotiations between Air Canada and finance branch employees at Winnipeg; the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—External Affairs—Canadian position on involvement of Cuba in Africa; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Royal Mounted Police—Sky Shops investigation—Role of officials of Department of Transport in granting lease.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the House leaders it has been agreed that with consent private members' business might be dispensed with today so that we may proceed with the debate. We are moved, as well, by the eloquence of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski).

Mr. Paproski: We agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): There seems to be unanimous consent. The hon. member who had the floor may continue.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for this opportunity to continue. I was illustrating the kind of situation that could be found in a rural area and why it is absolutely essential to have a gun for humane slaughter.

I now wish to deal with another situation. If any kind of a licence is to be granted, it should be a family licence because at one time or another every member of the family will be expected to use that gun. Suppose the father owns the gun and you give him a licence. You don't give the father the right to murder everybody else, and you don't give the others an equal chance. He's got to have the key. A gun on a farm is a tool.

● (1700)

I don't know whether members have ever seen what happens when a fox or coyote walks in among a flock of turkeys or hens. He doesn't grab one and run off with it, as city fellows might think. He grabs one and jumps the next one, and cripples the next one and goes to 15 or 20 of them, crippling them. Then, having crippled them, knowing they cannot get away from him he proceeds to haul them out one by one and he buries them. That is something a lot of these city slickers don't know.

You've got to keep a gun handy. You need a gun on a farm, and every member of the family has to be able to use that gun at any time. Suppose an animal is crippled and the father who has the gun is away. He may be away and he is the only one who has the right to buy any shells. If you have an animal, a horse or a cow with a broken leg, nobody dare go into town and get any shells. First of all, it is illegal; you cannot buy shells if you haven't got a licence, nor should the store operator sell them.

Why shouldn't everybody have a licence? After all, it is a family gun. It is a possession necessary for the entire family. What do you do in a situation such as I have described? Do you let the animal suffer, or do you break the law? Obviously, you are going to break the law and there is an invitation to break the law.

A whole lot of farmers and ranchers travel from one farm to the other; their land is scattered all over the place and they carry their .22 in a half-ton truck. They do so because they know that coyotes have been known to attack calves. Then, again, our country is bear country and bears are known to carry off calves. That is why a gun is always carried around. There are predators. A skunk could get into a chicken-run. All kinds of situations could develop. I can visualize a situation in which a farmer, having made his rounds, goes home and sits down to eat dinner. He is in a hurry—farmers are always in a hurry because there is always work to do. While he is there, the hired man comes in and says, "There is a breakdown somewhere." The farmers says, "Take the truck quick and drive into town to get the parts. The hired man dashes into the truck and heads out. On the way to town he meets a patrol car with a bubble-gum machine on top. The officers stop him and asks to see his licence. They want to check his brakes. While looking around the truck, they see the gun. The following conversation takes place, "Can we see your licence for that gun?" "I do not have one". "Oh, you haven't got a licence." Trouble, trouble! Mr. Speaker, the people who drafted this legislation have no idea what rural life is like.

Have you ever seen a trapper come off the trap lines? Have you ever seen the fishermen come off the ice in winter after fishing? They carry their guns. The kids carry their guns. What is a trapper going to do? He carries his gear in, dumps it into one corner, and there is the gun. Do you think the first thing he does before he even shakes the snow from his back is to lock up that gun? How ridiculous can we be? You have to go into these rural areas to understand. The people who drew up this legislation have no idea what it is like. How are we going to improve on this sort of thing in committee, when it is all based on the wrong premise? You are drawing up legislation oblivious of the fact that there is a rural part of Canada.

[Mr. Korchinski.]

I say, Oh, my gosh, you can do that in the city areas, "though I don't know what good it is. "If you want it in the cities, you can have it. But don't tamper with us, don't tamper with our work." The Indian has a right, under the Treaty of Paris, to have that gun. The white man has done it once again—gone out there and tampered with his rights and freedom.

I shall go on to something else which ought to be considered. The Indian population of this country is 1.37 per cent of the whole, yet the percentage of the Indian population incarcerated in our jails is 8.37 per cent. Obviously, this is some sort of record. But what kind of prison record will make it impossible under this legislation for a man to own a gun? In many cases the sentences involved here are short sentences. We have to bear in mind that a large percentage of the native population is in and out of jail. Is the minister telling me, then, that he intends to deny the right of every one of those men to own a gun because of some sort of prison record? I don't know. Nothing is spelled out in the bill as we see it before us. How much leeway have we got? You ask us to buy a pig in a poke, or a cat in a bag—whatever it is—and then you turn around and say, "It is good, because for the sake of political propaganda this is what we are going to do."

I want to go on to one other thing. I said this bill will set up a bureaucracy. It seems to me that if you want to register guns, it ought not to be necessary to go back and do it again five years later. The only reason I can see for that is the need to pay for this bureaucracy once it has been set up. I am told it might cost as much as $30 for a gun licence; that is one estimate that has been made. Can you imagine a father with two sons having to pay $90 between them for these licences?

My .22 only cost me $11 to begin with. One of my constituents wrote to me saying that his father bought his .22 for $4.95. To pay licence fees at this level is ridiculous. Obviously, there have to be exemptions here. After five years, you have to go back to the same official to re-register. Why? What happens if you have one gun and three members of a family, for example, the father and two sons, register; or, for that matter, a mother, if she is inclined to shoot at all? Nothing is spelled out. Where do you draw the line? Suppose there is one member of a family who is unstable? Is that family barred from having a gun? I don't know. Nothing is indicated in the bill. The only justification I can see for going back after five years is that the government, having set up a huge bureaucracy, must somehow raise the money to pay for it. Of course, we all know who is going to pay for it. It is the gun owner—it doesn't matter if the gun only cost $5 to buy originally.

Mr. Speaker, I am told by my whip that I have only about one minute left. I wish I had more time. I can only say one thing. In the words of the Alberta Wildlife Federation, Bill C-83 is "One Basford of a bill".

● (1710)

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, when the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was speaking this afternoon he congratulated the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), who is the justice critic recently appointed by the new leader of his party and was also the justice

critic of his party under the former leader, on his sixtieth birthday. Might I also add my congratulations. I have always found him to be co-operative and helpful when as chairman of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs from time to time over a period of many months we were organizing the appearance of witnesses before the committee.

The hon. member for Calgary North, relatively recently—I believe on May 30, 1975—in a question directed to the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) asked when the government was going to bring forth for examination a bill to restrict the ownership of certain guns and control others. This bill has been brought forth by the government as part of its peace and security package at the request not only of the hon. member and others but of attorneys general across Canada. Hon. members will remember that very recently the attorney general of the province of Ontario indicated that if legislation to restrict and control the ownership of guns in this country was not brought forward by this government, he intended to do so himself.

When speaking earlier today, the right hon. gentleman also complained of lack of consultation with certain important groups in this country before the legislation was brought forward. He mentioned the former commissioner of the RCMP, who I believe is now associated with the Canadian Wildlife Federation. As a matter of fact, the former commissioner, Mr. Nicholson, was consulted in detail when he presented a brief last June to the Solicitor General and to other interested parties at the time this legislation was being drafted. My understanding is that some 80 per cent of the matters raised by Mr. Nicholson on behalf of the Canadian Wildlife Federation were considered and in fact included in the legislation.

The justice committee has always been receptive to the representations of all parties who have interested positions to present on legislation before it. I would commend, as do many members on this side of the House, that we move this bill into committee for in-depth and detailed study of all its clauses.

As the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) said—and as is so obvious—there are, of course, differences in respect of controlling and using guns between rural areas of Canada and urban areas. I agree with the Canadian Wildlife Federation, other groups interested in the use and control of firearms and with the point of view of other members of the House that the committee could entertain, if the hon. member would so submit, the type of amendment that he feels would satisfy the complaints he made regarding certain incidents, such as having one gun in the family and perhaps five people having access to it in order to protect their assets on the farm, animals and so on. Such an amendment ought to be considered by the committee.

The minister also indicated that he is prepared to listen to any representations in connection with amendments which are put forward with reason and logic, so we can show that we can provide Canadians with some degree of protection against the misuse of firearms, not only the use of firearms to commit criminal offences but also in regard to the tragic accidents that have been occurring, in some cases through lack of understanding and knowledge of proper storage.

Unlike the hon. member for Mackenzie who has had the good fortune to live in the country, these people have had no training in the use of weapons. To the hon. member for Mackenzie these weapons are like any other tool that is used on the farm and in farming communities. People who live in cities and move to the country do not have this kind of familiarization with weapons. In their hands, they sometimes become very dangerous, not because of any intention on their part to commit crime but because of their lack of understanding of their use. Indeed, they have probably never had an opportunity to use a firearm.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert also said there were some on this side, though he did not name them, who do not like the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In my years in parliament, Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to detect any such feeling. In fact, I have detected, on the contrary, a great sense of pride and, yes, sense of security that we have in our Royal Canadian Mounted Police force, one of the most efficient police forces in the world.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Poulin: I suggest they are one of the most respected international police forces. I would point out to the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert that an indication of this is the fact that the former commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is now president of Interpol. To indicate, or by innuendo suggest that there are some on this side who do not like the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is to cast an unfair shadow on the great work and integrity of that force, from their senior officers right down through the ranks, and I think that ought not to go unanswered.

I believe the Solicitor General—it is an honour for me to work with him—has a mandate to work on behalf of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in parliament and he has been doing that job effectively and well. I know he considers the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in representing them in this House and in committees of the House, second to none and places them before many of his other concerns. One of the reasons for this is, of course, this peace and security package that is now before the House.

Several hon. members have spoken in the debate so far and made points to which I should like briefly to refer. For example, in his speech in this debate the hon. member for New Wesminster (Mr. Leggatt) made several important points about the causes of crime. One point which he stressed concerned the disproportionate number of native Canadians who are presently incarcerated in Canada. He went on to state that it is essential to approach the problem of crime at its roots in order to make progress toward preventing such an intolerable situation from persisting into the future. I cannot agree more with the hon. member. That is why certain initiatives have been taken by the federal government outside the context of this bill to approach the very problem which he mentioned.

In order to meet this problem, a major conference of native leaders and federal and provincial ministers was held in Edmonton just over a year ago. This conference of native people and the law explored the problem which was touched on by the hon. member and determined that a follow-up structure should be established in order to pursue solutions to these problems. The federal govern-

ment is now moving ahead with the native advisory councils created as a result of that conference.

Just a few weeks ago in Montreal a meeting of the Canadian advisory council on native people and the law was held. This council consists of representatives of the federal and provincial governments and provincial governments and the leaders of the six major native organizations across the country. One specific project, which deals with the concerns expressed by the hon. member for New Westminster, is the program of the federal advisory council on native people and the law to work very closely with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to develop training programs for all recruits to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in order that a more effective approach to the policing of native communities in Canada can be implemented.

Within the ministry of the Solicitor General it is recognized that more native people are required within the criminal justice system and, as a result of that, a study has recently been completed examining ways in which this can be implemented. Within the penitentiaries we have expanded the use of native liaison officers and also made great progress in utilizing native service programs in order to help our native inmates. Furthermore, recommendations flowing from the Edmonton conference concerning the creation of work camps and the transfer of native inmates to provincial institutions closer to their homes have been pursued and will continue to be followed up.

● (1720)

Programs by other departments designed to get at the very roots of the criminal problem in our native communities have also been established. One of the important programs of this type is the joint program of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and National Health and Welfare. I am referring to the National native alcohol abuse program which has been funded at a level of $13 million over the next three years and is aimed at getting at the very roots of crime which so often are related to alcohol abuse among our native people.

In concluding then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure you that the government recognizes that the concerns expressed by the hon. member for New Westminster are very real and very important, and that the government is taking action designed to get at the problems which are the source of these concerns. If there are no specific amendments to this bill, that does not mean the federal government is inactive in this field.

As many authorities point out, including the Law Reform Commission, real changes in the criminal justice system do not necessarily come from changes in law alone but also from improvements in programs, training, administration, and so on. I think some of the examples I have mentioned show that the federal government is deeply concerned and is in fact actively pursuing solutions in this area.

The legislation has also been questioned by hon. members on the grounds that it does not contain specific provisions to deal with the hard drug problem in this country. The government fully appreciates the seriousness of this problem and places a high priority on it. It was pointed out that there is a strong statistical relationship between the

traffic in hard drugs and violent crime in Canada. I agree with this. But it would be a mistake to look at the measures now before us for the ultimate solution to this serious and complex problem. The legislation cannot be expected to solve all problems of crime.

Strict provisions for dealing with illegal importation and traffic in hard drugs are in the Narcotic Control Act. The RCMP and other police forces across the country have placed a high priority on enforcing these provisions. When we discuss the treatment of heroin addicts, however, we begin to see the enormous complexities and the difficulties which must be faced. As hon. members know, the government did not implement the Le Dain commission's recommendation for compulsory treatment. Hon. members are surely aware, however, the recommendation concerning treatment was not directed at the federal government but at the provinces who are responsible for programs of this sort. The federal government has an important role to play in supporting and faciliting changes that might be introduced, but I think it is significant that no provincial authority has yet advocated the adoption of the commission's proposal.

On the question of a national drug maintenance system for addicts, which was also mentioned, a federal maintenance program designed to ensure the most effective use for methadone in the treatment of opiate dependence has been in operation for over four years now. In the Ministry of the Solicitor General funds are provided to assist community rehabilitation centres working in this field as well. No less than two chapters of the Le Dain commission's final report were devoted to this problem and the government has taken the benefit of much of the commission's advice in this respect.

Experience with deprivation of liberty as a means of facilitating treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts has not been encouraging. The experience with treatment in prison settings has been definitely unsatisfactory, with virtually all studies demonstrating a very high rate of relapse and recidivism. In response to this awareness, the proportion of persons found in illegal possession of heroin who have been placed on probation in the community on condition of compliance with a treatment program increased from 10 per cent in 1969 to 29 per cent in 1974. In many cases a condition of probation has been that the offender participate in and co-operate with a federally-approved methadone maintenance program. In this respect the government and the courts have been involved in the implementation of the Le Dain commission's recommendation for increased use of probation for heroin addicts on condition that they comply with an approved treatment program.

I have dealt at some length with these matters to show not only that the government shares the concern about these problems but also that it is moving on several united fronts to deal with them. Again, however, it is important that we separate the problems associated with the traffic in drugs and the treatment of drug addicts from the specific problems dealt with in the legislation now before us.

In this debate on the crime prevention bill, I could sum up my position in the following way. The government is proposing measures in this bill, and in another bill which will shortly be considered by the House, in order to further

the goal in affording a better measure of protection for the Canadian public against crime and to make our laws more equitable and humane. The government is taking the approach that certain parts of the criminal law can be tightened up in order to effect that goal. At the same time, however, other proposals of a legislative, regulatory and administrative nature in this package, some of which have been touched on today and other days, help to humanize the criminal justice system. I am referring specifically to the measure to introduce more due process into parole matters, to widen the community input into the parole process, and so on. A central theme in all this is the stress that must be put on the "front-end" of the criminal justice system; on efforts to prevent crime from occurring in the first place. Our goal is the establishment of measures which will be more effective in protecting the public.

It is my contention that each and very one of the measures presented in this bill, and in the peace and security package generally, can stand on its own feet and can meet the test of effectiveness which has been proposed as the benchmark against which the peace and security package should be measured. Furthermore, it is most important that the House understand that this bill and the peace and security package as a whole be considered as part of an ongoing process.

I believe that this crime prevention bill presented by my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), is a worthy next step to the one taken by this House in passing Bill C-71, and that the bill currently before us should be seen in this light. It is also important to remind ourselves that efforts continue on other problems as well. I refer to the examination of the Law Reform Commission's reports on criminal justice matters and the current series of nationwide consultations upon new legislation affecting young offenders.

The measures in this bill and in the peace and security package as a whole are also the product of a lengthy process of study within the federal government and of consultation with the provinces and private groups. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) has chaired two full-scale federal-provincial conferences on corrections, one in December, 1973, in Ottawa and the other in May, 1975, in Victoria. The Minister of Justice also meets regularly with his provincial counterparts, and he and the Solicitor General met with attorneys general and provincial ministers of justice on two occasions last fall alone. In addition, there has been set up a continuing committee of deputy ministers on corrections which has met on several occasions in the recent past. The latest meeting of deputy attorneys general was held here in Ottawa a few weeks ago.

In outlining these continuing forums for consultation, I should also mention other meetings such as the meeting of firearms' registrars last June, the conference and follow-up meetings on native people and the law held in the past year, and continuing discussions with private groups such as the Canadian Criminology and Corrections Association and the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies. From this you can see that the federal government is most serious about consultation with other authorities responsible for the criminal justice system in Canada.

Some of the important measures proposed in this bill are the amendments with respect to electronic surveillance. The police experience since the bill was passed in 1974, the Protection of Privacy Act, is that each and every one of these proposed amendments is necessary in order to provide the police with the most up to date and modern methods to be used in detecting and combating crime and organized criminals. The bill provides that rather than those enumerated now, all indictable offences will be subject to wiretapping in the event a court order is obtained.

● (1730)

Also, the act, if these provisions are accepted by parliament, will be generally amended to provide and act which will be almost identical to those introduced by the government in 1973. The amendments which were advocated by hon. members opposite at that time, and which were adopted, I believe have been shown through police experience to be a mistake. By notifying the person whose conversation has been intercepted within 90 days after the tapping has been completed we are not doing anything to tamper with the civil liberties of individuals. What we are doing in a positive way is to place an alarm bell in the offices of individuals implicated in organized crime telling them that the police of this country, who have obtained a warrant to detect them in this manner, know where they are and what their operations are, but have not yet been successful in obtaining enough evidence to carry a case on to prosecution.

The ordinary, small time criminal will not be very impressed with the notification that his telephone was bugged, if information was obtained although there was not sufficient information to lay a charge, but people involved in organized crime look upon such an alarm bell placed in their office as a tremendous bonus to each of them in all their endeavours.

If this bill is accepted, the return of evidence, directly or indirectly obtained is, I believe, a proper restoration of the common law procedure which we have used in this country based on the English common law system that, if evidence is admissible in a court, evidence which indicates the truth of a series of actions, it ought to be admitted so that the jury and the judge will have all the credible evidence before them in order to determine the guilt or innocence of the prosecuted party. This is a proper step. If there is any illegality in obtaining that evidence, or any other evidence that is usually submitted to a court, appropriate action can be taken with regard to anyone who would resort to such a method to get evidence for a trial.

In closing I should like to commend to the House the bill before us as a reasonable piece of legislation and a necessary and effective step in ensuring that our criminal justice system is made a more responsive, more adaptive, and more effective tool to improve the quality of Canadian life. I would also like to stress again the words of the Minister of Justice when opening this debate when he made it clear he was open to proposals for improvements in the bill.

I think it is clear to all who have studied the criminal justice system that the criminal law is really only one of the control mechanisms in our society, and the criminal justice system is only one of several systems. But in its widest definition, the criminal justice system includes everyone in our society, and it is also a reflection of what we are and what we value.

Because this implies more than just law enforcement or crime prevention, the quality of the criminal justice system, which we all understand cannot be perfect, depends upon the quality of the individual and the quality of the community—upon the degree or integrity, self-respect, and the sense of public responsibility for which we all must strive. For this reason I am convinced that answers to the important problems of crime in our society will not be found by experts alone, and that it is the business and even the duty of all law abiding Canadians to bring their contribution to bear on this formidable task.

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to you and my colleagues, and to my whip—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: —for this opportunity to participate in the second reading debate on principle of Bill C-83, "an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime," particularly since the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) has seen fit to impose closure on this debate on principle.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Huntington: Why closure on the debate on principle of the bill? They know this is a bad piece of legislative writing. They know that they are playing a sinister and irresponsible game of politics with one of the most important issues facing Canadian society today—law and order—peace and security—issues that need attention if we are to preserve and improve the quality of life in Canadian society for its law abiding citizens.

An hon. Member: Then why don't you support it?

Mr. Huntington: I was utterly amazed at the Minister of Justice when he spoke on the closure motion lecturing us on the fact that he saw no need to continue the debate on principle—that the bill should go as fast as possible to committee where the Liberal majority could continue to play their political games, with a minimum of exposure and a maximum of control. The sad fact of the matter is that the committee system is being abused by the government to the point where the system is threatened.

We have examples in committees where the government majority on a committee votes for continuous sittings if they are not getting their own way; where with 11 members they can provide a quorum; where the steering committee can select those bodies or organizations it wants to hear and conveniently overlooks others that have a contentious point of view to express; where time limits are set which interfere with the full exploration of a good point. The block system interferes with progress on important issues. This is not just my statement, because I was fascinated to find in the Ottawa *Citizen* issue of April 9 the following comments of Charles Lynch:

> And this, in turn, bolsters the criticism that the committees of the Commons are no more than sandboxes for MPs to play in, make-work devices to keep them busy and lessen the boredom many of them feel sitting in the House of Commons.

And last night on "W5" I found another warning about sandboxes.

[Mr. Poulin.]

What is more important in a truly just society than a full and open debate on the principle of a bill that is as important to all Canadians as "an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime"? Bill C-83 and its companion Bill C-84 do not even consider measures that will get at the true and real causes of crime.

No society in history has survived the rising tolerance for law and order that Canada has experienced since 1968; tolerance that is caused by bleeding heart permissiveness in the management, or rather lack of management in our institutes of correction; tolerance that is caused by a failure to update our laws so that people in a society with changing morals and values can continue to relate to the rule of law which is the foundation of a free and open democratic form of government.

Nowhere in these bills do we see measures to attack poverty which is the womb of crime. All we have had under the rule of this Liberal government is a perpetuation of a reservation syndrome, and the evolution of a new welfare syndrome where we now have families that have been on welfare for three and four generations.

Where are the programs that would have to reach beyond the next election to start encouraging life goals and self respect in the progeny of these under-privileged families?

In this so called just society we see "leadership" where a lonely seaman is to be deported to a country and form of government he does not want while at the same time we shroud and apparently protect the likes of the wealthy General Quang, a man with a sinister and evil record of crime in the most heinous activities of slavery—the distribution of opiate based drugs. If Bill C-20 comes into force before that man has had his day, he will be a citizen of this country.

We saw $4 million spent on the LeDain Commission inquiry into drugs, and what has the government done other than to use these past years as a stall to do nothing about this rot and evil?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Huntington: Sit there and smile. It is not our shame but yours.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: Where in this Bill C-83 do we see any measure that would remove the cause of 70 per cent of our violent crime by taking measures to eliminate the profit motive that is inherent in the narcotic malaise so prevalent in Canada and that causes so much misery and violent crime? I ask in all sincerity: is it callous indifference to the slavery, the suffering, the misery and the crime surrounding this evil? Is it a way of softening the strength of Canadian society for the imposition of a more totalitarian form of government that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) keeps hinting at?

● (1740)

Mr. Faulkner: You are a disgrace.

Mr. Huntington: I am not. Why don't you do something about the LeDain Commission recommendations?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. Huntington: Hon. members opposite are the ones who have to answer, not me. I am in the opposition. Is this illicit activity, which this Liberal government allows to grow like poppies in Turkey, an excuse for a larger and larger law enforcement bureaucracy? More bureaucracy on bureaucracy, and I ask, why doesn't an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime include legislation for the registration of narcotic addicts and remove from society those addicts who will not accept and abide by a proper, just, sensible, and humane rehabilitative program? This would remove the profit motive which is behind 70 per cent of all crime in Canada, instead of fooling around with this malaise of nonsense we have in Bill C-83. Nothing would make a more meaningful contribution to peace and security in Canada than legislation in this area of need.

In introducing this bill the Minister of Justice stated that "the central objective of Bill C-83, the government's peace and security program, can be simply stated—it is to counter rising violence in our society without resort to violence itself in response, this to the end that law abiding citizens will know a greater degree of security and safety while still preserving that critical balance in the scales of justice."

There are clauses in Bill C-83 which in fact, attempt to serve the central objectives stated by the Minister of Justice. I do not have the benefit of a formal education in law but I am from the street and have a concern which is shared by many out there.

There are five or six aspects of this bill which I favour, and in saying this I am perfectly content to entrust the examination and improvement of these aspects to the wisdom of my colleagues in the committee.

One of the aspects I refer to is the dangerous offenders category which repeals the existing section of the Criminal Code dealing with habitual criminals and dangerous sexual offenders. I welcome this new provision which will allow the courts to impose indeterminate sentences of imprisonment of dangerous offenders.

The second provision which I am in favour of is the maximum penalty for escape or attempted escape, and I particularly favour the repeal of statutory remission, which is to be replaced with earned remission.

The third provision I favour is that provinces will be given the authority to create special commissions of inquiry into organized crime which will give the provinces the legal power to call witnesses and documents from other provinces.

The fourth provision for which I have sympathy is the extension of wiretapping authority from the present 30 days to 60 days. I believe this is a valuable aid to law enforcement because statistics show that the average period of need has been 54.1 days. Most breaks in major crime, and particularly in narcotic distribution, have been through this valuable law enforcement aid.

A fifth aspect, which on the surface appears to go in the right direction, is the provision for the management of parole services to be transferred to the Commission of Corrections and for the number of board members to be increased to 26 permanent members. I am hopeful that the committee will give full consideration to allowing the sentencing judge discretion in the assessment of individual parole cases.

I am also sympathetic to the search and seizure provisions because I feel that the time is past for legislators to consider safety and other factors affecting the morale of law enforcement officers. It is my opinion that these six initiatives carried in Bill C-83 are valuable, and I have no difficulty agreeing with them in principle. As I stated, I leave their perfection and improvement to the wisdom of my colleagues who are trained in this regard.

This brings me to the point of concern and mistrust I have for the authors of this legislation. Rather than move forward with meaningful measures to correct our law and assist our law enforcement agencies, they turn this very serious subject into a three ring political circus by devoting 39 of 73 pages to the highly emotional subject of gun control.

Gun control is a subject which deserves full and open debate on its own, and that is why I urge hon. members on the government side to support the very wise amendment which was allowed to be put by Mr. Speaker to the second reading motion of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Huntington: Just in case hon. members opposite do not understand the amendment, I will read it. It proposes that:

> Bill C-83 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for the purpose of considering a more proper legislative division thereof.

According to the Minister of Justice, the gun control measures proposed in Bill C-83 are of a "comprehensive nature directed both to those who would use guns for criminal purposes and to others who, in using them for legitimate ends, must learn to do so with greater respect and care." Yet the minister immediately tries to clarify the matter for us by saying that, "for those who use firearms as tools of their criminal trade no registration and licensing system will effectively curb continued access to and use of weapons." The minister admits that gun controls will not affect the availability of weapons to the criminal elements of society but instead will compel law abiding citizens to create another bureaucracy so that those who own guns can be licensed and their names kept on a list. For what purpose? It is not the gun which kills, it is the will behind the gun.

We have all been inundated with statistics, but I offer a few which show that anti-gun laws do not get at the real problem and do not affect homicide rates. One example is Switzerland where every man over 18 is trained and required to possess and maintain a firearm in his home. In 1968 the homicide rate in Switzerland was 0.7 per 100,000

population. On the other hand, in Japan, which prohibits civilian ownership of firearms, the homicide rate was 2.3 in 1968. It is interesting to note that in Switzerland there is a mandatory weapon sentence to be served consecutively with sentences for crimes. In addition, Swiss correctional institutions are self supporting, and when you are a visitor in them, you work.

Does licensing work? The same statistics, provided by the government, point out that 68.4 per cent of all firearm murders resulting from criminal acts are committed with handguns, and handguns are licensed under present laws. The fact is that crimes of violence will continue to be committed, with or without firearms. From 1961 to 1974, 44.2 per cent of all victims were murdered by firearms, and 55.8 per cent were murdered by other means.

It is my contention that crimes of passion will continue to be committed, because they are usually committed by people who are not chronic criminals. If guns are not available, other means will be used. It is my belief that many of the people involved in this class of tragedy would not have trouble being registered or licensed because before the event many would be considered normal citizens. Crime cannot and will not be controlled by placing undue restrictions on law abiding citizens, as the gun control measures in Bill C-83 attempt to do.

Why this new legislation when our present law, if enforced, would do the job? For instance, under the present code section 83 makes it an indictable offence liable to imprisonment for five years to carry a weapon for a purpose dangerous to the public peace, or for the purpose of committing an indictable offence. Surely people committing crimes while in possession of a firearm can also be charged with that, in addition to the offence committed under this section of the code. Why is it not being enforced? If there are problems of interpretation, why do we not amend this section?

Section 85 of the present code makes it an indictable offence, liable to imprisonment for five years, to carry a concealed weapon without a permit. What person who is going to commit a crime would not conceal his weapon, and how many of these weapons are actually registered? Again the person who has committed a crime while in possession of a weapon could also be charged under this section of the code. To my knowledge this is not being done. If it is being done, it is not being done consistently.

Under section 86 of the Criminal Code any one who, "without lawful excuse, points at another person a firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, or uses, carries or possesses any firearm or ammunition in a manner dangerous to the safety of other persons, is guilty of an indictable offence" and liable to two years' imprisonment or is guilty of on offence punishable on summary conviction.

● (1750)

Any person committing a crime while in possession of a firearm could be considered possessing a firearm in a manner dangerous to the safety of other persons. Why are criminals who are that the new proposed gun control measures are redundant and are merely duplicating the functions of the aforementioned sections of the Criminal Code. It is convenient, conventional wisdom that a multitude of unenforced statutes of the law leads to a disrespect of the law by the public, and that is one of the gun problems we have in Canada today.

It is my understanding that directives need only be sent to Crown prosecutors across Canada informing them that people found in possession of a weapon while having committed an offence should also be charged under either sectons 83, 84 or 86 of the present Criminal Code. Whether the sentence is served consecutively or concurrently will be left to the discretion of the judge. That is under the present law. If this does not work, then an amendment need only be made to those sections making the sentence mandatory.

One can only assume, from the lax and tolerant attitude of our present government to the present Criminal Code and from its past practice of not enforcing the laws therein, that any new legislation will be treated in the same manner, because during this debate over and over again we have heard that this bill will make law breakers out of many present law abiding citizens.

There are some points made in the paper submitted by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police on gun control laws which I think are worthy of consideration during my participation in this debate. They point out that any improper type of legislation may cause more harm than good by imposing unnecessary restrictions on society. Years and years ago during the war I was told never to write a law that I was not prepared to enforce because, if I did so, I would have trouble on my hands. This is the best wisdom I was ever given, and I have carried it right through my life.

This paper lists three categories with which firearms are more and more frequently identified. The first is the sociopolitical movement which cannot be disregarded, and which historically has been associated with the manifestation of anti-establishment thinking that has accompanied the short or long drawn out process of government change. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, this is a major concern to many people in Canada today no matter what the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) says.

The second category deals with an element of society which will always choose to live off the avails of normal appetites but in a carrion fashion, with minimum personal effort and with total disregard of its effects toward society. This is the category of "crime for profit."

Then we come to the third category which is the crime passionel, that crime of violence which is committed in a moment of passion or temporary insanity.

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police in their paper on gun control point out that in any of these categories those dedicated to crime will not or cannot submit to any law, and already disregard existing legislation. I agree with this statement and analogy. The problem at hand is the high incidence of crime and the search for methods to reduce it. If this can be achieved by the elimination of a weapon, then so much the better, but this approach can be discarded from the very beginning because violent crime can be committed with any number of weapons.

The Association of Chiefs of Police also say that "the causes of crime must be sought elsewhere—in the greed, hatred, jealousy and general moral depravity—and the remedy, if there be any, is more likely to be found in

morals and education, in improved police methods of detection", and I should like to add, in improved police methods of prevention. They conclude with the statement that "the prompt and certain imposition of punishment" is absolutely necessary. That is another thing we are not getting in Canadian society today.

I note with some astonishment that in both of these trade-off companion bills, C-83 and C-84, after years of the swinging door syndrome and permissive experiments in rehabilitation, we are now to enter an era of longer sentences. I ask: are our correction institutions now to become "vegetable farms"?

In this debate on principle where do we get a chance to review the very tragic and sad state of policy and management in our detention facilities?

The correctional services budget in 1960 was $19 million to $20 million, with a headquarters' staff of 50 people supervising a total penitentiaries' staff of 3,000 in Canada, overseeing over 6,000 inmates. The correctional services budget for 1975, according to the Blue Book, is over $230 million with a headquarters' staff and regional headquarters' staff of 620 people supervising a total penitentiaries staff in Canada of 7,000 people, looking after 8,800 inmates.

The measure of success in penal reform is the recidivism rate. In spite of the prolific growth in staff from 3,050 to 7,620 in 15 years, and in spite of the 1,100 per cent increase in expenditures in this service, the recidivism rate is still constant. Of all persons admitted to the penitentiaries in one year, about 80 per cent have had previous penal institutional experience, and 42 per cent to 45 per cent have had previous penitentiary experience. Where are the separate training facilities that are absolutely necessary if we are to start having proper rehabilitation measures in this area of first offenders? It is in this area that emphasis should be placed on rehabilitation programs.

I believe that for the objects stated by the Minister of Justice to be achieved, a rearrangement of priorities within this bill is needed. A separation of the gun control subject matter in this bill from the other aspects pertaining to peace and security would give this Thirtieth Parliament a chance to work up very meaningful legislation in this very important area of community need. When a government plays shallow political games with a subject as important as that covered by this bill, I guess it has no option but to hide its shame behind closure. I urge all members to support the important amendment of my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock I now leave the chair until eight o'clock later this day.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Francis Fox (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the subject with which Bill C-83 deals, the protection of society against crime, especially violent crime, is of paramount importance. The measures set out in the bill are part of a complex of measures the government has in mind for strengthening our criminal justice system. I believe, as one of the last speakers on the government side, that it is necessary to clarify a number of apparent misunderstandings about the measures we are putting forward.

The rationale for this bill, and for the other measures the government intends to introduce, is the need for a strong but reasoned response to the threat to our society posed by a pattern of constantly rising crime, in particular crimes of violence. There can be little doubt of the need for such a response. Between the first quarters of 1974 and 1975, for example, the incidence of robbery involving the use of firearms rose a staggering 74 per cent. Firearms are now used in 50 per cent of all murders; this proportion has been steadily increasing since the 1960's and is still growing. It is apparent that, to maintain and improve control of the situation, new initiatives such as those contained in the bill brought forward by the government are required.

The measures we are proposing in Bill C-83 are comprehensive. They affect dangerous offenders, special crime inquiries, changes in parole, changes in the penitentiaries and reformatories acts, protection of privacy, and measures to regulate firearms. These measures will receive searching examination in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and constructive commentary from the many organizations that have studied our measures. Both the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) will welcome their constructive submissions and suggestions. Before these measures are referred to that forum. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a number of concerns that members raised in debate or that arose elsewhere.

I begin, Mr. Speaker, by reminding members who criticized the bill for being too comprehensive and including too many subjects that the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1969 and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1975-76, Bill C-71, were also omnibus bills providing amendments to many different sections of the Criminal Code. Bill C-71, as members may remember, dealt among other matters with, drinking and driving, conspiracy, laundering money, protection of foreign diplomats, and cattle rustling. Omnibus bills of amendments provide a convenient and wholly appropriate method of keeping our laws relevant and consistent with changes in society, a method which this House has found acceptable before now.

Some members argue that Bill C-83 leaves too much to regulations and does not include sufficient legislative detail. It should be apparent that we cannot have bills both ways, both simple and complex at the same time. We believe Bill C-83 strikes the proper balance between statute and regulation, and that the regulations provided for in Bill C-83 are useful and necessary for lending flexibility to the implementation of some of the new measures put forward in the bill.

Other hon. members criticized the bill for omitting specific measures to deal with the hard drug problem and other causes of crime in this country. I fully agree with those hon. members; these are problems with which a minister of justice should be concerned and I trust that in the not too distant future the government will present the

House with the fruits of its long consideration of these matters. Meanwhile I call the attention of those hon. members to the fact that specific measures of the bill, such as the special sentencing provisions for the use of guns in the course of crime, and the strengthening of police powers with respect to electronic surveillance designed to strike more effectively at the crime bosses who control hard drug trafficking, are intended to attack the manifestations of some of the problems they raised.

As these and other measures demonstrate, the basic aim of Bill C-83 is to maintain control in the face of rising violence in our society, to help to restore to Canadians a sense of security and safety while preserving a delicate balance in the scales of justice between society's right to security and the rights of the individual. Let me now turn to its specific measures, Mr. Speaker, with a view to clarifying some of the misunderstandings that have arisen over the last ten days.

● (2010)

There were those, for example, who mistakenly criticized the government for introducing measures to register all rifles and shotguns, and those who attacked the bill for being ineffective in taking firearms away from criminals. Let me remind those members that two thirds of the murders in Canada take place between friends and acquaintances, not in the commission of other criminal acts, and that two thirds of the murders in Canada involving firearms are committed with rifles and shotguns. These facts demonstrate very clearly that there is a basic and overwhelming need for legislation in the area of firearms control such as we are proposing.

The government believes that the measures for the control of firearms contained in Bill C-83 will go a long way toward reducing gun related violence in Canada. They are an inter-connected and interdependent package that, taken together, as a whole, will grapple successfully, we think, with the major issues of misuse and abuse of firearms in Canada.

First, there is a licensing system, not for the weapons themselves, but for owners, a system in which all who want to own a rifle or shotgun will be required to demonstrate their fitness to own one. In adopting this measure the government rejected harsh solutions, such as a total ban on all weapons, the setting up of repositories where guns would be locked up when not in use, and registration of every rifle and shotgun. These were rejected because the costs outweighed any expected benefits and because, in the case of the first option, the government recognized that there are legitimate reasons for gun ownership, such as target shooting, hunting for sport or food, or for the joys of collectorship. As gun users themselves have pointed out, it is the person who kills, the gun is only the instrument.

What the government is proposing, Mr. Speaker, is no more and no less than the measures already in effect in respect to other dangerous instruments, whose possession is nevertheless legitimate and even necessary, such as automobiles. The government proposes simply to require individuals who wish to purchase or use firearms or ammunition to obtain a licence first, like an automobile driver. One licence, valid for five years, will cover any number of rifles and shotguns, and any amount of ammunition. The sole test is fitness to possess a weapon.

Firearms will continue to be available to all responsible persons for all legitimate purposes, but persons with a history of violent behaviour or drug of alcohol abuse will be screened out. Surely members cannot object to that. Surely members cannot, as the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) stated the other day, endorse the present system whereby someone just released from prison or a mental hospital, or an individual in a sudden burst of emotion, can just walk into a store and buy a high powered rifle or shotgun, no questions asked.

That is one set of provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker. The bill also contains stiffer penalties for criminals using guns while committing any indictable crime. Such a criminal will receive a mandatory, consecutive sentence ranging from one to 14 years in addition to any other penalty he may receive. Furthermore, he may be prohibited, by court order, from carrying or having in his possession any firearms or ammunition for any period of time specified.

As a further measure to deal with gun-related violence, Bill C-83 also provides greater police powers to search and seize firearms of all types wherever it is apparent that a crime is about to be committed, or that a person with a gun is a danger to himself and to others. This provision is primarily aimed at what the law euphemistically calls domestic quarrels.

We should bear in mind that two thirds of all murders in Canada arise from these household spats. They are the greatest source of danger to a police officer in the course of his or her duties. Common sense alone would seem to dictate that if a police officer is required to intervene, then that officer should be empowered to impound any weapon that presents a danger.

Finally, Bill C-83 tightens restrictions on importing and manufacturing weapons, adding Saturday night specials, sawed off rifles and shotguns, and all fully automatic weapons to the list of weapons forbidden in Canada. The bill also requires permits issued by the office of the Commissioner of the RCMP for the manufacture, wholesaling, and importing of firearms.

These then are the main provisions of our approach to the gun problem, a comprehensive approach including tighter regulations on private use to encourage private responsibility, more power to police to stop potentially dangerous situations before they develop, and the use of special additional prison sentences as a deterrent against armed crime.

In the near future, as a further measure, the government plans to complement the provisions restricting the general availability of guns by introducing across Canada a voluntary "turn-in-your-weapon program". There are more than ten million guns estimated to be in circulation in Canada at the moment. Although we rarely admit the fact, we have one of the highest per capita gun populations of any country in the world. Many of these weapons are not being used. Many are in all probability improperly stored in a closet or garage and represent a hazard. Brampton, Ottawa—the tragic shootings there prompted citizens to turn in their weapons by the hundreds. We are hoping to

persuade many other Canadians to do the same, and so lessen the potential for such tragedies in other localities.

During the debate some hon. members called attention to the fact that Bill C-83 contains no provision for mandatory testing or safety courses. In considering the question of firearms handling competence, one should be clear that while fitness to own a weapon is no guarantee that it will be properly handled, competence in its use—even a high degree of competence—is no guarantee of fitness. However, the bill does recognize the importance of considering firearms handling competence, and authorizes the Solicitor General to enter into agreements with the provinces to co-ordinate the administration of our provisions with their programs encouraging hunting and firearms safety training. We hope to include competency tests through this arrangement and, as the bill moves through the standing committee, the minister will be interested in hearing representations and further suggestions on this point.

Another hon. member raised the somewhat technical question of vicarious criminal liability. In other words, if someone steals your gun and shoots someone, could you be charged with murder? This is a question also raised by responsible hunting associations like the Canadian Wildlife Federation which, I should point out after some of the references this afternoon, endorses some of the proposals in Bill C-83, such as the ban on automatic weapons and increased police powers to seize firearms in the interests of safety. The answer to the question is, no. If there is any doubt implied in the wording of the bill, I am certain we shall want to correct this in committee.

What Bill C-83 does in this regard is to make you liable to be charged with careless handling and storage if it could be shown that the weapon was carelessly stored and that reasonable precautions for the safety of others had not been taken. Someone, for example, who leaves a loaded rifle on the front porch could be convicted and, if so, become liable to a penalty ranging from a suspended sentence to five years. The actual definition of carelessness will be for the courts to decide in each case. The courts have been required for a long time to assess carelessness, careless driving, for example, and should have no difficulty adjusting to this requirement.

Other comments pinpointed some necessary areas of revision in the bill; questions of minors' rights to shoot, the definition of ammunition, the provisions regarding gun collectors, and the effect of the bill on certain native groups. In the light of members' and others' comments and representations, the government is considering amendments in these areas and these will be pursued in committee.

Other measures in Bill C-83 include reforms of the detention system, about which the Solicitor General has already spoken, and measures concerning special crime inquiries, dangerous offenders and protection of privacy. With regard to special crime inquiries, I should like to say we are still reviewing the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Di Iorio case which upheld the rights of provinces to hold inquiries into organized crime. We will be re-examining the provisions of Bill C-83 in the light of that decision and the Minister of Justice will have more to say on this during the committee hearings.

I should like to point out, while on the subject of crime inquiries, that our only interest here is to ensure that provincial governments have the adequate constitutional authority to proceed with those inquiries. As the bill indicates, our primary concern is to ensure that such investigation can be carried to completion. That is why our initial proposals give to the inquiring authority greater powers than a provincial authority could confer. As for the dangerous offenders sections of the bill, hon. members are aware that these provisions reflect the considered judgment of two committees, as expressed in the report of the Canadian Committee on Correction, known as the Ouimet report in 1969, and the Senate report on parole in Canada in 1974.

Both reports recommended changes in the criminal law so that criminals whose records of crimes of violence mark them out as constituting a serious and continuing threat to the physical safety of other people could be separated from society on a long-term basis. Indeterminate sentencing for offences of this kind is widely used in many countries whose penal practice is recognized around the world as progressive and enlightened. It provides an appropriate mechanism to protect society against dangerous criminals where it is virtually impossible at the point of sentencing to determine an appropriate length of sentence. The advantage of the indeterminate sentence lies in the fact that it postpones the decision on a release date to the point where authorities can more accurately judge the readiness of the dangerous offender to resume a normal life in the community without constituting a continuing threat to the safety and well-being of others.

● (2020)

Because of the gravity of this type of sentencing, the government has been careful to surround the provision with safeguards for the offender. The application for a sentence of indeterminate detention may be made by the Crown attorney only with the consent of the provincial attorney general. The offender can call any relevant evidence, including that of a psychiatrist, psychologist, or criminologist. The court may seek additional evidence by remanding the offender for medical observation for a limited period. Further, the indeterminate sentence must be reviewed within three years of the sentence, and every two years thereafter, by the National Parole Board.

I come now to the provisions that relate to the use of electronic surveillance. These provisions have raised concern on both sides of the House as to whether the bill strikes a proper balance between the need to provide effective protection for society and the need to safeguard the rights of the individual. The need for changes in this law to enhance our capability to attack the carefully protected bosses of organized crime in particular is evident, not least from the Solicitor General's report of 1975. In that report the Solicitor General explained that many of those convicted in the Quebec meat scandal might be free today if the present law had been in effect when the inquiry began.

The Minister of Justice also has the responsibility of protecting and upholding civil liberties in Canada, and he has welcomed the comments of civil liberties associations and other responsible groups and observers concerned with this area. The minister will wish to listen carefully to their proposals for change, notwithstanding that Bill C-83 pres-

ently includes a number of safeguards protecting civil liberties.

The changes in the Protection of Privacy Act that are proposed leave in place the already existing powerful guarantees against abuse of electronic surveillance. Judicial authorization continues to be a requirement. Unauthorized communications are themselves inadmissible in evidence. The act of illegal eavesdropping is punishable as a criminal offence. Full and free reporting of proceedings in open court is expressly permitted, thus ensuring the public right to keep fully informed of the way prosecutions are conducted and the way these investigative measures are being used. While we must ensure that the safeguards are adequate, we must not prevent our police forces from using the latest available technology in the fight against organized crime. Quite clearly, as long as the fundamental guarantees remain in place, the danger to the citizen is greater if we tie our hands needlessly in the fight against organized crime.

I should like to point out to hon. members that the proposed amendments carry the unanimous support of the provincial attorneys general who daily face the task of fighting criminals.

Admission of evidence derived from an unlawful surveillance is a similar problem, and its solution requires a similar perspective, Mr. Speaker. By deciding to admit such evidence and by repealing the suppression doctrine we have had in force, we are bringing wire tap laws into line with existing law on search warrants and more closely into line with our traditions of the common law. Some have argued that the measure rewards illegal conduct. In fact this is a narrow view of the issues involved.

As Wigmore, the great American authority on evidence, has noted, the exclusionary rule makes justice inefficient and coddles criminals by serving neither to protect potential victims nor to punish the offending officer. Rather, it punishes society by the release of criminals into our midst. Obviously, the solution to dealing with a case in which believable evidence has been illegally obtained by means of an unlawful wiretap lies in applying the existing legal sanctions rather than excluding the evidence. That is the balance that best protects the public and individual alike.

The measures contained in Bill C-83 comprise an over-all approach and they are part of a series of changes the government intends to introduce in the criminal justice system. Some commentators have mistakenly suggested that the proposals in the bill violate the spirit of the Law Reform Commission's recommendations. It is true that there are some specific items in the bill which differ from certain specific proposals of the commission, but the basic intent of our proposals is consistent with the commission's analysis of the underlying purpose of our common law. Indeed the latest report of the commission, which deals with this very subject, provides sound philosophical underpinning for that legislation.

Members of the House, particularly those who are also members of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, may recall the remarks of the former head of the Law Reform Commission, Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt—

Mr. Alexander: An old classmate of mine.

[Mr. Fox.]

Mr. Fox: Then perhaps the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) will enjoy reading the remarks of Mr. Justice Patrick Hartt, who pointed out that there is no basic inconsistency between the approach of this bill and the principles the commission has tried to set out for the criminal law.

The influence of the careful studies and reports of the Law Reform Commission will also be apparent when the government brings forward, as it intends, measures to overcome the bottlenecks in the courts system, and measures to overhaul the laws of evidence and the system of sentencing. These are now being readied for presentation. This is a time for action. The public is ready for change. The public is insisting upon an updating of the law so that it more closely and adequately meshes with contemporary Canadian reality. Bill C-83 is an important step toward that goal.

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have been looking forward to this debate on Bill C-83, but I have to ask myself right at the outset whether or not this is really a debate. Webster's dictionary says that to debate a subject is to discuss it by considering the opposing arguments, so it could hardly be called debate when the government has already made up its mind what it is going to do about the proposals in this bill.

The irony of this so-called debate is compounded by the government's determination to limit discussion on this extremely important and far-reaching legislation by bringing in closure, thereby disallowing the rights of many members to air their views. As you know, Mr. Speakers, the bill before us complicates the issue even further by dealing with so many different facets of crime, such as wiretap proposals, parole, prison breaks, changes in sentencing provisions, and other matters, some of which may have merit if they were dealt with on an individual basis. Instead we see them pooled together in an obvious effort to hide the inadequacies which exist in some of the individual proposals.

Because of the time restriction I will dwell on the one aspect of this bill that seems to be the prime concern of Canadians from coast to coast, and certainly a big concern of constituents in my riding, and that is the specific subject of the proposed firearms restrictions, registrations, and regulations, more commonly known as gun controls. We have seen clearly that the government is as totally disinterested in the weight of public opposition to the gun registration proposals in this bill as it is to capital punishment and other important issues.

I believe that it would be safe to say that every member of this House, including every member on the government benches, has received a great volume of mail on the subject of gun registration. I believe that it would be equally safe to say that the mail received by every single member has been overwhelmingly against the gun control provisions in this bill as they are written.

● (2030)

An hon. Member: What did you say, Simma?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek) has the floor.

An hon. Member: $218 a minute.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the hon. members opposite—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley will please address the Chair.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad hon. members—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member will please address the Chair.

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I stated "hon. members opposite" obviously have not been listening to the majority of their constituents. They should remember that they were put here in the House of Commons by a majority of those people, and they should abide by the wishes of their constituents.

An hon. Member: You are here by 200.

Mr. Jelinek: And that's better than losing by one.

To continue my speech, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say that the Canadian people are against gun registration of any kind, or that they are against control of the sale, use and storage of weapons. More than anything else, it means that the Canadian people are completely fed up with the manner in which the government attempts to legislate. In practically every instance when the government tables legislation to deal with a real or imagined problem, it resorts to over-kill. There is no doubt whatever, Mr. Speaker, that the gun control section in this bill is over-kill, pure and simple.

Let me make it clear at the outset that as an individual who is horrified at the continuing increase of crime around us while the government allows known killers to walk our streets only to kill again, I would more than welcome and certainly support any legislation which would attempt to deal with the problems of law and order which we are faced with on a daily basis. Unfortunately, I see no way in which this bill as it now reads will effect a reduction in crime, particularly that part which pertains to gun control.

I was interested in the remarks of my colleague, the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), in respect of the government's contention that registered guns will not be used to kill people. I cannot draw any other conclusion from the statements of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) that we can curtail deaths in Canada caused by long guns by the simple expedient of registering the owners of rifles and shotguns. So many analogies have been used to illustrate the fallacy of such an argument that I will not relate them all here. However, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that a high percentage of homocides in this country are committed by handguns, which have been controlled for 50 years.

In all of the cases of long guns referred to by the government supporters of this legislation, every one of the persons involved in the deaths would have qualified for registration certificates for the guns. Yet the government has the gall to include in this hodge podge legislation a type of gun control proposal that is only known to the deteriorating police states around the world. Let us not be so naive as not to realize that if a gangster is determined to commit a crime he will not need to register his firearm but rather obtain it through other devious ways and means which will exist even if these gun control proposals do become law.

Just think of the cost of administrating these controls on law abiding citizens. It will become a bureaucratic nightmare in more ways than one.

It would be ludicrous to suggest that any bureaucrat reviewing applications for gun registration could look into the future and, on the basis of what might happen, reject an application from an otherwise stable and law-abiding citizen. I will suggest to the hon. members of this House, though, that if we place too much authority in the hands of appointed bureaucrats to decide who can or cannot own a gun, it is going to lead almost automatically to abuse and, more than that, it is going to encourage the government, and its appointed bureaucrats, to extend this type of authority into other areas of lawful activity of Canadian citizens.

I would not pretend that I know more about what life is like in a controlled society, Mr. Speaker, but I at least know what it is like from personal experience. I know how easy it is for people in a society to accept the view that what a government is doing to them is for their own good. That is the way it happens. A government that is determined to assume control over a society that has known freedom will always adopt the manner of the great protector. "What we are doing is really for your own good, and it would be in your best interests to accept a certain amount of control in order to obtain long term benefits", it will say. Such governments are always the champions of human rights, civil rights, and all of the other rights that they plan eventually to curtail. That is what I fear the most from the government's assumption of control over our lives, Mr. Speaker.

The government pretends that it is doing all sorts of things for our own good, and I know where it can all lead. I have seen it happen. In view of the millions of people who are still living in the controlled society that I was able to escape from, I have to consider that I am one of the fortunate few. But I believed, as did millions of others, that I was comming to a country that offered a free society, freedom of all the things that communist countries in other parts of the world now control, and in fact that is what Canada has always been, a country exemplifying freedom to the rest of the world.

But what do we have today? We have a government in this country that wants the control over the means of production, over the ecomony, and over all aspects of human activity and endeavor. Like the governments in Eastern Europe its members are self-styled champions of civil liberty, individual freedom, and a wide range of human rights. It does not matter that these two philosophies are in conflit. It is what you can get the public to accept, and not necessarily what is right, that forms the basis of a philosophy that seeks to control people and societies. And that is precisely the type of society that the

Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau is trying to have Canadians accept.

Allow me at this point to read a set of rules obtained by the allied forces after the war from the communist "Rules of Revolution." Hon. members here will know that these rules have been distributed to members and relate indirectly to Bill C-83, and I will get to that.

Before reading the rules let me point out that they have been taking effect around the world, not only just after the war but up to the present time, whether it be in Asia, eastern Europe, the Middle East, Angola, South America and, yes, even North America, whether we want to believe it or not. Quoting from the communist "Rules for Revolution" they are:

A. Corrupt the young; get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity, thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

3. Destroy the other people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and disgrace.

4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and ruthlessly as possible.

5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

6. Incite unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.

7. By specious argument cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, self restraint, faith in the pledged word, ruggedness.

Then the final point which is the one that relates directly to this bill:

C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

If you reflect on how many of the above points are already in effect in this country you must begin to wonder just how much longer our democratic way of life will continue.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the real key to what the government is attempting to do is its insistence that gun-related crimes can be controlled or curtailed by forcing law-abiding citizens to register as gun owners. It has been suggested a number of times by some of my colleagues in these debates that the logical next step is to register all owners of baseball bats, kitchen knives, hatchets and axes, and all other instruments and objects that are used to commit violent crimes.

● (2040)

The fact of the matter is as the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack) pointed out, that we cannot outlaw the instruments of death any more than we can outlaw death itself. Lethal weapons as such are already controlled as well as they can be controlled by being included as offences in the Criminal Code. Sawed-off rifles and shotguns, automatic weapons, and revolvers are already classed as either restricted or prohibited weapons in the Criminal Code, yet most gun-related crimes in Canada, as in other countries, are committed with restricted or prohibited weapons.

[Mr. Jelinek.]

The logical way to tighten up the law is to tighten the laws that are being abridged by criminals. Adding still more weapons to the restricted classes is not going to prevent or curtail gun-related crime. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the Minister of Justice is as naive as this gun-control legislation makes him out to be, so I have to suspect that there is a more sinister motive behind it, one that has nothing whatever to do with controlling crime.

I know as well as any other person in Canada that the government is bankrupt of ideas when it comes to getting violent crime under control, and I know that neither the Minister of Justice nor the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is all that concerned about the problem. How could a minister be concerned about controlling crime when he states publicly, before any legislation is even tabled, that he will not be a party to the execution of a person convicted of a brutal, vicious and deliberate murder? How can we believe that such a minister would follow up and ensure that such a murderer would really be kept in prison for twenty-five years? The answer is simple. We can't.

Allow me to point out that there are many other individuals and groups of individuals who share this view publicly. For example, just last Friday the committee representing the rank and file of the RCMP from across Canada expressed their concern that their boss, the Solicitor General, was "unable to be effective as the federal minister responsible for the force." Is there any wonder? They are talking about the same minister who just a few weeks ago said that Soviet KGB secret agents aren't spies. Perhaps he believes they are butchers, bakers or candlestick makers—or even diplomats.

In any case how can we trust a government to protect society when, for example, convicted rape murderers of children are allowed out of prison on daily and weekend passes, to commit further crimes? How can we trust this government to control convicted criminals when almost every week we see another prison break, or another taking of hostages by hardened prisoners? The obvious answer, again, is that we simply can't. We can only trust the government to chip away at the rights and freedoms of the law-abiding citizens.

The Minister of Justice insists that capital punishment is not a deterrent to violent crime, and says that the answer is to impose longer prison terms for certain types of murder. I'm glad that the minister can at least distinguish between the various types of murder. No doubt when this legislation is railroaded through the House we will have two more types of murder—murders committed with registered guns, and murders committed with unregistered guns.

The plain fact is that the minister does not know whether or not the threat of execution would be a deterrent to certain types of premeditated murder. We don't have any data on which to base such an assumption for the simple reason that the cabinet in the past ten years has commuted every death sentence imposed by our courts, therefore breaking the very laws which it passed. Parliament compromised on the contentious issue of capital punishment and voted to impose the death sentence for conviction of the murder of a policeman or prison guard. While we don't have any data on the deterrent effect of the death penalty we do have records that show that some of those murderers

whose sentences have been commuted by the Liberal cabinet have gone on to commit further crimes, including murders.

I am afraid that we are going to find ourselves in the same position that the people of California, and other states, now find themselves in as a result of the U.S. Supreme court decision banning capital punishment. That infamous murdering animal, Charles Manson, who had his death sentence commuted to life imprisonment after being convicted in 1969 for seven senseless murders, will be eligible for parole in 1978, just two years from now. Just think of it?

It is a mockery of justice and a sad commentary on any society to allow such a situation to exist. It is not a situation that exists only in the United States or in other countries remote from us. We have our own Charles Mansons, whether we want to accept that fact or not, and I do not want to turn such people out on leave, parole or full release, to prey again and again on innocent people, until at least they are cornered, and either shot down by the police or returned to a jail cell for a few more years. Unless we are prepared at least to put the death penalty to the test, and find out once and for all if it will deter violent and senseless murders, then we are not doing all we can do, and all we should do, to protect the innocent and law-abiding.

The Minister of Justice said a few days ago that this gun registration legislation will keep guns out of the hands of the irresponsible. What complete and utter nonsense! The irresonsible in society acquire guns in the same irresponsible way that they do everything else. The minister is insulting our intelligence when he suggests we can control the actions of the lawless by imposing new restrictions on the actions of the law-abiding people of Canada.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that people are not against some control over the sale, storage or use of firearms. No sensible person would agree that firearms should be immediately available to all sorts of people, in stores, by mail order, or by simply picking up a rifle or shotgun that is left lying around by its owner. I repeat that the Minister of Justice is resorting to overkill, instead of studying the matter thoroughly and sensibly.

The minister should be attacking the weak points in our gun laws, not the strong points. Gun clubs and other organizations concerned with the safe and responsible handling of guns are not the weak points in the gun question. These are the groups who would be in the strongest position with respect to limiting the irresponsible distribution, storage and use of firearms. These are the people who have pioneered the safe use of firearms, and who have carried the burden of education and instruction in the safe use of firearms. It is these people who have brought pressure to bear on the provinces, in the absence of any federal programs, to introduce gun safety courses.

In Ontario, for example, we have an excellent program of gun safety and hunter safety. No person in Ontario can buy a hunting license without first completing a hunter safety course and passing both a written and practical examination. The graduate receives a certificate which is presented to the agency selling hunting licences. It is a serious offence for anyone to sell a hunting licence without verifying that the buyer has such a certificate.

However, the problem here, is that the Minister of Justice simply doesn't seem to be able to come up with any concrete proposals for dealing with violent crime. His sympathies seem to be more with the rights and dignities of those convicted of crimes, and so his tendency is to vent his frustration on the innocent victims of crime and the law-abiding citizens of Canada. He can't bring himself to the point of allowing the state to take the life of a convicted murderer, and he can't seem to find any way of deterring those who follow a deliberate and calculated life of crime, especially those who use guns in the commission of crimes. And so, Mr. Speaker, the minister has decided to kill all the chickens in order to foil the fox. Of course this is a cop-out, but that is not new or unique to this government. It is a form of deceit, something at which the government is adept.

The minister says gun registration as proposed in this legislation is not intended to be confiscation. He says that in place of the death penalty we will impose longer, mandatory prison sentences. He promises a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, but we just cannot believe him. I think back on the multi-million-dollar campaign waged by the Prime Minister in 1974 against the wage and income control program advocated by the former leader of the opposition. The Prime Minister convinced the people of Canada that such a program would not work. And after his government was returned to majority power he imposed the present wage and price control program on the country, a program which had already been worked out in principle at the very time he was attacking our own program.

I cannot accept this bill on any count, Mr. Speaker, neither the gun control proposals, the wiretap proposals, the changes in sentencing provisions in the Criminal Code, the changes with respect to dangerous offenders, parole, nor the proposals for dealing with prison breaks. My objections have already been very ably defined in the remarks of my Conservative colleagues during this limited so-called debate. The fact remains that the government continues to shy away from including any specific details of law in any of the bills it has tabled in recent years.

I am suspicious of any open-ended legislation where the details are filled in after the bill has been passed by parliament. We should be voting on specific details rather than broad principles, and in the case of gun registration in particular I want to know what sort of bureaucracy the government plans to install to administer the law. I want to know exactly what regulations and conditions a person will have to contend with when he or she enters a registration office to apply for a gun registration certificate. It is not unreasonable for members of this House to want to know what they are voting for or against.

● (2050)

That is the reason why all these very important crime issues cannot and must not be pooled in a single misleading piece of legislation such as the one before us. It is easy to see that this devious Liberal government is continuing to try to fool the public. In this case it is most obviously trying to soften the people of Canada into believing that making this bill law, capital punishment will no longer be necessary. I think that the government has been fooling the people of Canada long enough, and I sincerely hope and believe that the public will not fall for it again.

It appears at this point in time that our only hope for getting this bill sorted out, and getting some details filled in, will be at committee stage. That is why, if I vote for this bill at second reading, I will be only doing so with the hope of having the necessary changes proposed during the last few days made during the committee stage. If the Liberal members will not compromise, then there will be no way that I, as a representative of my constituents in High Park-Humber Valley, can vote for this phony bill, as it now stands, at third and final reading. I can only hope that some of the members on the other side of the House will take the opportunity of the proposals made in committee to do what they themselves surely know must be done. This bill as it is written will be as bad for their constituents as for mine, and so if they have any interest at all in seeing that good legislation is salvaged from a bad bill, then I have faith that we will correct the obvious inequities and iniquities in Bill C-83 at that time.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) on a point of order?

Some hon. Members: No.

An hon. Member: You are wasting time.

An. hon. Member: He wants to ask a question. It is not a point of order.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I only want to ask the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek) for clarification. Did I misunderstand him that he believes the two bills are together? He called it a package deal a while ago, Bill C-83 and Bill C-84.

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

Mr. Jelinek: Mr. Speaker, I will clarify the point very quickly. I never referred to Bill C-84. I was talking about the different subjects in Bill C-83 such as wiretapping, gun control, etc.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively as the previous speaker, the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek), read out was has been coming in the mail to all members of parliament, this so called document on the "Communist Rules for Revolution."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You know all about that.

Mr. Rodriguez: I thought it was more like the capitalist rules for revolution. Let me clarify. The first thing they do, according to those rules, is to:

Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

I know many liquor companies in this country which became rich by pushing booze on young people. It is the Ontario Tory government which lowered the drinking age to 18, and it is its minister, Mr. Sidney Handleman, who got all the contributions from the liquor companies.

[Mr. Jelinek.]

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

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You are out of order.

Mr. Alexander: I thought we were debating Bill C-83. The hon. member has been speaking now for three minutes and I sincerely hope he will get back to the bill as soon as possible because we always want to hear words of wisdom in this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) has the floor. I suggest he revert to the terms of Bill C-83.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can see that it hurts them because they are always great ones to repeat this garbage, which in itself has nothing to do with Bill C-83.

The hon. member read the document into the record and I thought we should remind him that it is indeed capitalism that has been responsible for all these kinds of ills which he has read out as being so called revolutionary.

The government has presented Bill C-83 for parliament's consideration and decision. This piece of legislation comes under the general heading of peace and security. When we start thinking about peace and security we tend to think of widening police authority, prohibiting certain acts or instruments, and toughening penalties.

Our children and, I suppose, we as adults get a lot of romantic ideas from American television programs such as police shows, where in every case we see the police making an arrest we see them warning the arrested person of his right to remain silent and if he should say anything it could be used later on in prosecuting him. We do not have that right in Canada. As a matter of fact I know that our police force has indeed very wide powers, much wider than in the country to the south of us. So if we get a romantic view from television and think that Canadians also have these rights which we see on U.S. television, then we should be informed that such is not the case.

Not so long ago I had occasion to write to the Attorney General of the province of Ontario about the case of a young man who was arrested in a hotel in Sudbury and taken to the local jail. What was his offence? He was suspected of smoking grass in the hotel. He demanded to make one phone call to his lawyer, which he thought he had the right to do, but the police promptly booted him to the jail and told him he had no such right and he would stay in jail until they should decide what they would do with him.

The widening of police powers is one of the things that concerns many people in this country. In the bill before us the government seems intent on impressing on the Canadian people that it is the last buffer of security against a rising tide of crime and violence. Therein lies my first criticism of Bill C-83. It includes six particular items, from entirely new legislation governing the ownership of long guns, to amending present legislation covering habitual offenders and dangerous sexual offenders, electronic surveillance, special crime inquiries and custody and release of inmates.

● (2100)

Of all the items in Bill C-83 gun control has attracted by far the greatest attention, and in some parts of the country more than others. In my riding of Nickel Belt, which is predominantly rural and working class, there is great concern about certain provisions, which concern has resulted in about 180 pieces of mail daily, plus a 6,000 signature petition. I understand the basic resentment of the people in my area against certain provisions of the bill. They see it basically as legislation aimed at large urban centres like Toronto, Montreal or Ottawa, where a firearm is not looked on in the same manner as in rural areas. Indeed many of the folk in my area say that this legislation is for those urban crazies who do not know about or have any respect for firearms and who want to shoot each other. They feel they are being put through this bureaucracy for the sake of protecting urban dwellers from each other.

In Nickel Belt most of the workers are employed in mines or smelters, and when work is finished, or on week ends, hunting and fishing are indispensable forms of relaxation. Many of the workers have hunt camps or cottages and spend time in the summer and fall hunting and fishing.

They are also concerned about the cost of any kind of licensing program. One constituent pointed out to me that he now pays $15 for a moose licence, $5 for a licence for hunting migratory birds, and $10 for a deer licence, and after those costs there is also the cost of a hunting licence. Now there is a proposed gun licence fee which is as yet undetermined. My constituents see this additional cost a further proof that eventually hunting will be reserved for the rich.

My constituents have also expressed concern about the engulfing red tape of bureaucracy. By nature, rural folk seem to be much more resentful about encroaching bureaucracy than urban folk, probably because they are much more self reliant. In particular, they are set against the proposal to have two guarantors testifying as to the character of a prospective gun owner.

Concern has been expressed about the provision of search and seizure without warrant. In particular, if no charge has been laid, the firearm owner ought to be able to claim his property unless the licensing action is in progress or some charge has been laid.

Another question raised by my constituents deals with reimbursement. If, during the initial three year licensing period, a person is not issued a licence to own a firearm and the registrar issues an order to take his property, will that person be reimbursed? That is very important to the people in my constituency. I have met with members of rod and gun clubs and other interested citizens and listened to their opinions, and expressed mine, in the hope that this legislation can be as effective as possible.

I support the principle of gun control. Indeed the bill does not go far enough with respect to tightening gun control. I have said this to rod and gun clubs and those interested in my constituency, and there are large numbers of them.

Mr. Darling: What did they say?

Mr. Rodriguez: They said they would turn me out.

Mr. Darling: Exactly.

Mr. Rodriguez: But I must always be fair and honest with the people I represent, and I cannot say things I think they want me to say so that I can win their votes. I seems to me that being here is a responsibility. I must look at the evidence and make the decision which is in the best interests of Canada as a whole rather than in my own narrow interest, or in the interest of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) of getting re-elected. I suppose we could all become very popular in this House if we were to be for capital punishment and against gun control, but that is not the purpose of being in rd slowing the escalating rate of deaths involving firearms in domestic and non-domestic situations, as well as in accidental deaths. I say that because I notice that in 1974, under the heading criminal acts, 68.4 per cent of firearms murders involved handguns, which are presently strictly controlled in Canada, so I do not think this legislation will control criminals, no matter how we control long gun owners. No matter how strictly we control them, firearms will still be used in the commission of criminal acts in society.

However, the area in which I think this legislation will make some difference is in the inter-familial relationship or with regard to the person who is mentally unbalanced, either long range or temporarily, the person who is a violent alcoholic or who has had a criminal record, who is out on probation or who is out on bail awaiting trial. I think these classes of people ought not to be permitted to have the responsibility of bearing a firearm, and that is where I see this legislation being effective. I have taken that position in my constituency. It is not a very popular position, but in conscience I could take no other. I reject the argument put forward by hon. members in this House, and also by people at large, that it is a right to have a firearm. I must confess that I know of no such right.

I think this matter has less to do with rights and more to do with maturity. It seems to me that it is a privilege to own a firearm, and it is certainly the responsibility of the state to determine who can legally bear firearms and under what conditions. The same attitude should prevail with regard to drivers' licences. It is not a right of a citizen to have a driver's licence, it is a responsibility, and I think too often in the past we have been stressing our rights more than we have been stressing our responsibilities. This is an area in which we have been far too lax in the past.

Mr. Epp: Hear, hear! I finally agree with you.

Mr. Rodriguez: At the moment there is nothing to prevent a person who has been treated as a serious mental patient, and who is possibly dangerous to himself or others around him, from going to the closest army surplus store and purchasing a firearm or, for that matter, to prevent someone who has been convicted of a violent crime from blithely walking down to his friendly Canadian Tire Store and picking out his favourite firearm. If he is not happy with that he could purchase a periodical which is called the Calgary *Gunrunner*. In it he could find anything from a bazooka to an M.2 rifle. Any serious hunter I know from Nickel Belt knows you do not take an M.2 semi automatic rifle or a bazooka into the bush to hunt, but you can buy it all, and it is listed there. If you are so interested, there is nothing like an auction, and the Natural Resources Depart-

ment of the province of Ontario sells rifles. There is nothing like an auction.

This is the kind of laissez-faire attitude in society which leads to a breakdown of a sense of responsibility, and somehow people are getting the idea that they have a right to own a firearm. Stores have no legal basis for refusing to sell firearms. I know that the Criminal Code places the onus on certain persons not to purchase firearms, but there is no onus on stores not to sell firearms to such people. At the moment there is no system whereby stores keep records of ammunition or firearms sold to individuals.

It was mentioned previously that there are approximately 10 million firearms now in the hands of Canadians. There is one firearm for every two Canadians, there is an annual increase of about 420,000 firearms, and no one knows where they are scattered. They are out there somewhere, and coupled with the fact there are no controls with respect to who sells and who buys, and no required competency test, the whole thing becomes a jungle which is quickly breaking down, and it will come down on our heads sooner or later. The time to take some action is now.

When there were such unfortunate and tragic incidents as those in Brampton and in Ottawa, my office received letters from southern Ontario and from everywhere else asking why we parliamentarians were not doing something about tightening up gun control. It seemed that everything died down three or four weeks after that. Now we are getting the other backlash that people do not want controls.

● (2110)

It is easy to see in respect of this kind of situation, this easy access to firearms, that we are playing Russian roulette, with innocent people at the end of the barrel. This concerns me as a parliamentarian and as someone who must look at this bill and make a decision on it. Unfortunately the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) are not in the House this evening. However, I want to say to them that the gun control section must be further tightened.

I, and many of my constituents, believe that the guarantor provision should be dropped because it will not be effective. This provision is not the same as that in respect of the guarantor of a passport. A guarantor of a passport is one who, for example, certifies that he has known the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) for two years and can state that the picture submitted is a reasonable facsimile of him. That is not the same as the provision in this bill. We are not asking for identification. We are asking the guarantor, under the provision in this bill, to make an assessment of the character of the applicant and to state whether or not he is a person of character who could be entrusted with a firearm. It seems to me that is entirely different.

Even in rural communities where everyone knows everyone else there would be a difficulty in getting someone to be a guarantor for a person to be permitted to obtain a licence. It seems to me that in an urban situation, such as Toronto, no one ever gets to know anyone else. Therefore I do not see how one could find two guarantors who would be prepared to say that one is a person of such a character that one should be permitted to be licenced.

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

For instance, the guarantor may be a school principal. This missed the whole point. Today the schools are very large composite schools. The principal never knows who the students are. It is the guidance cousellor who deals with the pupils. The principal is an administrator who, in an urban area, could never testify concerning the character of his students. It seems to me there is another arguments which we should keep in mind which I believe is valid in this connection. I refer to the argument that this will become an elitist thing. It seems to me that certain classes will be certifying certain other classes. The elitist class will be classified as the lawyer, the judge, the school principal, and so on.

An hon. Member: And a teacher.

Mr. Rodriguez: No; a school principal. It seems to me that this involves a certain class distinction. It provides, apart from that elitism, as I have said, no real safeguards. I and many of my constituents think that we should be moving to drop that provision in respect of a guarantor, and instead have the registrar of firearms as the official who would make the decision in every case on the basis of the facts so far as he is aware of them. For example, psychiatric hospitals which are treating dangerously mentally deficient persons and who are moving back and forth from the community to the hospital would pass this information on to the registrar. This information now is passed to the local police force but it could just as easily be passed to the registrar. He could also be furnished information concerning any persons who are out on parole, or who are out on bail, or who have been convicted of a crime in the past.

If these names were passed on to the registrar then, if such a person should apply for a licence, the registrar would institute a check and make a decision on the basis of the facts available to him. In addition I think it is very important that the competency test be included at this stage before any licence is issued. In other words, the person applying must conform not only to the requirement of not having a record which would prohibit his obtaining a licence but he should also provide a competency certificate, and on that basis he will or will not be given a licence. That competency certificate would indicate that he or she had successfully completed a course in gun handling. It seems to me that is a role gun clubs could play in teaching people the proper way to handle and the best way to care for and store a firearm.

I also believe that the registering of guns should be under the aegis of the government rather than contracted out to the private sector. This would avoid the all too prevalent pork-barreling which we see flourishing all too easily in this country these days. With regard to the licensing, I feel it ought not to exceed $5 for at least the first five year licensing period. At the end of the first five year period the situation could be reviewed. I feel also that in the matter of search and seizure of a firearm without warrant the citizen ought to get his firearm back unless a charge is laid under the Criminal Code, or unless for some reason his licence is being revoked.

In respect of the initial licensing period, if an individual cannot be licensed and the registrar causes his firearm to be confiscated then that person should be reimbursed for

his property. I would urge that the gun control section of Bill C-83 be amended along the lines I have noted.

However, there is a part of Bill C-83 which causes me great apprehension. I refer to the wiretapping provisions. During the minority parliament of 1972-74 parliament passed a bill which set up wiretap provisions. Now we have the spectacle of the government in a majority position wanting to put back into the wiretap legislation provisions which parliament had previously rejected. A speaker on the government side of the House argued that it is necessary to have electronic surveillance because that is how we could get at the top people—the dons of the mafiosi. I do not think he realizes that the top mafiosi today do not use the telephone. They are much smarter and wiser in that particular area. So I do not think any people of this type will be trapped in that way.

Mr. Nystrom: They use the Liberal committee rooms.

Mr. Rodriguez: Well, I have known them to be used for other things. This particular part of Bill C83 dealing with electronic surveillance to me is most regressive. It seems to me that the state has not made its case for additional powers under the wiretap legislation of Canada. Indeed it gives more arbitrary power to the police without a corresponding protection for the individual citizens' privacy.

I have no experience in this matter so I must believe what other persons with experience and some expertise have said. Ramsey Clark, former United States attorney general and one with considerable experience, made the following points about such surveillance:

a. wiretapping was not used between 1966 and 1969 yet indictments against members of organized crime tripled; he concluded that wiretapping is a wasteful and inefficient means of investigation and is not, moreover, effective against organized crime;

b. wiretapping destroys the professionalism of investigators; electronic surveillance encourages not investigation, but just sitting waiting for something to happen;

c. it is enormously expensive—for example, the use of laser beams which can pierce walls up to 12 feet thick;

d. such all-encompassing eavesdropping evades human dignity—e.g. the listening in on the sexual activities of Martin Luther King and the subsequent use of this information to smear King's reputation.

On the face of it it would seem to me that these amendments, with respect to electronic surveillance, give the police a licence to invade the privacy of any or all citizens without any authorization. Who will prosecute the police?

● (2120)

The present law at least provides defence counsel with an opportunity to determine whether unlawful surveillance did take place. The requirement for notification to be given to the person who has undergone electronic surveillance at least provides citizens with protection against an over-zealous police force. The government argues this requirement has seriously inhibited electronic surveillance, because notification alerts the potential offender before the investigation can be completed. The example the government gives is that "such investigations can be of a long-term nature and sometimes unproductive periods of some length occur where, for example, the subject is out of the country". The government should be required to provide statistics. How often has this happened? The proposed amendment increases the potential period of surveillance from 60 days to 120 days. But as the government itself argues, 60 days is usually enough.

In 1975, under section 178.12 of the Criminal Code, 555 authorizations were granted, and 449 renewals were approved. Apparently only two renewals were refused. Considering the track record, it is difficult to see why section 178.23(2b) does not provide the police with enough leeway to complete investigations. Coupled with proposed authorization periods, this proposal gives them a minimum surveillance period of 210 days. The government should tell us how many requests under section 178.23(2b) have been made and how many refused, and also how many convictions resulted from electronic surveillance.

According to the government another difficulty concerning notification requirement is this: it has inhibited the investigation of organized crime. Actually fault did not lie with the notification requirement; it lay with the types of offences for which authorizations can be granted. For instance, the present law dictates that authorization for interception may only be granted in respect of certain, specific indictable offences and any indictable offence involving organized crime. I call on the Minister of Justice to revoke that particular section as, potentially, it offers no greater security to Canadians than the present law does; on the contrary, it could undermine confidence in the state.

Let me say a word about crime inquiries as provided for in the bill. I do not disagree with this provision, but merely raise one point. I want to see the innocent protected. Sometimes, when inquiries are in high gear, the innocent are dragged in. Too often, in the mind of the public the innocent are judged as guilty merely because they are involved in the investigation. It seems to me that the minister should draft provisions to ensure that such inquiries do not become witch hunts but, rather, protect the integrity of the innocent.

Let me now say a word about the dangerous offender section. I suggest that, at the time of review of the indeterminate sentence by the National Parole Board, the board should be expanded with the addition of two persons who should come from the community into which the offender says he wants to be released. In relation to the section dealing with custody and release of inmates, there is nothing there that I disagree with, in principle.

In summary, I cannot support the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). He wants to send the subject matter of the bill to committee because he knows that by so doing he would kill the bill. I want the bill to go to committee, witnesses to appear and, hopefully, constructive amendments to be moved. Hence I support the bill in principle and will exercise my prerogative on third reading, when I shall see the bill after it has been through the committee stage, and after I have once again consulted concerned groups in my riding.

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of debate of second reading I wish to comment on areas of the bill which I hope will receive careful examination and possibly be amended in committee. This debate takes place at a time when people are concerned about the rise in crimes of violence and want protection. It is important to make sure that the measures we adopt are effective, realistic, and afford that protection. But it is also

important not to put in place measures so repressive as to be antithetical to rehabilitation.

Let me speak on wiretapping. I sympathize with the police viewpoint, with their contention that they need additional powers to deal with organized crime. From my own experience in corrections, I would say that the majority of people incarcerated are socially incompetent minor criminals, while the so-called "master criminal" often goes free. I do not wish to see the police restricted in their very necessary investigative work, especially if they are to reverse this trend. However, I am concerned about electronic surveillance, even when done with a judge's warrant. I think wiretapping represents an intrusion into people's lives which should be monitored very carefully. Representing, as I do, an ethnic riding where people are sometimes handicapped by lack of knowledge of English, where dissimilar names often seem similar by reason of unfamiliarity, and where mistakes in identity are made, I am concerned about the possible complications in the life of an innocent person which could result from a police file being built up about him or her.

The present requirement that people be notified after a certain period if police surveillance does not lead to a charge is, I think, a doubtful safeguard. I can understand the view of the police, that it limits their investigation of criminals and may in fact serve as a warning to a wide criminal network to go underground temporarily. But from the viewpoint of the innocent person I think such notification after the event can cause much anxiety and distress and will not necessarily result in corrective action, namely, the destruction of the file. I therefore suggest that either the regulations or an amendment to this bill—and I prefer the latter—should stipulate that in the event of an investigation not leading to a criminal charge after a certain period, all records of the wiretapping should be destroyed. There ought to be a verification procedure, to show that the records have been destroyed.

Let me now talk about the dangerous offender. Bill C-83 contains "dangerous offender" provisions to replace the "habitual criminal" and "dangerous sexual offender" categories. This is in line with the Ouimet committee recommendations of 1969, and with similar recommendations of the Canadian Mental Health Association committee on legislation and psychiatric disorders brought forward in the same year. The "dangerous sexual offender" category has been badly used. Sometimes the result has been excessively long imprisonment for people whose patterns of behaviour, although socially and morally objectionable, were not dangerous.

It is important not to confuse sexual behaviour with aggressive behaviour. Exhibitionists and other sexual nuisances are sometimes seen as being launched on a progressive route to rape; but figures obtained both in the United States and Canada show that convicted rapists are much more likely to have previous convictions for violent offences like assault or break and enter than for exhibitionism, voyeurism, and so on. It is important to protect the community from dangerous offenders, but that will not be done by locking up the socially and sexually incompetent.

[Miss Nicholson.]

● (2130)

Methods of prediction of dangerousness have been improved and refined considerably in recent years, but the definition of "serious personal injury" in this bill merits very careful examination if indeed it is to encompass the truly dangerous.

Turning to the Parole Act, I am pleased to see the proposal to add to the parole board representatives of the community to which an inmate is returning, in some cases. This first-hand knowledge of local conditions and feeling, and the supports or stresses the parolee will encounter should improve the decision making.

I have some concern however, about the parole board assuming responsibility for granting all absences from institutions. It is true that unwise decisions on unescorted absences have been made by some institutional staff, but there is no guarantee that the parole board will make better decisions.

In a well-run institution, correctional staff should consider it part of their professional responsibility to know prisoners as individuals, to know whatever potential an individual prisoner has for constructive, socially useful behaviour, and to support acceptable goals in positive ways. In this context arranging temporary absence for useful purposes can be an important rehabilitative tool.

If correctional staff are not using it wisely, they should be assisted to develop their judgment and prediction skills. However, to take away from them the decision making and, therefore, the responsibility to think about the factors that enter into decisions is to risk a static custodial program without much dynamism or interest in change.

I note that there is provision for the National Parole Board to delegate the authority to grant temporary absence without escort, and I hope this will be used where appropriate. Bill C-83 suggests that the decision to delegate will be made on the basis of some inmate criteria. The wording is "an inmate or class of inmate". It will undoubtedly be useful to develop criteria of this kind, but the competence and skills of staff enter into this too and they tend to vary from one institution to another, depending on the leadership and quality of staff development.

With regard to remission, I am pleased to see statutory remission abolished as I think it was meaningless and confusing. However, to ensure that earned remission really is earned, that it provides positive incentives for inmates to involve themselves in constructive work or study, it will be important to ensure that there is a clear and well developed evaluation system so that the remission is not credited in an automatic way.

If remission is earned and well earned, I think it should be forfeited only in very grave circumstances. I would, therefore, like to see an amendment to the proposal in the bill which provides for forfeiture for "any disciplinary offence". If staff and inmates know that remission, once earned, will be forfeited only for grave reason, which could be defined, there is more likelihood that the inmate will try to earn it and that staff will award it carefully.

This bill essentially deals with violent crime and the prevention of it. It is urgent that public confidence be restored since people have been disquieted by the rise of violent crime. With gun controls in place and with public

confidence restored by the passage of this bill as amended, I trust, it will then be important to direct our attention to the prevention of crime. I think one needs to look at this in four steps.

Obviously everything we do in the way of social legislation—housing, income maintenance, family law, education and child welfare—is prevention of crime in the broadest sense. It is no accident that the inhabitants of our training schools, reformatories, and eventually penitentiaries, overwhelmingly come from disadvantaged families.

The second layer of prevention of crime comes in adequate policing. Here I refer not only to the community officer who can do a great deal to defuse situations where the ordinary law-abiding citizen might find himself in difficulty and who does a great deal of preventive work with youth, but also the visible uniformed policemen whose presence has been shown to cut down on certain kinds of crime, notably break and entry.

Third, I hope that we will soon be debating some of the important recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, particularly on sentencing. We have too many ineffectual relatively minor offenders in jails who would be better in community programs, leaving the prisons for the dangerous offender who needs to be out of circulation for a certain time. Measures to keep the offender in the community also provide opportunities to encourage accountability. The offender who is obliged to make reparation and remains in the community to make reparation is perhaps faced each day with the realization of what he or she has done in a way that the inmate in a prison is not.

There are many of the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission for innovative sentencing which could be implemented under present legislation. One must hope that attitudes of judges will change so that there is more interest in sentencing in ways that benefit the community and that reserve prison sentences for those where it really is essential.

For those who do get to institutions, it is important that there be a spectrum of institutions, from the community residence or hostel type right through to maximum security. The provisions in this bill for provincial-federal agreements are, I hope, the beginning of an attempt to use the facilities more wisely and more constructively.

Very often in a province such as Ontario you have three, four or five layers of institutions being run under provincial auspices, and the same under federal auspices. More sensible combined use would make it easier to get an individualized program for a person at a particular stage of his or her existence, and allow maximum security to be used not only as a holding place, bus as a place in which a person could be assisted to acquire greater control and move gradually on to a program more suited to whatever improvement he or she was showing.

Finally, I am pleased to see in this bill one amendment to the Prisons and Reformatories Act. I hope it is the beginning of many because the Prisons and Reformatories Act is a very outdated piece of legislation which badly needs many other improvements.

• (2140)

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin my contribution by paying tribute to the hon. member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) who gave us a very lucid and well thought out presentation on the subject, giving credit where credit was due, but pointing out the weaknesses in the bill.

I have often thought as I surveyed this measure that it was sponsored by the wrong minister when it was sponsored by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Maybe it should have been sponsored by the Minister of Immigration, who is also responsible for Manpower (Mr. Andras); it coud have come under the job creation program since obviously it will require a great deal of manpower to administer.

I have in my hands a publication, dated March 9, which was sent to me and, I suppose, to all members, by the B.C. Wildlife Federation. In this document the executive of the federation says the Treasury Board has already approved 900 new positions just to start this program. Based on the fact that the government has just indicated there will be registrars or licence issuers established throughout Canada for the public's convenience, the federation estimates that the program will require in the order of between 10,000 and 15,000 new civil servants, meaning a bill in the area of between $200 and $300 million. To add a final touch to this picture, the government has already indicated that the licence holders will pay for the entire cost of the program. On the basis of the issuance of three million licences for gun-owners in Canada, the annual licence fee could conceivably be in the area of $100 a year. This is staggering in itself. It amazes me, though, that this bill should be called "peace and security legislation".

I realize, of course, that the people of Canada want security, but I am reminded of an old adage, "The people are asking for bread and are being given a stone." Everyone is in favour of peace; everyone is in favour of security. And the people who are hungry for it most will be those most disappointed by the legislation. If this legislation were intended to produce peace and security one would think it would focus on those who violate peace and security the most, and while the bill does give some credible attention to that aspect it is nevertheless true that the people who will be affected most are those who are already respectful of law and order. The part dealing with firearms affects hundred of thousands of people who already peace loving, while the sections dealing with criminals are in a very small minority.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we have had some discussion among party representatives and I think there is a general disposition in the House for you not to see the clock until ten o'clock, perhaps allowing the hon. member who has the floor to finish his speech. We could then proceed with the procedural question.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): We could do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member may complete his remarks.

Mr. Friesen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To support the point I am making I should like to quote an hon. member who is the chairman of the justice committee, the hon. member for Lafontaine-Rosemont (Mr. Lachance), who pointed out that only three paragraphs are directed to crime prevention while the rest are "an inefficient tool to fight crime". That is a member on the government side speaking, and he is the chairman of the committee. I certainly support the proposal put forward by my hon. friend from Calgary North that the bill be split up into separate parts.

I might draw it to the attention of the House that the section on the crime commission is already anachronistic since the decision of the Supreme Court validating the operation of the crime commission in Quebec. Thus it would appear that some of the legislation is already out of date. I might add that this Supreme Court decision accepting the point that we are in a field of provincial jurisdiction would indicate that much of the bill before us ought possibly be referred to the Supreme Court for a decision as to its constitutionality.

It would seem to be a cardinal principle to follow that if we want good legislation we ought to consider the people who are affected most by it, as well as those who are knowledgeable regarding the subject. It came as a great surprise to me that the Department of the Solicitor General, while it did contact members of the public at large, notably members of the B.C. Wildlife Federation, did so well into the program, at which point the department did not even know that already in British Columbia there is a licensing program in existence which makes training and competence mandatory. When the officials of the federation offered their counsel and help, the offer was apparently turned down. I guess by this time it can be taken for granted that the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) would turn down that kind of competent advice. This is why we so often find duplication in government services across Canada. The provinces already have a good program in operation and now the federal government wants to duplicate it.

It seems to me there are several important principles of law which ought to be followed in this legislation. The first is that the very existence of a law ought to act as a deterrent to wrongdoing. This is why speed limit signs are posted. It is not enough that the law be there; it has to be obvious, it has to be made evident so that the public knows where it's at. These gun control provisions are a deterrent only to those who already have a solid core of good will. For those who are bent on doing evil the existence of a law such as this will not be any deterrent at all. Therefore there has to be a deterrent in addition to the law, punishment for violating the law.

Second, the law, to operate properly, ought to encourage responsibility for behaviour. The hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) just pointed this out and I think she is entirely correct. One of the failures of our society is this: we have not taught people to accept responsibility for their behaviour. In most cases when young people are brought before the courts, the judge simply turns them over to their parents or to another agency, slaps their wrists and says, "If you are good in future, everything will be all right." There is no thought of restitution, or at least, not often enough. Our people are not growing up with a sense of the need to be accountable for their behaviour.

One of the functions of law ought to be to make us responsible for what we do but, sad to say, much of the bail practice, much of the parole system, focuses not on being responsible but on finding ways of getting out of having to be responsible. I hate to say it, but some of my good friends in this Chamber who are lawyers have focused not on getting justice for their clients but on helping their clients to get off. That leads to a total miscarriage of justice. The focus ought to be upon providing justice for society; and the law should make us responsible for our behaviour.

● (2150)

Third, the law ought to be enforced uniformly. There ought to be equity in the disposition of the law. The problem I find with Bill C-83 is that it will be impossible to enforce the bill uniformly. For example, I have in my riding a competitive marksman who travels across Canada to compete. He has in his arsenal of handguns seven very finely tooled pistols. Under this legislation he cannot even travel across Canada to compete any more because he would violate the law.

It is easy to say that he can do it under the Olympic regulations, Mr. Speaker, but the Olympic regulations allow only two classifications, and this gun owner is an expert in seven. That is point No. 1. The second point is that if he is going to travel across Canada to compete he has to carry spare parts with him. This might be another pin, a clip—anything he needs in case one of his handguns breaks down. Under this legislation he would have to have another licence to carry those extra parts. It is impossible under this legislation to be equitable to all people.

Another class affected by the legislation is the antique dealer. In my riding there is a collector who has a mobile museum of guns. People come and see his museum all the time, and he travels around with it to show people. What is this man to do under the legislation? Various suggestions have been made in the House about making these guns inoperative by doing a little welding on them or disfiguring them in some way. But as soon as he makes his guns inoperative, their value as antiques is diminished. These guns are, in a sense, his life savings, his investment.

As other hon. members in this House have said, the gun legislation before us tends to make law breakers out of honest citizens. The people who are law abiding will conform with it. Those who do not have this hard core of good will in them will violate the law without compunction. The law abiding citizen will be hassled and harassed; the other person will not.

Then there are the violent in society, those who believe in violence and who live by violence. I have watched them operate. I have been on the streets where they have operated. Violence is a way of life to them. They believe that the establishment is wrong, that the establishment is corrupt, that it is a case of being more upright and moral by trying to overthrow the establishment than by being part of the establishment. It almost becomes a point of righteousness to help destroy the establishment with this kind of perverted morality.

What are we going to do about these people, Mr. Speaker? Are we going to give those with a distorted sense of morality the opportunity to escape the full force of this legislation? Are we going to take away the rights of the large mass of people who are already law-abiding and not deal with the violent in our society? As I have said, it is impossible to have uniform enforcement of this legislation.

Let me give the House an example. If you do not store your weapons properly, Mr. Speaker, you can be liable for up to five years' imprisonment for careless storage. But a person who steals a weapon that has been carelessly stored could get away with only one year if he commits a crime with it. Usually a person does not steal a weapon if he does not plan to commit a crime. Where is the sense of justice with this kind of distortion? With all deference to the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), we are dealing here with an exchange package between Bill C-83 and Bill C-84, this package that was mailed to our offices. The government has openly said that we are dealing with an exchange between capital punishment and peace and security.

Under Bill C-84 the maximum penalty is 25 years, which means a convict can vegetate. At the same time a rapist could get a maximum of 20 years. Why should anyone who has just committed the crime of rape, and who is liable for a maximum of 20 years, run the risk of leaving a witness lying around, for an extra five years?

An hon. Member: He would be eligible for parole.

Mr. Friesen: Eligibility for parole is another controversial aspect in this legislation. My lawyer friend over on the other side has been getting people off on parole. The legislation also focuses on minimum penalties rather than maximum penalties. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has already introduced a bill providing for a maximum penalty of five years for crimes involving use of weapons or firearms, and this seems to me the approach that we should take. But the government has consistently been moving toward minimum sentences or as short sentences as possible in this legislation instead of maximum sentences. It seems to me that we should increase the minimum penalties and lower the maximum penalties, thus eliminating the vegetation that could occur when people are in prison for a long time, yet still retaining sufficient deterrent to fit the crime.

One final point—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being after 9.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, April, 1976, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question neccessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the bill now before the House.

The question is on the amendment. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made Thursday, April 8, the recorded division stands deferred until 4.30 o'clock tomorrow, to be followed also by a division on the main motion.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

LABOUR CONDITIONS—PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND FINANCE BRANCH EMPLOYEES AT WINNIPEG

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, to outline briefly the problems facing the Air Canada finance branch employees in Winnipeg, there is still a constant fear on the part of employees that Air Canada plans on transferring all the operations of the finance work to other groups of employees, or to contract out such work. The latter was already implemented, several weeks ago, with portions of the finance work historically performed by the Winnipeg employees being contracted out to C.A.E.

I will continue to protest this action taken by Air Canada in the strongest possible terms. There is no doubt in my mind that Air Canada has been taking steps over the last few years to wind up the finance branch in Winnipeg and move the whole operation to Montreal. It is my firm belief that Air Canada is introducing or has already introduced a decentralization program to remove the finance work from Winnipeg. The Liberals have moved enough government departments into the province of Quebec and it is time this was brought to a stop.

This problem in respect of the Air Canada finance branch has been in existence for the last two parliaments. I have been up on my feet about 30 times on this issue, and other opposition spokesmen have been up countless times. Just to give you an indication of what happened, way back on December 12, 1974, this is what the Liberal minister stated, as reported in the Winnipeg *Free-Press* of that date:

> Labour Minister John Munro agreed Wednesday to instruct his department to provide whatever assistance was necessary to try to resolve the differences between the government owned airline Air Canada and its finance department employees.
>
> The difficulties that have flared up anew between the management of Air Canada and its finance branch, located in Winnipeg, were aired in the Commons Wednesday. Opposition members outside the house pointed out that when the finance branch stops operating financial operations of the huge airline grind to a halt.

That was a year and a half ago and we are still going through the same operation all over again. When is this problem going to be resolved? The number of employees involved in Winnipeg is 700. If Air Canada is successful in making the move to Montreal this will be a tremendous loss to Manitoba, and it will certainly disrupt the lives of 700 families.

Adjournment Debate

Tonight I am calling on the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) to make Air Canada lay its cards on the table and come clean. Why is no progress being made with this lengthy labour dispute? What does Air Canada plan for the finance branch in Winnipeg? All we know is that there is a constant confrontation, but we do not know what Air Canada is up to.

Air Canada is using tactics similar to those used when the overhaul maintenance base was moved from Winnipeg to Montreal in 1969. I can recall at that time the President of Air Canada standing up on a step ladder in front of a hangar telling all the boys, "Oh, don't worry fellows, we are not moving the base out of here". While he was telling them that they were moving another department out and another group of men down to Montreal. They are going through exactly the same tactics again today.

Just to give you an idea of what this is costing Air Canada and the Canadian public, I have here a report from London, England, on the Air Canada operation at the Heathrow Airport. This points out that three business firms are slowly going bankrupt because Air Canada cannot pay its bills due to constant labour trouble at the finance branch in Winnipeg. It states:

> Seagram's (liquor supplies). Despite relatively small invoices of a few hundred pounds each for December and January, they advise by letter that account failure to receive payment after two followups, the account was being turned over to their legal department, and henceforth, all orders would be on a "Cash on Delivery" basis. We have been doing business with this firm here for over twenty years.

The manner in which Air Canada treats its employees is bad enough, but here are further problems at Heathrow. They state in this interdepartmental document:

> From previous experience, we believe these three examples may well be just the tip of the iceberg. Several times a year we have been traced and on one occasion threatened with legal action by our Grosvenor Hill landlord for non-receipt of quarterly rental payment (approximately £14,000). Last year the manager, Disbursements, was provided with copies of 20 representative letters from suppliers all relating to their need to have invoices paid within ten days or "cash on delivery". Cash flow is a very real problem in the U.K. firms today.

Is that not a ridiculous situation for Canada's national airline? Everyone wants cash on delivery now. The document goes on to state:

> Messrs. Britton and Shackell from Finance, Winnipeg, subsequently visited London in March 1975 and met with all concerned re the problem, and it was thought at that time they had recognized the need to improve the capability of London to handle payment of accounts locally . . .

The document states:

> I understand from the accounts office supervisor that we cannot expect any positive action for the next 12 to 18 months as he has been informed that the delay is due to a backlog of programming time in the C & SS branch.

What a ridiculous situation! This has been going on for over three years, and now they tell us that even in 18 months they will not be able to correct it. The document goes on to state:

> Meanwhile, as you will appreciate, various London staff are having to spend a good many hours of non-productive time in trying to expediate payment and placate suppliers.
>
> Public relations-wise our image can only be poor and we are now facing distinct possibility of having essential services/supplies withdrawn.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

This is probably happening to All Air Canada operations around the world. If it is happening at Heathrow it has to be happening elsewhere. Also, as I pointed out last Friday, gas will be cut off at the Heathrow flight kitchen of Air Canada and there are threats that electricity will be cut off due to the ridiculous problems at the finance branch in Winnipeg. Also this internal document says:

> The attached memo presents a rather succinct picture of a continuing and rather perplexing problem regarding the payment of accounts in Great Britain. We have gone another year "down the pike" and yet the problem has not been satisfactorily resolved since it surfaced about three years ago.
>
> Notwithstanding the lack of resolution of the union contract in Winnipeg, and the switch-over problem to the Univac computer, there is a need to quickly put in place a system which will facilitate account payment in Great Britain and yet provide the necessary financial control over disbursements.

So you can see how important it is that the problems be solved immediately at the finance branch in Winnipeg.

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

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the hon. member for once again having secured documentation which is internal to the department.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have it too.

Mr. Blais: However, it never ceases to amaze me how fuzzy the hon. member's thinking can be, for in effect what we have noticed here is the tying in of the unexplainable inability to pay one account of a gas bill at Heathrow to the transferring of Air Canada facilities from Manitoba to Quebec. The hon. member also stated that the finance department in Winnipeg will be transferred to Montreal, and at the same time he asked whether Air Canada would not make a statement on what it intends to do with that Winnipeg finance department. On the other hand the hon. member says that we must stop the movement of government departments from Winnipeg to the province of Quebec.

● (2210)

He cites as an example some dreamed up threat that some department of Air Canada—finance—might be moved over into Montreal. That is unsubstantiated. And all that, we finally discover, is somewhat tied into a labour dispute. The relationship between Heathrow and the movement of government departments from Winnipeg to Montreal and the tying in of the whole thing into a labour dispute to my mind indicates the fuzziness of the thinking of the hon. member.

With reference to the labour dispute which preoccupies the hon. member, and undoubtedly all hon. members, not only from the Winnipeg area but all hon. members who are interested in peaceful labour relations, I might indicate that the Department of Labour has provided the parties with full conciliation assistance under the Canada Labour Code in efforts to assist them in resolving their collective bargaining dispute.

A Winnipeg lawyer, Mr. Duncan Jessiman, acted as conciliation commissioner in efforts to settle the dispute. While to this date he has been unable to arrange a settlement, he made a report containing findings and recommendations for settlement of the key issues in dispute. However, his report was not acceptable to the parties, and the union membership commenced legal rotating strikes in December of 1975.

I suggest to the hon. member that he should make a declaration as to whether he would like to remove the right to strike from those parties who are engaged in the strike as a result of a collective negotiation which evidently has reached an impasse.

Mr. McKenzie: A very fuzzy answer.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—ROLE OF OFFICIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT IN GRANTING LEASE

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, last week as reported at page 12609 of *Hansard*, in attempting to elicit more information concerning the background of the extension of the Sky Shops lease I asked a former minister of transport, now the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson), to indicate briefly what role members of his senior staff played in this matter, whether these roles were carried out with his knowledge and authorization, and what action, if any, he had taken to ensure that the RCMP had access to all relevant information with regard to these activities.

The minister indicated that he was informed informally concerning an exchange of correspondence between the executive assistant to the then minister of regional economic expansion and his own executive assistant. If I understood him correctly, he also indicated that he really did not have much knowledge of what disposition was made by the RCMP of the correspondence to which he gave them access.

The whole question of how the government deals with the awarding of leases and concessions is obviously of great concern. There is no reason why Sky Shops should be regarded as a unique, or even a rare example. Let us consider, for example, all this company did or had done for it in the period 1970 to 1972. This is a most curious affair. One should remember that while the present Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was in the transport portfolio, Sky Shops was very active in lobbying.

In the winter of 1970 its campaign began. It deliberately sought to have its lease extended upon terms which dispensed with competitive tenders, something which by definition was, and I believe still is, against stated government policy. Departmental officials in the Department of Transport were contacted. The principal secretary to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), Mr. Lalonde, as he then was, was approached by Mr. Lapointe, who was a chief executive officer of Sky Shops and who had been allotted $10,000 to advance the interests of this company.

A former minister of transport, the Hon. Lionel Chevrier, was retained to press the company cause, and we have now learned that executive assistants may have been corresponding without the approval, or perhaps even the knowledge, of their respective ministers with regard to a Sky Shops lease extension.

So I hope this evening—and I appreciate very much his coming here—that the minister can further explain the increasingly complex background of this matter. Perhaps the minister can say how these events, and the correspondence in particular, happened without his knowledge. I am not disputing that he did not know anything about it, but I should like to know more details in retrospect about how this could have occurred. It is not as if others in Ottawa or his own department were not aware of the pressure to change his department's policy on tendering. Is it not logical or likely that at some point in time the minister must have signed some documents recommending to his colleagues on the Treasury Board that the Sky Shops lease be extended on its terms?

For approximately two years personnel in the Department of Transport were lobbied extensively. Can we not assume, as logical members of parliament, that the minister of transport as he then was must have become very curious about the RCMP's interest in his files as they related to Sky Shops? Tonight I hope the minister can shed a little more light on the background of the correspondence and why, in the normal course of events, an ex assistant from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion would be concerned about an airport duty free store lease and why the minister was not informed.

Over five months ago, on November 3, 1975, I asked the new Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) to stay the renewal of the Sky Shops lease, which was not to take effect until the following month, until he was fully satisfied that the renewal was properly obtained. This was not done. Also on the same day I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) in concert with his colleague in Transport to investigate thoroughly the circumstances of the Sky Shops leases at both Mirabel and Dorval. To this point in time we still have no assurance that parliament has all the answers to why the leases were renewed and granted on the terms which prevailed.

Therefore I ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the former minister of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion and Transport, to join with me and support the calling of a judicial inquiry into the entire background of the Sky Shops lease extension, and tendering procedures at Mirabel for concessions there. Until such time as our committee procedures are modified so that more effective investigation can be done there, a judicial inquiry is the only way to learn what has to be done to improve the ways in which tendering procedures, or the lack of them, are administered in cases such as this.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I was advised late this afternoon of the intentions of the hon. member, but of course I had no way to know until three or four moments ago what kind of a statement he wished to make this evening. He has made a number of comments. I am not in a position to test the veracity of them. They involve various people who were engaged in the matter, and things of that sort. I am sure he would not expect me in the three minutes I have to try to deal with them, or indeed either to accept or refute them. I repeat that I have heard some of the comments only in the last few moments.

Adjournment Debate

The late show tonight is based on the questions the hon. member asked me on Thursday. It is to those that I am prepared to address myself. Specifically he asked in the first instance, I think, about the reason I was not curious as to why the RCMP would have asked me in the first place if I would object to any search of my correspondence or a look at my files from my Transport days. The answer is that when they came to see me they told me it was in connection with the Sky Shops affair. I said, "Fine", and I gave them the authorization. I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree it was entirely appropriate for me to do so. I do not know from any questioning or inquiries what the resolution of that might be. That is the situation which exists at this moment. I have not since that time been questioned or checked by the RCMP or by anyone else. Nor have I sought any sort of information as to what the results were.

The hon. member knows very well of course how I learned informally of the existence of certain correspondence between my executive assistant and the executive assistant to the then the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I do not think he will object to my saying he was among those who advised me of its existence. It was only in that way that I became aware of it; that is, by statements by him and other people who I assume in the very nature of things found out this was the case. I do not know specifically what the contents of those letters or correspondence were. I have not seen them.

On the final point having to do with—I am trying to paraphrase the hon. member's question—whether or not I would have been advised of this kind of correspondence, I think he must be aware that in the normal course there are many occasions on which members of cabinet, officials, and various others, including I might say members of this House, write letters of inquiry on behalf of various people. I regard all this as being entirely legitimate and appropriate, but I think that anyone who suggests that a minister or, for that matter, a member of parliament is aware of every piece of correspondence seeking information is being unreasonable.

● (2220)

In all fairness, a great many such inquiries are made, but to the best of my knowledge and recollection there was never any awareness on my part that any such inquiry was made. Also, until such time as I see the correspondence, or it is made public, it would be unfair to suggest that any member of my staff, or anyone else, would engage in any impropriety, or anything like it.

I realize again that once one of these issues is raised it creates real problems in terms of obtaining rational and reasonable views. In this case I am aware that the gentleman in question has suffered unfairly moments of anxiety as a result of this. My only comment is that I hope the matter is cleared up as quickly as possible. I can only repeat what I said in the beginning, and answer as I did on Thursday: that is the full extent of my awareness of the matter which the hon. member has raised.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CANADIAN POSITION ON INVOLVEMENT OF CUBA IN AFRICA

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) certain questions about his Cuba visit. I asked specifically if he had registered any further protest about Cuban involvement in military operations in Africa. In my question, as reported at page 12051 of *Hansard*, I attributed to the Prime Minister the statement that "Premier Fidele Castro was sending troops to Africa with a great deal of thought and feeling." I went on to say that I would be interested in any new information concerning the Cuban involvement and, if such information was available, in knowing the current position of the administration with respect to this unhappy situation. The Prime Minister was in a real flap. He answered:

> I must point out that the hon. member has grossly and inaccurately misquoted me.

I then said:

> If I am grossly and inaccurately misquoting the Prime Minister so did the *Globe and Mail* this morning.

I then followed my remark with a supplementary question. I wanted to know if there had been any official protest concerning this war involvement on the part of Cuba and, if so, what was the form of the protest. The Prime Minister answered as follows:

> I am informed that the misquote in the *Globe and Mail* was a quote from some American paper, so the hon. member is twice removed from the truth by two very big barriers.

He went on to say that, oh, yes, he had protested. Another minister had protested the involvement. He ended by saying, "We are opposed to that kind of intervention".

I suggest that the government adheres to a double standard. Today the Prime Minister, supported by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), had no hesitation in refusing financial assistance to a certain athletic event which is to take place in Canada, because it is understood that South Africans may attend that event and the government takes exception to the present status of segregation within that country. I do not disagree with that position; I simply ask why, if you do not agree with the internal activities of another country, do you involve yourself with Cuba? Why is there this double standard ? Why is there this involvement in the case of Cuba but not in the case of South Africa?

A few months ago the Prime Minister shunned a ploughing match near my riding in Ontario. His stated reason for shunning it was that two old Rhodesians happened to turn up and proposed to participate. He said that in no way would he give that ploughing match his blessing by appearing at the function.

The Prime Minister claims I misquoted him on March 23. Well, the remark I attributed to him, to which he referred, was carried in the New York *Times*. The New York *Times* reported the Prime Minister as saying that:

> ... Fidel Castro is a man of world statute, one 'very well informed about Africa,' who sent 10,000 Cuban soldiers to fight in Angola's civil war only after 'a great deal of thought and feeling for the situation.'

Mr. Rodriguez: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: I notice it has the blessing of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). I can well under-

stand the Prime Minister having a lot in common with that hon. member, knowing their backgrounds. Not only did the New York *Times* attribute that quote, but the Prime Minister stated in this House in answer to a question from the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and I quote:

In so far as Premier Castro's views, he made them known to me. I have the feeling that he has a good knowledge of Africa and a good feeling for the realities there.

Right in this House he said virtually the same thing I attributed to him in the question to which he has since taken such exception.

Some time ago I pointed out to the House, in the form of a question to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), that we were giving extensive aid to Cuba through CIDA and the Export Development Corporation. Something over $100 million has been extended. The point that the President of the Privy Council and the Prime Minister have managed to sidestep is that Canada has no obligation to assist a country that is capable of sending troops, take your pick, anywhere from 6,000 to 12,000 according to reports, to fight in civil wars thousands of miles from its shores. Not only have they chosen to go into Angola, but the troops are now remaining in Angola and are active in seven other African countries which presumably have aggressive desires within the continent of Africa. Not only is this so, but when the government suggests it does not want to allow internal considerations in these countries to change its aid programs, it is contradicting itself.

About two years ago when the President of the Privy Council was Secretary of State for External Affairs he had no hesitation in cutting off government aid to India because the government felt that country had gone against Canada's wishes and detonated a nuclear device built with plutonium from a Canadian nuclear reactor. I am not disagreeing with this position, but what I find most remarkable is that the Prime Minister has embarrassed us with many of our allies around the world, including Venezuela. If I had more time I would read the quotes coming out of Caracas concerning the visit of the Prime Minister to Cuba.

The Prime Minister has embarrassed us as far as our world position is concerned, stating that he has a kind of token opposition to the Cuban involvement in Africa, but judging from his reply of March 23, in no way is he prepared to state to this House what official protests he has made.

Has he indicated we will withdraw our economic assistance to that country if it does not cease and desist from its aggressive tendencies, not only by sending troops to Africa but also making a contribution to South American countries, one at least bordering Venezuela from where we import a very large amount of our oil? The House deserves a better explanation than what it has had up to the present time.

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, of course Canada's foreign affairs policy is not and could not be based on news reports in the *Globe and Mail* and the New York *Times* which seem to be the sources of information on the subject on which the hon. member opposite just spoke. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated the opposite very clearly in this House on March 23. He concluded his statement by reaffirming without any ambiguity, and I quote:

We are opposed to that kind of intervention.

The hon. member gave a strange example of stopping aid to India after the nuclear explosion in May 1974, and the case of apartheid in South Africa. These are two cases where international bodies—in one case the International Atomic Energy through the NPT and other multilateral agreements, and in the other case the General Assembly of the United Nations—have adopted clear resolutions voted upon by the world, to which of course we adhere. Consequently we took the course of action which is the wish and the will of the Canadian people represented by the Prime Minister and the various actions taken by our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen).

● (2230)

The case of the conduct of Cuba and its involvement in Angola has been repeatedly exposed to the House and to the public through the statement made in the United Nations General Assembly last fall by our Canadian representative in the Fourth Committee. It was then later repeated in the minister's release dated January 20, 1976, and again in his press statement of February 18 when he announced Canada's recognition of the People's Republic of Angola. He reaffirmed our opposition to the continued presence of foreign troops.

With regard to an official protest to Cuba, the Prime Minister, as the hon. member is aware, has spoken directly to Premier Castro on this subject. This is repeated each time a Canadian minister has occasion to meet his Cuban counterpart and to my knowledge the most recent instance was the meeting between our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) and his Cuban counterpart. I think this is a very clear case in which the Prime Minister of Canada is representing the wishes of Canadians, as usual, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 13, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH PENALTIES FOR FRAUD EQUIVALENT TO GRAVITY OF OFFENSE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with a matter of pressing and urgent necessity.

Considering that an individual who committed a $750,000 fraud got only a one day sentence before the Quebec courts, while another individual got 8 years imprisonment for a $2,000 fraud about a week ago; considering that the big swindler is a rich businessman while the small one is only an ordinary citizen; and considering that those decisions show that citizens are not all equal before the law, the rich people being favoured, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard):

That this House instruct the Minister of Justice to table before the House a bill aimed at establishing a specific schedule of penalties in the case of fraud, so that the sentence would be directly related to the gravity of the fraud, to see that judges impose penalties which are not based on the thickness of the swindler's wallet but on the gravity of the fraud.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSAL TO STOP CONSIDERATION OF THE PURCHASE OF BRAZILIAN ARMOURED CARS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to deal with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under the provision of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that reports have indicated that the Canadian government has narrowed its search for a new armoured car for our armed forces to two countries, they being Brazil and Switzerland, and in view of the fact that the Department of National Defence is reported to have issued a report to Treasury Board recommending the Swiss Piranha model over the Brazilian Urutu, but that this recommendation was blocked by people in the Latin American Division of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and in view of the fact that the decision to purchase the Brazilian model would not only encourage a vicious military dictatorship in Brazil but would cost Canadian workers jobs since the Swiss model would be built in Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

● (1410)

That the Canadian government through its departments stop any consideration or negotiations now going on concerning the purchase of Brazilian armoured cars.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the presentation of this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

SUGGESTED CONSULTATION BEFORE ESTABLISHMENT OF WORK CAMP AT APPLE RIVER, NOVA SCOTIA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move under Standing Order 43 a motion of urgent and pressing necessity, namely:

That the decision taken to establish a permanent type work camp on the property of Scott Maritimes Pulp Limited at Apple River in Cumberland county, Nova Scotia, be rescinded and that the Canadian penitentiary Service immediately undertake further consultation with the citizens of Apple River, Advocate and area and only move forward with the establishment of the camp if they have the consent of the citizens.

Mr. Speaker: This motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Northern Affairs

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT OF DECISION ON PERMITS TO DRILL IN BEAUFORT SEA PENDING COMMITTEE STUDY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to Standing Order 43. It has just been announced that the government will make a final decision on offshore drilling in the Beaufort Sea on Thursday, April 22, at a time when the House is recessed. This parliament has been given no chance to examine this proposal to date and we are now faced with the sleazy and arrogant intention to announce a government decision when the House is in recess and members of parliament have no opportunity to respond in this House, which is both their right and duty to the people of Canada. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House condemns the government's action of announcing its decision on offshore drilling in the Beaufort Sea while the House is in recess, and demands that the decision be postponed until the matter is referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Speaker: The motion cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR RESTRICTION ON IMPORTATION OF BROILERS TO PROTECT PRODUCERS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with an important and urgent matter.

On December 11, 1975, I put on the order paper questions concerning the imports of broilers and poultry. After over four months, I am still waiting for a reply. Yet, bulletin No. 14 on poultry markets dated April 9, 1976, published by Agriculture Canada, market production division, advises us that in the first quarter of 1976 alone, poultry imports amounted to 6,786,392 pounds, exactly three times the imports in the corresponding period in 1975. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

That this important matter be immediately referred to the Standing Committee on Industry, Trade and Commerce, with a view to limiting the massive import quotas of poultry or broilers which decidedly threaten the economic survival of thousands of poultry producers as well as Agriculture Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ROLE OF MINISTERS AND OFFICIALS IN GRANTING CONCESSIONS

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Can the right hon. gentleman now inform the House of the details of his rather lengthy meeting with Commissioner Nadon and other members of the RCMP yesterday afternoon regarding the Sky Shops affair and, in particular, the conduct of any ministerial aides or other persons involved in negotiations or representations regarding Sky Shops interests?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as a result of request made by the opposition, I had a meeting yesterday with the commissioner of the RCMP. I want to make it clear to the House that I am only reporting on this meeting in so far as it might have had any bearing on anything concerning members of my government, in other words, ministers. So far as other people might be concerned, I shall not entertain questions on that. I think the House will understand the RCMP conducted investigations. They have turned over their files to the provincial attorney general. If charges are to issue, they will come from that source. I think this indicates the wisdom of the practice of the government, and of the Solicitor General in the past, of refusing to give any details of investigations which might be initiated or which might be in course. This is obviously needed as a protection to innocent people.

This having been said, I want to say that the RCMP report to the provincial attorney general does not recommend that charges be laid against any member of the government. Any further information, I repeat, will have to wait the laying of charges, if any are to be laid, against whom and in what circumstances.

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—POSSIBILITY OF COMPLEMENTARY INQUIRY—BY WHOM REQUESTED

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for his answer. In view of statements made by a senior Quebec Justice Department official with regard to the implementation of a so-called complementary inquiry from the RCMP into the Sky Shops affair, did Commissioner Nadon or anyone else inform the Prime Minister of the details of such an investigation supposedly requested of the RCMP? If so, can he inform the House as to the purpose, nature and terms of reference of such an inquiry and who requested an inquiry of this nature?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as of yesterday afternoon when I met the Commissioner, there had been no notice or knowledge of any such

inquiry. Today is the first time I have heard of it. I heard of it about an hour ago. I am not aware of what is referred to in that news report. I do know there will likely be a pre-inquiry, a pré-enquête, which is general procedure before laying charges. However, I have no understanding of what is alleged by the hon. member. I have no knowledge of it.

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—POSSIBILITY PEARSON GUIDELINES VIOLATED BY MINISTERIAL AIDES

Mr. Elmer Mr. MacKay (Central Nova): Without giving details, is the Prime Minister satisfied as a result of his meeting yesterday that the guidelines promulgated by Mr. Pearson with regard to ministerial aides have not been violated? If he is not satisfied, what action will he be taking or what instructions will he be giving?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think I made it quite clear in my answer that I was reporting on ministerial conduct. I am pleased to say that what I told the House last week as a result of speaking to the ministers has been confirmed by the RCMP and they are not recommending that any charges be laid against any minister. In so far as other people are concerned, I want to repeat what I said earlier. I think the House can understand that citizens in this country are presumed innocent until found guilty. I do not see why the opposition or any other member of the public would want to know who is being investigated, why and what the results might be.

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond by asking a question about what the right hon. gentleman has raised. I remind him that on page two of Prime Minister Pearson's letter—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a final supplementary he should put the question.

Mr. MacKay: Is the Prime Minister in agreement with the short excerpt I propose to put to him from the guidelines of the late Prime Minister Pearson. On page two of his famous letter of November 30, 1964, he said and I quote:

> There are several things that should be stressed. The central one is that a Minister's staff must be subject to exactly the same high code of conduct that is recognized for Ministers themselves.

My question is simply this. Does the right hon. Prime Minister still adhere to this statement of philosophy and guideline set out by his famous predecessor?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I gave this answer yesterday or at the end of last week. The answer was yes, I do agree with that. However, the hon. member should reflect that perhaps there should be guidelines for members of the public or of the opposition wanting to find out about investigations into people by police and the damage that this can cause.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (1420)

An hon. Member: Another red herring!

Mr. Trudeau: I hope there will be some respect shown for the reputations of innocent people by the other side of the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

UNEMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO REDUCE

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A question for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that we are now running at the worst sustained rate of unemployment since the recession of 1961—there has been a paltry drop of .1 per cent compared with last month—a rate which, with the sole exception of the United States, has in the last year run consistently ahead of every other major western country in the world, is the government at long last planning to reduce this 700,000 figure of unemployment which is so harmful both in human terms and to the economy?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I quite agree with the hon. member that unemployment takes a very heavy toll both of individuals and of firms in Canada. It was for that reason, for the purpose both of reducing the rate of inflation and fighting any increase in the rate of unemployment, that the government brought forward a set of mandatory controls. We had hoped, in bringing this program forward, that we would have had the support of the hon. gentleman. So far, it has been withheld.

Mr. Broadbent: We did not support it, precisely because we said it would lead to sustained high rates of unemployment. Given the fact that unemployment in the Atlantic provinces continues to run at a rate higher than the rest of the country—it was up again last month in terms of the national average—has the government any particular plans for people in that part of the country who remain so unfairly treated in terms of employment opportunities?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It seems to me that the gentleman has just contradicted himself. He has referred to the fact that the period of unemployment pre-existed the controls and he said he opposed them because they would have created unemployment. He cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Broadbent: That answer is even more stupid than usual from the minister. Would he now deal with the fact that among those unemployed, women show a disproportionate rate of increase running some 20 per cent ahead of men while the rate of unemployed young people is about 100 per cent above the national average? Would the minister kindly remove the smirk from his face and tell the House what he plans to do about those two groups of unemployed?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I notice that when the hon. member becomes most abusive and shouts loudest he is on the weakest ground of all.

[*Translation*]

PROPOSAL THAT UNEMPLOYED BE USED ON PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, who has just replied virulently to the leader of the New Democratic Party concerning unemployed Canadians.

Is the minister not considering or is he not tempted to consider hiring the unemployed who are available for work and, instead of giving them unemployment insurance benefits, paying them more for the work they could do in various fields, like building the roads we need in Canada, and the public buildings which are not built because of the government's restrictions? Would it not be to the advantage of the government, the department and Canada to hire these unemployed and pay them decent wages, and thus at the same time develop the country and avoid heavy expenditures like unemployment insurance in Canada?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall point out to the hon. member that in Quebec, for instance, there were 25,000 fewer unemployed last month. Regarding supplementary expenditures for building, I must say that we have found that the government must control its expenses. That means we cannot spend more money for special programs, as my colleague the President of the Treasury Board has announced. For these reasons, we expect a resumption of economic activity in Canada this spring and summer, and significant reductions of the unemployment rate.

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The minister tells us that he must control public spending in Canada. I agree with him on this point. However, we cannot anticipate the number of people who will be unemployed next month or next week. Thus the government does not control anything at all. So my question is the following: if we cannot control the increase in the rate of unemployment—and when the minister says there were 25,000 fewer unemployed in the province of Quebec, I do not think of Quebec alone, but of Canada as a whole, and in the whole of Canada unemployment is on the rise—then I ask the minister this question: rather than not being able to control these spendings, let us pay those who are actually unemployed, that is, why does not the government consider the possibility of hiring them and paying them normal wages, which would allow to have something done, while nothing is being done right now and yet money is spent on the unemployed just the same?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council of Canada has suggested such a plan. It would consist in revising the unemployment insurance program in such a way as to prevent unemployment from going up in Canada. We are considering this suggestion and my colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, will inform the House of the proposed amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM THE SOCIALIST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before beginning another round of questioning I know hon. members on both sides of the House would want to join with me in welcoming in our gallery the presence of the very distinguished delegation from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, led by their most distinguished vice-president, General Peko Dapcevic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MARIN REPORT AND MEASURES TO IMPROVE MORALE

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and is based on the recent press release of the RCMP staff relations committee which states that the Solicitor General has lost credibility. In view of the fact that the minister has yet to make any statement respecting his willingness or otherwise to implement any of the recommendations of the Marin report or that any tangible steps will be taken to improve his rapport with the force, when will the Solicitor General take such steps to demonstrate to the RCMP that he is a credible leader and what steps is the government intending to take to improve morale in the force generally?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I reject, of course, the statements made by the staff relations group or the division representatives. With respect to implementation of the Marin report, I was in Regina last week to discuss this matter with them and they asked me for a delay because they said they were not ready to discuss it.

● (1430)

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—POSSIBILITY OF IMPROPRIETIES BY MINISTERIAL AIDES WHICH MIGHT LEAD TO DISMISSAL

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, since matters such as the Sky Shops affair have a direct bearing on morale in the force, and assuming the minister listened to the reply of the Prime Minister to the question asked by my colleague, the hon. member for Central Nova, could the Solicitor General inform us in connection with the reports of the RCMP that were obviously disclosed to the Prime Minister, whether any improprieties existed on the part of ministerial aides, and I am not asking for names? Did any improprieties exist that were something short of an illegality which would not give rise to the laying of charges, but falling within the guidelines of the late Prime Minister Pearson as being conduct reprehensive enough to warrant these ministerial aides being dismissed?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, when I met with the RCMP commanding officers and the division representatives they mentioned several things

that were of interest to them, but Sky Shops was not one of them. Nor was there any mention of the other matters for investigation raised by hon. members opposite. In respect of the second part of the hon. member's question, the RCMP did not mention that there was any conduct or document relating to a minister or ministerial aid that they found to be illegal or in any way improper.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

PERSON RECOMMENDING MISS CARRIÈRE FOR APPOINTMENT TO IMMIGRATION APPEAL BOARD—POSSIBILITY OF REAPPOINTMENT

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the revelations concerning the role played by Miss Carmel Carrière, who was once the executive assistant to the Minister of the Environment, in the extension of the Sky Shops lease, and her subsequent appointment to a $27,000 a year job with the Immigration Appeal Board on the recommendation of at least one minister, can the Prime Minister now inform the House on whose recommendation Miss Carrière was appointed and whether she will be reappointed to that position in view of the fact that her present term expires on May 10 of this year?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, without in any way admitting what was put as the preamble to the question, this position with the Immigration Appeal Board would have been on the recommendation, I imagine, of the then minister responsible for immigration, and it would have been authorized by order in council of the government.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not think it appropriate then to postpone such reappointment of Miss Carrière until her status has been fully clarified, so that the reappointment will be made only after there has been a full inquiry and that status has been clarified once again?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, in so far as the reappointment is concerned, I believe this particular one will be coming up in a month or two and I will bear in mind the representation of the hon. member.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POSSIBILITY OF PRE-INQUIRY INTO SKY SHOPS AFFAIR—REQUEST THAT RESULTS BE MADE PUBLIC

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister alluded to the fact that a senior official of the Quebec Department of Justice had indicated that the possibility of a pre-inquiry into the Sky Shops affair is probable—that was the official, not the Prime Minister. Has the minister had any discussions with his counterpart in Quebec about the merits of such an inquiry?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, since it is my understanding that a pre-inquiry could in fact be held in camera with the results transmitted only to the department, will the minister undertake to discuss this method of proceeding with his counterpart in order that we can be sure the results of such an inquiry are public, because surely a private result would be unacceptable?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, whether there is a pre-inquiry or not is, as far as I am concerned, the suggestion in a newspaper report. That is the only information I have seen. However, I also think it would be improper for me to endeavour in some way to direct the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice of the province of Quebec on how to administer justice within that province and within its very clear jurisdiction.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—REASON MR. JAMIESON DID NOT SEEK CLARIFICATION OF REQUEST TO SEE FILES

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Since the minister last night confirmed his lack of curiosity when the RCMP asked for his files on the Sky Shops matter, I wonder whether he could explain why he made no attempt to get some clarification for this rather unusual request either from the RCMP, other ministers or someone on his staff, in particular his executive assistant?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, precisely for the reason that if I did make any attempt to do so hon. members opposite, at least some of them, would have accused me of trying to interfere with the process of investigation.

An hon. Member: Oh, never.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the same minister. In view of the minister's admission last night on the adjournment debate, brought on by the hon. member for Central Nova, that there were many matters raised at that time which the hon. minister could not answer, and in view of his specific statement last night as recorded at page 12756 of *Hansard* that: "My only comment is that I hope the matter is cleared up as quickly as possible", will the minister agree that this should be the case? There were many things raised last night which are matters of public record, but which are unknown to the minister and about which he could not answer last night. In view of the obvious desire to clarify this matter as soon as possible, would he not agree that he should be one at least in the Cabinet who would be in favour of a public inquiry into this matter?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Oral Questions

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ROLE OF MR. MARCHAND IN DEALING WITH SKY SHOPS' LEASE AND OTHER QUEBEC CONTRACTS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister. Given the statement by the Prime Minister in answer to the first question that the RCMP, in discussions with him, indicated they would not want to lay any charges against any minister, it seems there is still a matter which is troubling me and many other people. Can the Prime Minister explain to the House how a lease involving a duty-free shop at an airport could find its way into the office of the minister in charge of DREE, and on what basis, on what right and for what purpose was that? Was the purpose to allow the minister responsible for DREE to follow the normal practice which seems to have become apparent with these contracts regarding the province of Quebec; that is, to be vetted by the ministry of that particular man as the Quebec leader?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, could I remind the hon. member that he made an allegation yesterday concerning this matter that he has not yet withdrawn, and it is at page 12710 of *Hansard*. I would ask him whether—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I could raise the question of privilege now as a result of what the right hon. gentleman has said, or I could wait until three o'clock. In any event, Sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we might as well wait until three o'clock because the same question of privilege is going to be raised on either one side of the House or the other.

ROLE OF MR. LALONDE IN DEALING WITH QUEBEC CONTRACTS

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not answered the question with regard to the input of what I have called the acknowledged leader at that time in terms of his party in Quebec. He has not answered that question. While he is thinking about the answer to that question would he think about this. If there is or was such input by that minister, I would ask the Prime Minister to inform the House whether the same input is now being made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare? If that is so, by what authority under the Financial Administration Act or any other federal statute is such input legalized?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to hear what the member will say at three o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Speaker.]

MANPOWER

GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration my question is directed to his parliamentary secretary. In view of Statistics Canada reports published today to the effect that youth unemployment remains above 13 per cent, I should like to ask the parliamentary secretary whether he can inform this House what measures he intends to introduce aimed at reducing youth unemployment this coming summer?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the hon. member's question, but I would remind him that he will have the opportunity to discuss this problem before the committee, since the department's estimates will be tabled very soon.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTED PURCHASE OF SWISS ARMOURED CAR TO ENSURE EMPLOYMENT FOR CANADIANS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, recent reports have indicated that the government is about to place a $150 million order for new armoured cars for the Canadian forces. In view of the fact the Defence Department has recommended that the government purchase the Swiss Piranha model over the Brazilian Urutu, and in view of the fact that this Swiss model would be produced in London, Ontario by General Motors under licence, thus involving a considerable economic benefit to Canada, will the minister assure the House that the order will be placed with the Swiss company to ensure that Canada does indeed receive the economic benefits?

● (1440)

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am not able to announce the decision at the present time. It is true that we are negotiating the purchase of an armoured vehicle, and the recommendations at the present time are before Treasury Board.

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE DEALING WITH PURCHASE OF BRAZILIAN ARMOURED CAR—PROTECTION OF CANADIAN WORKERS

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of what appears to be pressure from the Latin American division of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to purchase the armoured cars from Brazil is the minister prepared to table all correspondence relating to this purchase in the committee dealing with the defence department's estimates.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, this problem is still before the Treasury Board. When the decision will be taken, we will see to that.

[*English*]

Mr. Rodriguez: I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary again is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Can the President of the Treasury Board assure the House that the interests of Canadian workers will be put first before the building up of a military economic complex in Brazil.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, this proposal to buy equipment for the army is one which has long since been submitted to the House. We do have military obligations, and of course we have to keep them.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—SUGGESTED IMPLEMENTATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As the Senate report on the state of the textile industry in Canada states that the domestic industry's share of the Canadian market has been allowed to slip from 64 per cent ten years ago to less than 46 per cent now and that 25,000 textile workers were laid off in the past year and the unemployment rate among textile workers was 18 per cent in 1975 compared with the Canadian average of 7 per cent, does the government intend to follow the recommendation of the Senate that:

> The minister should negotiate voluntary restraint agreements on more textile products and with more countries and these should be more closely policed than at present. In addition, the government should keep an up to date import control list so it knows what the situation is.

In other words, it should know what the score is and what is going on.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. While I will not say we will follow the Senate recommendations in their entirety, there are some logical recommendations there. I might tell the hon. member that, provided the necessary work can be completed today, I will be tabling three reports of the textile and clothing board tomorrow and as is the custom, immediately thereafter indication will be given of what action the government proposes to take in those three sectors.

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTION NEW POLICY BE DEVELOPED BEFORE ELIMINATION OF RAIL SUBSIDIES ON FLOUR AND GRAIN

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is one of a continuing series to the Minister of Transport as custodian of section 272 of the Railway Act. Because the dominion-provincial task force has been for a few days studying the feasibility of running unit grain trains from the prairies to Saint John or Halifax, would the minister not now agree with the wisdom of my much older proposal that a new policy be developed and not just studied before putting to the axe the old policy of rail subsidies on flour and grain.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member is looking at the positive side and sees the great and good things that can happen when an expensive policy which creates anomalies is removed.

* * *

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—REASON FOR FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO IMPLEMENT ANNOUNCED POLICY

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The same Senate report indicated that the government was not following out in the last year and one half its own announced textile policy. In view of the massive lay-offs in this country in the textile industry at the present time and the great difficulty the industry is facing, can the minister explain to the House why the government has not been carrying out its announced policy during the last few years?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I said there were parts of the report with which I agreed and others with which there was some disagreement. I do not think it is quite correct, indeed I do not agree with the sweeping generalization, that we have not been carrying out the policy. I should say, however, to the hon. member that I mentioned the fact that probably tomorrow or Thursday we will be indicating what we probably will be doing in three sectors. Shortly thereafter, I will indicate the terms of reference for a group requested by the textile industry which will have representation I hope from the interested provinces, and which will examine precisely the question the hon. member has raised concerning the implementation of the existing policy and how it can be improved. At the same time, I will look at some of the other proposals, a variety of them, which have come forward both through the committee report of the Senate and from other bodies.

Oral Questions

FINANCE

ALLEGED FAILURE OF FAST WRITE-OFFS AND REDUCED TAX RATES FOR CORPORATIONS TO CREATE EMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. After reviewing the figures for employment in the manufacturing industries, I find that no more jobs existed in the first quarter of 1976 than on average in 1972 and in view of the fact that the corporate tax measures of fast write-offs and reduced tax rates introduced in the budget of May 1972 and subsequently confirmed in other budgets were designed to, "provide well paying new jobs for Canadians" in the manufacturing industry, is the minister prepared to concede that these measures have failed to provide the promised employment opportunity.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

EFFECT OF ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM ON COMPETITIVE TRADING POSITION WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, considering that the rate of inflation in Canada exceeds that in the United States by nearly 3 per cent, and that the recent appreciation in the exchange rate with the United States dollar is making our exports even less competitive, is the minister in a position to report whether the anti-inflation program of the present administration has had any success in halting the erosion of our competitive position with the United States.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I have had occasion to observe the program has been effective in reducing the average rate of settlements in Canada in the last six months from somewhere close to 20 per cent down to at least 5 percentage points lower.

REQUEST FOR COMPARISON OF CANADIAN PRICE, WAGE AND UNIT COST TRENDS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, since the improvement of our competitive position is one of the anti-inflation program—and I suggest that bringing it down from 20 per cent to 15 per cent is a long way from the 8 per cent target—and since the resolve of Canadians to fight inflation will be heightened by a full appreciation of the seriousness of the current situation, will the minister include, in his budget presentation, a comparison of Canadian price, wage and unit cost trends with those of the United States, as was done by his predecessor in the June 23 budget?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consider the suggestion. I point out that the comparison with 8 per cent, of course, the latter is the rate of average compensation as opposed to the rate of settlements which have occurred in specific contracts in the manufacturing sector.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COMMENTS OF JUDGE PARADIS ON JURY VERDICT—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

Is the Minister of Justice prepared to tell the House what he intends to do regarding the denunciations of André Choquette, formerly with the United Aircraft Corporation, in terms of Judge Louis Paradis' comments, following acquittal by a jury, and in terms of what the judge said against the jury's decision? Can the Minister of Justice tell the House whether he intends to deal severely with a judge of the Superior Court who judges his own peers, who takes a decision concerning a union member who has in effect been acquitted by twelve people?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, speaking generally of course it is not unusual for judges to make some comments on jury verdicts, but speaking specifically on this case, the gentleman in question has written to me complaining about the judge's remarks and it is the appropriate type of case which falls within section 33 of the Judges Act, so I will make a reference of the letter to the Judicial Council of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BILINGUALISM

REQUEST FOR AID FOR FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Following the policy statement of the Department of the Secretary of State concerning the development of francophone minorities outside Quebec, does the Secretary of State intend to do something about some of the claims of the federation of Francophones outside Quebec, to wit, develop regional offices and create positions of coordinators of bilingualism at regional and local levels in order to be really in tune with the population concerned?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The federation of Francophones outside Quebec notices also that it is imperative that its allotted budget for the current year be re-evaluated. Does the Secretary of State intend to take the necessary means to ensure that this organization in full development will not be another victim of the government's budgetary cuts?

● (1450)

[*English*]

Mr. Faulkner: That is a more difficult proposition.

AVAILABILITY OF SPECIAL GRANTS TO STUDY NATIVE LANGUAGES

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Secretary of State, and it refers to his recent statements about second language training across the country. Did those statements refer only to the two official languages, or will special grants be available from that grant structure for native communities studying native languages across this country?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): No, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member knows, the program is a follow up to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and therefore deals only with the two official languages.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR STUDY OF NATIVE LANGUAGES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Will he take a special position with his cabinet colleagues, because of the importance to native culture of the preservation of Indian languages, with reference to the brief submitted to him last week by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians suggesting that some of the grant funds for second language education be channelled toward native language study where they do not at this time have a written language?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, we just recently extended our grants to cultural colleges for another year period. I think they amount to $5 million for the cultural colleges for the Indian people across the country, and languages are one of their major areas of study.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DISPUTE WITH EMPLOYEES OF FINANCE BRANCH OF AIR CANADA AT WINNIPEG—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. It has to do with the dispute with the employees of the finance department of Air Canada. Following his meeting yesterday, I wonder if the minister might indicate to the House the results of that meeting and specifically whether he has assurances from Air Canada that there will be no lockouts, and second, that the farming out of jobs to CAE and others will cease.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did meet with the Air Canada people yesterday. They assured me that they were not attempting to break the union in any way as a result of the impasse in negotiations. They said that they had contracted out some work. They contended it was a minimum proportion of the workload, and that this was to assist them in catching up with the backlog. They did not anticipate any escalation in the contracting out of further work, certainly for the immediate future. I might also say that they assured me that Air Canada has no intention of phasing out its operations, namely, its financial administration, out of the Winnipeg area.

An hon. Member: We have heard that story before.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I know, but it was reiterated yesterday. I might also indicate that talks are resuming today, I believe, between the parties in the hope that this long standing dispute can be resolved.

Mr. Whiteway: Can the minister indicate to the House whether he received assurances that Air Canada will not lock out the employees of its finance department?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I did not get that in specific terms. I just indicated all the assurances I received. With contract talks resuming today, I do not believe it would be beneficial to the interests of either side for any further aggravation of that kind.

* * *

AIR CANADA

ALLEGED INTENTION TO MOVE FINANCE BRANCH FROM WINNIPEG—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transport, and it relates to the problems at the Air Canada finance branch in Winnipeg. The Minister of Labour just stated that Air Canada would not be phasing out the finance branch, but he said also that Air Canada is contracting work out because it is getting behind. I point out to the Minister of Transport that the staff there is sitting doing nothing. Will the minister get a firm assurance from Air Canada today that it will not phase out the finance branch in Winnipeg? This is the main root of the problem, and this is why there is unrest. There is a constant rumour that the finance branch will be moved.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there should not be any unrest about that because Air Canada has made this very clear to the finance branch in Manitoba. Air Canada has firmly indicated that to me, and I am happy to pass that on to the hon. member. Air Canada has no intention of phasing out the finance branch in Winnipeg.

* * *

HEALTH

APPEARANCE OF REYE'S SYNDROME IN NEWFOUNDLAND—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION AND REPORT

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. There is evidence of two cases of Reye's syndrome in northern Newfoundland, which is a wonder because of the fact that there has been no spraying

of the spruce budworm since 1968. I wonder if the minister would indicate if he has caused an investigation into this matter, and what were the results?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have not caused an investigation into this matter. However, we are funding research on this subject by Dr. Crocker at Dalhousie University in Halifax. We have to await the results of that study. As the hon. member said, the cases seem to have developed without relation to spraying, and a few cases have recently been reported in the eastern United States which also do not seem to be related to spraying, so we may be facing a difficult situation. The cause and effect relationship does not seem to have been well established yet with regard to this rare disease.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCES ON SPRAYING FOR SPRUCE BUDWORM TO ASSURE FUTURE TIMBER RESOURCES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of the fact that spraying of the spruce budworm could seriously affect the economy of the Atlantic region vis-à-vis the pulp and paper industry, and that there would also be an effect on the timber resources of the province as a result of the spruce budworm and the hemlock looper, I wonder if the minister would indicate if he has had a discussion with the ministers responsible in the Atlantic region to ensure that the future of the pulp and paper industry in the Atlantic region will be solidified.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, my department and my officials are very conscious of the importance of forestry resources for the Maritime provinces, and any decision by both levels of government to protect and develop these resources is a matter of concern to us.

As for damages caused by the spruce budworm, our department recently agreed to participate in discussions with the government of New Brunswick in order to fight this plague at the beginning of the season. To my knowledge, however, we have not participated so far in any negotiations with other governments of the Maritime provinces. There may have been exchanges of information but I do not know of any negotiations or actual proposals concerning a program which could be implemented either by the government of Newfoundland or the government of New Brunswick to deal with this problem, if it is more acute there.

I note that newspapers report that Nova Scotia does not see fit, at this time, to participate in such a program.

* * *

[*English*]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

REQUEST THAT DECISION ON PERMITS TO DRILL IN BEAUFORT SEA BE MADE WHILE PARLIAMENT IN SESSION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, if I could have his attention. A report recently indicated that the minister was intending to make an announcement on April 22 with regard to drilling permits in the Beaufort Sea. In view of the delays already, would the minister advise why it is necessary that this announcement be made on April 22, at a time when this parliament will not be in session?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I do not know the source of the hon. member's information. It is our hope to make a decision this week.

Mr. Leggatt: Would the minister therefore confirm that that decision will be made while the House is in session? If he intends to make it this week, can we expect that announcement either today or tomorrow; otherwise will it be made after the break? Will the minister give an assurance that the announcement will be made in the House so that members of the opposition will have an opportunity to respond?

Mr. Buchanan: The problem I have is that the matter is on the agenda for cabinet on Thursday.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Buchanan: Unless hon. members would like to sit on Thursday, I do not know how we can deal with it before the House adjourns.

* * *

POST OFFICE

LETTER URGING PITNEY BOWES CUSTOMERS TO BUY OLYMPIC METER DIES—REASON MINISTER SENT LETTER

Mr. Bill Clarke (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General arising out of a form letter dated March 17 from his office and signed by him. The letter was sent to all Pitney Bowes customers and urges the recipients to buy Olympic meter dies for $150. The question I would like to ask is what portion of the $150 is to be retained by Pitney Bowes, and why is the taxpayer of Canada asked to pay for the minister's solicitations on behalf of this business?

● (1500)

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, Pitney Bowes has a vested interest in selling meter dies, which is their business. We have a vested interest in ensuring that meter dies contain the Olympic symbol in order that people who use meter dies rather than stamps will avail themselves of the opportunity of offering financial assistance to the Olympics. Of course, this is a co-operative venture of the Post Office, Pitney Bowes and the Olympics in general.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. MARCHAND (LANGELIER)—REMARKS OF MR. BAKER (GRENVILLE-CARLETON)

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have never abused this procedure. I have been sitting here for ten years and I never used it before as far as I can remember. I simply refer to what the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) said yesterday. I did not do this earlier because there was some confusion yesterday on the import of his words; then I read *Hansard* and here is what the hon. member said. I shall say it in English because he spoke in English so that his words are not misinterpreted. The hon. member said the following, and I quote:

[*English*]

Again, a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the now public admission in the matter of the extension of the Sky Shops lease that the then minister of DREE was allowed input into the question as Quebec leader, although this lease—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this is the point I want to raise this afternoon. I do not know where there was public admission that I played a role in the extension of the Sky Shops contract. I even stated the contrary; nobody ever dared state that I had something to do directly or indirectly with the Sky Shops affair. I hope that the hon. member did not think what he said and that he will simply say what he meant, and the matter will be settled. If he maintains that he did say this, Mr. Speaker, I will ask you to have him withdraw his words if he does not want the normal procedure in such a case to be followed. I do not want—and I have no intention of playing the offended virgin—reputations to be destroyed through insinuations; I think that we should not accept this in the House.

[*Englishs*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —I am glad the minister raised the matter today as a question of privilege. He asked me specifically to withdraw an allegation with respect to his involvement, direct or indirect. He also asked me whether there had been any reference with respect to his involvement in this particular matter. I accepted unequivocally, in the preface to my question to the Prime Minister today, the statement made by the Prime Minister on the reports made to him by commissioner Nadon which stated—these are his words, I think; I took them down—that he does not recommend that charges be laid against members of the government. I have never accepted anything else with respect to this minister.

With respect to the public statement as to his involvement, it was made on April 8, 1976, by his brother minister who is now Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, when in answer to a question by the hon. member for Central Nova with respect to this matter he said the following, in part:

I have, however, been informed informally that there was an exchange of correspondence between the executive assistant of the Minister of the Environment and my executive assistant.

That was in his then capacity as minister of transport. The question that I have, and the question that many Canadians and many members of the House have on their minds, is not with respect to any criminal involvement of the minister, because that has been laid to rest by the leader of the government, but with respect to his responsibility for the operation of his office.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I think the minister, now that he has raised the matter as a question of privilege, owes the House an explanation as to how, on God's green earth—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —a matter involving Sky Shops leases at airports could find its way into the office of the minister in charge of DREE.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I repeat, sir, that I have accepted without question, as I must, as I am bound to and as I do—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You're slipping.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —the statement of the Prime Minister with respect to the criminal involvement. But I do not accept, as a member of the House of Commons, the words of the Prime Minister yesterday that I must substantiate everything, as if I were in a court of law. I am an elected representative here and I am entitled to certain answers, and so are the people of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, in the course of making a contribution to a question of privilege raised by the Minister of the Environment, pursued a point which is of great value. But the narrow confines of the question of privilege relate only to whether or not yesterday, in the words of the Minister of the Environment today, an allegation was in fact made that the minister had input into a certain decision. That was the language that was used. I will have to ask the hon. member to confine himself to that point.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have almost completed what I have to say with respect to the matter. As to the last point made by the Prime Minister yesterday—I think this is a question of privilege which affects the privileges of this House—the question is, what is the position of a member when he asks a question? If the Prime Minister is allowed, day after day, to set up a straw man regarding the laying of a charge or the making of an allegation when a member asks a question, then I do not think this should be allowed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): In closing, I want to draw to the attention of the House and to you, sir, your own words with respect to the incident that occurred involving the hon. member for York-Simcoe. At that stage there was an attempt to ask a member to substantiate, to withdraw his statement or to lay a charge, and all of this silly, specious parliamentary nonsense.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): He said:

And the third rather vague practice relating to charges made if they are specific, withdrawn or in some way connected with an offer to put a member's seat at risk. That practice is very vague.

It is even worse than that, sir. You are most charitable. That practice does not exist in our parliamentary democracy or in this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I say to the minister, on his very narrow question of privilege, that such is the public record. Sir, the question still remains of the minister's political responsibility for the actions of those who are involved in his office.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I think it might be useful to put in its proper context the complaint of the Minister of the Environment. He complains of a statement made by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton as reported on page 12710 of *Hansard*. The statement must be read in its entirety. With great respect, I think that a moment or two ago the Chair missed a word. I think Your Honour referred to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton as referring to an input into a decision. With great respect, that was not the phrase used. Allow me to read the question as reported on page 12710 of *Hansard*. This is what the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton is reported to have said:

● (1510)

Again, a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the now public admission in the matter of the extension of the Sky Shops lease that the then minister of DREE was allowed input into the question as Quebec leader, although this lease was not within his departmental jurisdiction, could the Prime Minister now tell the House whether the policy and practice of the government is that all contracts for the province of Quebec, whatever their departmental origin, are currently vetted through the Minister of National Health and Welfare in his capacity as head of the Quebec troika?

The Prime Minister replied, and what he said is pertinent to the question of privilege the minister has raised. He said, first:

I am not sure what the hon. member is implying—

He was not implying anything; I put that in my own parentheses. I continue quoting:

—when he says there was input by the minister responsible for DREE. I think it has been quite clear from the minister that he was not involved in any way with the Sky Shops matter and therefore I think the hon. member, if he made that allegation, should be prepared to withdraw it or substantiate it.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton then said:

I made no allegation with respect to the involvement of the minister.

I submit that if the matter the minister has raised is to amount to a breach of the minister's privileges, the statement alluded to must amount either to a slander of his person as minister, libel, or a statement in the nature of a charge directed at the minister and implying corruption. I think the precedents are clear and I need not cite the authorities at length. I refer the Chair to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth edition, page 96, citation 105(3). I refer to the third paragraph of that citation. I submit that the minister's complaint does not amount to the type of privilege contemplated by that citation.

I also cite May's Parliamentary Practice, eighteenth edition, page 148. In that part, headed "Reflections upon members", there are examples of speeches and writings which have been held to be contemptuous and breaching the privileges of a member. Not one of the examples given in that citation is similar to the matter described and put forward by the minister and complained of. The only example which is in the least similar to the matter complained of comes under the heading on page 149, "Imputations against members of corruption in the execution of their duties."

I submit that the statement of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, that the then minister of DREE was allowed input into the question of the lease, falls far short of an allegation of corruption. Indeed, it is questionable if it falls within the definition of improper conduct. It may well be that there was a vetting of the leases on behalf of the minister of DREE who now says he had nothing to do with it. It appears that there was an exchange of correspondence between his executive assistant, when he was minister of DREE, and the executive assistant of the then minister of transport. I say all this on the assumption, expounded and confirmed by the Prime Minister yesterday, that ministers are responsible for their personal staffs and that their staffs must adhere to a certain code of conduct. We must, therefore, assume that there was ministerial responsibility for that exchange of correspondence.

The then minister of transport acknowledged that he subsequently knew of the exchange of correspondence, although he had not seen it. That, sir, may be proper conduct. I do not think the Prime Minister, responding yesterday to the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, should have said, "make a charge." That, I submit, was not the course to be followed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the purpose of this discussion is not to talk about the conduct of the Prime Minister yesterday. We are considering a question of privilege relating to affairs concerning the Minister of the Environment only, and we ought to confine ourselves to that.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, indeed we are concerned about yesterday's proceedings since the question of privilege arises from the exchange between the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. I simply submit to the Chair that yesterday the Prime Minister's proper course was to answer the question. If there was no impropriety, he could simply have said so and that would have ended the matter for the day. I submit as strongly as I can that although the minister's feathers may be ruffled, the point does not constitute a breach of his parliamentary privileges nor a breach of the privileges of this House.

I submit that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton used mild language yesterday, in view of the evidence. It is on the record: it was put there by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and by other questioners involved in the subject matter.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, may I make my own role clear in this matter? My purpose in challenging the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): The Prime Minister should be more worried about the next member for Ottawa-Carleton.

Mr. Trudeau: —was to make sure that the facts were known to this House. I am not raising a question of privilege, although the minister may. My role was to make sure that this House understood the allegation smuggled into the question by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Smile, Pierre.

Mr. Trudeau: The allegation smuggled into the preamble of the question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: In the allegation, the hon. member suggested that there is a public admission that the then minister was allowed input. Mr. Speaker, the minister denied this input. The hon. member made some smokescreen to talk about other things. The essence of the question before the House is that this fact alleged by the hon. member is false. Whether the matter raised amounts to a question of privilege, calls for withdrawal, or anything else, is a matter for the Chair to decide. I want to establish clearly that the allegation was false, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): You don't read *Hansard*.

Mr. Trudeau: It was a false statement of fact, such as the opposition very frequently makes in the preamble to a question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I will call on the hon. member for Annapolis Valley in a moment, but I want to indicate my assessment of the situation. The Chair has been asked to decide two questions: first, whether an allegation was made by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton; second, whether a question of privilege exists with respect to the privileges of the Minister of the Environment or all members of the House. I do not think either question is terribly difficult to decide. Both are significant, but I do not think either gives the Chair difficulty. First, it is obvious that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton made an allegation. I cannot think of any other interpretation of language which reads:

> Again, a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the now public admission in the matter of the extension of the Sky Shops lease that the then minister of DREE was allowed input into the question as Quebec leader—

● (1520)

That is an allegation. It could not be interpreted in any other way. I find that it is an allegation. The question I now have to decide is whether it constitutes a question of privilege. I find it does not constitute a question of privilege. It is an allegation which is denied; it is an allegation which has been called false, but it is not an allegation of improper conduct. It is not unparliamentary language, and it is not in any of the confines of the definition of questions of privilege that have been accepted in the past. It is an accusation or allegation made by one member in respect of the conduct of another. It concerns an allegation of fact which is disputed. That is something that occurs rather frequently in the House.

It may constitute a matter of great irritation or debate both inside and outside the House and a matter of considerable significance vis-à-vis the reputation of members on either side of the House, but within the confines of the definition as I understand it, it does not constitute a question of privilege.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF SESSION

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the length of the present session of parliament. I realize that there is nothing in the rule books that requires the government to prorogue a session of parliament within any given period of time. However, in view of the fact that traditions are being shattered by the length of this present session, which is approaching two years, it seems that parliament ought at some point to be advised whether this session is going to go on and on, or whether the government plans for it to be prorogued within a reasonable time.

I recognize that today is Tuesday, not Thursday. However, since we will not be here on Thursday it is a matter of order that the House be told of the government's plans, not just for the next few days but for the balance of this session. Does it intend to bring the session to an end in 1976? If so, when? What does it expect the House to do between now and whatever date it plans for the session to be ended? There are two questions here: When will the session be prorogued, and when will the summer recess commence? At some point before we rise for the Easter recess the House has the right to have this information communicated to it. I realize that this could perhaps be done tomorrow on the motion regarding the Easter adjournment, but it strikes me it would be useful for us to have his information in advance of that debate. That is why I raise it as a point of order today.

Mr. Speaker: I could not, in fairness, in any of the precedents find that the question raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre constitutes a valid point of order in respect of today's proceedings. Although it is a question of great interest to hon. members, it certainly does not constitute a point of order with respect of today's proceedings. However, it may be a question of sufficient general interest that the House will want to give

its consent to allow the President of the Privy Council to comment on it. Does the House give consent to such a comment being made by the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre who indicated to me his intention to ask the question today. Under ordinary circumstances I would have made such a statement either on Thursday, if we were sitting, or tomorrow at the time of adjournment. However, I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is right and that it will help in the adjournment debate if the House has some indication of the government's plans for the remainder of this session. I might as well give a complete statement of business for today, tomorrow and for the period until we hope to adjourn or prorogue.

Today we will begin with Bill S-31, the Quarantine Act, which I am hopeful will not take very long. When that is concluded we will take the report stage of Bill C-20, the amendments to the Citizenship Act. Hon. members will also recall that there will be a vote on second reading of Bill C-83 at 4.30 p.m. today. Tomorrow we will continue with Bill C-20 and the adjournment motion.

It is the government's purpose to conclude this session to all intents and purposes by June 30 and to begin a new session in the fall. I understand from the attitude of the parties opposite that they share these objectives. I am sure they do not want to sit in July. Indeed, so much is the prospect disliked by some members that I hear rumours about a platoon system on the part of the official opposition so that those who do not want to stay can go home, while the rest bask in the warmth of the July days in Ottawa.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Make a charge, or withdraw.

Mr. Sharp: I withdraw. I know that the opposition would like to bring this session to an end and to have a Speech from the Throne as soon as possible. There are certain bills on the order paper which have high priority, including some in which a great deal of House time has been invested. The government wishes to see these dealt with before the summer adjournment which I repeat, will be, in effect, the end of the new session even if we continue for a very brief period just before the opening of the new session in the fall.

One Bill, C-61, is at third reading. Three Commons bills are at the report stage, namely, C-20, C-68 and C-89, and one bill from the Senate, S-8. Next in order of the investment of House time is Bill C-83, second reading debate on which was concluded yesterday and which now goes to committee. Then we come to four bills which are on the order paper, which have not yet been called for debate but which the government wishes to have disposed of before the summer adjournment, namely, C-81, C-84, C-87 and C-88.

The government has no other major items that it intends to proceed with during the present session, except a budget. It may be necessary, however, to seek approval for

[Mr. Speaker.]

two bills, one relating to airport security and one to extend the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act, which should not be controversial. I must add that there may be government decisions in the next couple of months that will require House action, of which I am not now aware.

From now to the end of June there are 13 allotted days. It is my intention to distribute these throughout the weeks that remain, beginning with May 4 and May 7 which I now designate as allotted days. The last allotted day will be June 22. I hope to discuss with the House leaders a full program of allotted days, in the intervening period, for the other ten days. With co-operation from all sides, I am confident that we can achieve our purpose and be able to adjourn and terminate this session to all intents and purposes before the July 1 holiday.

I have omitted from this list Bill C-82 relating to the Thousand Islands bridge because of the illness and absence from the House of the hon. member for Leeds who has a special interest in it. If he returns before June 30, and proceeding with that bill will not interfere with other business, it will be included. Finally, I should perhaps indicate the order of bills when we return after the Easter break. The first order of business will be three bills related to the anti-inflation and restraint program, namely, C-89, C-81 and C-68. It is the government's wish to begin second reading debate on Bill C-84, the bill relating to capital punishment, during the second week of our return, and except for interruptions for allotted days and for the budget, if that should intervene, to continue that second reading debate until it is concluded.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there is one vital omission in the government's program which will eat up six days of about 30 government days remaining between now and September. That is, the budget. Did the minister mention the budget?

Mr. Sharp: Yes.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I apologize. On behalf of the hon. member for Leeds, I want to thank the government House leader for his consideration with regard to the bill dealing with the Thousand Islands bridge. Finally, has he consulted his seatmate with regard to the by-election in Ottawa-Carleton?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister one question with respect to the information he has given us. With regard to the plan for concluding by June 30, that will obviously call for a good deal of co-operation. But is the government now making a firm commitment that the first session of the thirtieth parliament will end in mid-1976 and that a new session will start this fall?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, unless something very untoward occurs, it is our hope to end the session on June 30. Certainly we will not extend it beyond the summer break. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that we may return for a day or so before beginning the new session.

● (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) on the same point of order.

Mr. Beaudoin: No, Mr. Speaker, it is on the same question put by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Since the minister has indicated that this session would be adjourned and that there would be a few days left to discuss the bills he just mentioned, before starting the other session, would the minister say whether it is final one way or another that the summer recess will begin on June 30?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: That is our purpose and our plan. I hope we will receive the utmost co-operation. I am quite sure there can be adequate debate on the remaining items to the satisfaction of the public and of this House if we can program our bills in an orderly way. I hope for the co-operation not only of the House leaders but of all hon. members.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) on the same point of order.

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, once again, I should like to respectfully draw your attention to the fact that on motions today, I moved a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43, and when you asked for the unanimous consent of the House to allow me to put this motion, I heard objections being voiced from the Gallery across the floor. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would beg you to kindly put in practice Standing Order 28, which states that a member, when he wants to intervene, must rise in his seat to be identified, because today we have not been able to identify the member who put in an objection to the motion moved pursuant to Standing Order 43. Mr. Speaker, we have realized for some time now that this practice of opposing any motion moved pursuant to Standing Order 43 comes perhaps from the House, but today I have seen people in the gallery who objected to this motion. I cannot understand that we take for granted an objection to any motion being put by someone who must not take part in the House debates because he is not a member.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to try to settle this question once and for all by applying Standing Order 28.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The last time the hon. member raised this question on the same point of order, I tried to explain the situation in French. It might not have been clear. So, I must explain it once more but this time perhaps I should do so in English.

[*English*]

Standing Order 43 does not envisage speeches on a motion which are described in Standing Order 28. The question to which the House is asked to address itself, pursuant to Standing Order 43, is whether or not it wishes to give its unanimous consent to setting aside whatever business is scheduled for the day in order to debate something else.

Dairy Policy

A withholding of consent might constitute simply an expression of refusal to stop the debate of the day, refusal to stop the question period, or refusal to stop routine proceedings, and have nothing to do with the merits of the question. It is not a speech on the motion, and it is not an expression either of support or rejection of the motion itself. It is simply a question whether or not the consent of the House is given to stopping business at that point and addressing itself to some other matter.

Standing Order 28, which has to do with speeches, is not applicable to Standing Order 43, where the question is whether the business of the day can be set aside in order that the House might proceed to consider something else. That can only be done by unanimous consent, and if there is a single contrary voice, regardless of the side of the House from which it comes, and regardless whether the hon. member wishes to identify himself, a motion under Standing Order 43 cannot be pursued.

* * *

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Fourteenth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Cafik.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF REPORT "MENTAL DISORDER IN THE CRIMINAL PROCESS"

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), I should like to table, in both official languages, a report of the Canadian Law Reform Commission entitled "Mental Disorder in the Criminal Process."

* * *

TRANSPORT

TABLING OF REPORT ON SWAMPING OF "SAN JUAN"

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I should like to table, in both official languages, a summary report on the investigation into the swamping of the vessel *San Juan* off the east coast.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

STATEMENT ON DAIRY POLICY

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty at this time to announce the dairy program for the 1976-77 dairy year. Effective today, the target returns level for industrial milk has been increased to $11.45 per hundredweight. This is an increase of 43 cents per hundredweight, or 3.9 per cent, and is in line with increased cost of production. The new target returns level is determined in accordance with the long-term dairy

policy which I announced last year and which provides for adjustments equal to increased production costs.

The rate of federal subsidy for this year will remain unchanged from that of last year, at $2.66 per hundredweight. This is in keeping with the government's wish to moderate as much as possible the increase in dairy products prices in the interests of both the producer and the consumer.

In order that the target return of $11.45 per hundredweight be attained, the Canadian Dairy Commission, on behalf of the producers of industrial milk, will offer to purchase butter and skim milk powder from processors at higher prices. The support price for butter will increase 5 cents, to $1.08 per pound. The support price for skim milk powder will increase 4 cents, to 68 cents per pound.

Part of the reason for overproduction of industrial milk during the past year was insufficient control through the use of quota. The industry has no choice but to tighten its controls this year to bring industrial mild production down from its current high levels. The provinces and producer organizations, whose co-operation is essential, have recognized and agreed to this.

Taking into consideration the amount of stocks and projected demand for dairy products, the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee, which is made up of representatives of producers and provincial governments and is chaired by the Canadian Dairy Commission, has estimated that domestic requirements are 95 million hundredweight of industrial milk for 1976-77. This will be the maximum volume eligible for the direct subsidy of $2.66 per hundredweight.

In keeping with the fact that actual shipments of industrial milk are usually somewhat less than total market share quota, and that production of industrial milk must be curtailed, the total amount of market share quota to be allocated to provincial milk marketing agencies will be 100.5 million hundredweight. Should producers ship more than 94.5 per cent of their individual quota, a levy of $8.60 per hundredweight will be charged on all shipments exceeding 94.5 per cent of quota. A year-end adjustment will be made to assure that the $8.60 levy will apply only to shipments in excess of 95 million hundredweight.

Any milk shipped in excess of individual quota holdings will have the penalty of $8.60 per hundredweight applied, and there will be no chance for refund on any deliveries in excess of quota. The levy on all in-quota deliveries has been increased to $1.35 per hundredweight in accordance with our policy.

● (1540)

I realize that bringing milk production in line with demand will be a difficult adjustment for dairy farmers. But to operate an effective supply-management system, producers should not exceed domestic market demands. After all, this is what supply management means.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that dairy farmers must reduce their shipments of industrial milk now, and not starting next fall or winter near the close of the dairy year. I do not want farmers continuing along at present high levels of production and adding to our surplus only quickly to deplete their herds at the end of the dairy year in order to avoid shipping more milk than their annual quota allows. That sort of irresponsible action would result in too few cows remaining to start off the subsequent dairy year, and possibly in a shortage of milk or milk products a few years from now.

[Mr. Whelan.]

To accomplish an early cutback in production, and yet not to overreact to the situation, I am asking the provincial milk marketing agencies to implement a monthly allocation of market share quotas to each individual producer. If a province does not establish a satisfactory system of controls, I have instructed the Canadian Dairy Commission to take whatever action it thinks is appropriate to achieve the desired goals.

One of the major areas of concern to me is the separation of the fluid and industrial milk markets. It is apparent that milk producers would benefit from a complete integration of both industrial and fluid milk markets. I believe that producers should receive equal returns for milk of equal quality, whether the milk is intended for manufacturing or fluid sales. I am asking the Canadian Dairy Commission to consult with the provincial milk marketing boards during the year to work out a program for complete integration of their fluid and industrial milk markets. This basis could provide a system for future federal subsidy programs. I am also asking the commission to review, within the framework of approved policy, other aspects of the program in their entirety.

While the year ahead will be a difficult one for the dairy producer, I want to reiterate that the government remains deeply committed to the dairy industry. The government will be paying subsidies of $253 million directly to producers and $24 million for marketing costs. In addition, product prices will be supported at $1.08 per pound of butter and 68 cents per pound of skim milk powder. To provide the necessary support, the government is increasing its loan limit to the Canadian Dairy Commission from $300 million to $334 million to finance the purchase of these products. It is also limiting cheese imports to 50 million pounds.

The Canadian International Development Agency has also been instructed to investigate thoroughly the possibility of increasing the skim milk powder component of its food aid program either through a bilateral arrangement or through the world food program in countries or on projects where it can be beneficially used. I was told just before entering the House, Mr. Speaker, that CIDA had decided to buy $20 million worth of skim milk powder, which will eliminate some of the dairy farmers' costs, etc. At world prices, this amounts to approximately 75 million to 80 million pounds of skim milk powder that the dairy farmers will not have to finance.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that good supply management is the key to the continued prosperity of the Canadian dairy industry. It remains the policy of the governement to ensure that efficient producers of milk and cream are given the opportunity to earn reasonable returns. The policy which this government has adopted for the current dairy year will ensure that these aims are met.

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, upon review of this statement and upon pondering its effects for the future,

one is encouraged to strengthen one's suspicions and doubts about this government's real intention to support a domestic dairy industry with any real, continuing stability. Agricultural subsidies, and particularly dairy subsidies, benefit producers and consumers alike. This announcement once again underlines the fact that it is this government's intention to shrink, and shrink substantially, Canada's dairy industry and to continue its policy of forcing producers to get every cent of their income in the future from the market place.

This is disturbing news to producers, but it carries with it equally severe and serious implications for the consuming public. Actual returns to producers could in the future be reduced, and market prices for dairy products likely will increase and consumption could well decline. Support appears to be reduced by some $22 million—$275 million as compared to $253 million—and it is estimated that an additional $40 million will be required from the total to cover some of the administration costs, some interest costs and storage fees, of which only $24 million will be paid either by the federal government or the Canadian Dairy Commission. Thus, a considerable portion will again fail to end up at the producer level.

It should be pointed out that when the program was announced last year with its target price of $11.02—a figure, by the way, that producers did not actually receive—the cost of production was not met then. Taking into account reductions in subsidy payments, haulage, export levies, licence fees and advertising, the amount received by producers was approximately $8.76 a hundredweight, or some $2.27 per hundredweight less than the target price.

It is widely recognized that the cost of producing one hundred pounds of milk varies. However, many well-documented cost studies indicate a figure in the neighbourhood of $14. With this figure in mind, and given the support price of $2.66 a hundredweight, producers are in fact actually subsidizing dairy products to the tune of $3 a hundredweight from their own operations. Some people may ask: How can such a statement be true; how can it be possible? Let me answer them, Mr. Speaker, by saying that it is true and it is also commonplace. It is possible because the milk cheque income must be supplemented by sales of breeding stock, by sales of cash crops, and in many cases must be supplemented by off-the-farm income.

I am not quarrelling with the minister with respect to world stocks of skim milk powder. However, the government's record in regard to skim milk powder for export sales and world food aid must be regarded as nothing less than a complete failure. Particularly at a time of surplus product, Canada's commitment remains at a shamefully low level. At a time when our domestic stocks are in a surplus position, it is unacceptable to learn that our commitment has been reduced. I am certain that most Canadians would agree that the need for world food aid has drastically increased over the past ten years. Canada's current commitment through CIDA of skim milk powder for aid is 1¾ million pounds less than our last ten-year average. I trust that the minister's instruction to CIDA will be more successful in the future than the past record indicates.

The minister's statement also made reference to quotas on cheese imports. Another unfortunate aspect of this government's inaction relates to the refusal to reduce cheese import quotas. Importation of cheese has risen drastically, from 31 million pounds in 1970 to 50 million pounds in 1975. This government has ignored the traditional method of calculation that is based on a five-year average. Calculated in this manner, we would have a quota of 38 million pounds, a limit much more in tune with the needs of Canadian producers and the industry. It has been indicated by a leading industry spokesman that every million pounds of chese imports results in a loss to Canadian producers of approximately $360,000. Thus, a reduction of 10 million pounds would result in savings to the industry of some $3.6 million.

I am not quarrelling with the minister about our present domestic surplus position. There are reasons for this that should be recognized, taken seriously and given full consideration. Most of the causes are not of the producers' own making. For example, we have had some excellent weather conditions during the past season. We have experienced declines in the number of exports of dary heifers, and we have had larger than normal numbers of older dairy cows still being held because of low beef prices. There are factors largely, if not totally, beyond the producers' control.

● (1550)

Canadian producers welcome the opportunity to compete in a fair marketplace but they cannot, and should not, be expected to compete in a marketplace filled with heavily subsidized products from foreign competitors. In addition, they should not have to stand alone against the treasuries of the European Economic Community in the world market, which is the case at the present time. The industry has requested that some special assistance be given to producers to overcome their world market disadvantage.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of my colleagues on this side of the House will have questions. I would respectfully repeat the three suggestions or recommendations I made previously to the minister and his officials. First, the minister should continue actively to pursue the possibility of an effective supply management program at the national level as it relates to fluid milk production. Second, policy changes should create an incentive to even out year-round production. These two factors would match more closely supply with demand; thus, a reduction in surplus stocks would obviously result. Third, the government should transfer the control of import permits from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to the Canadian Dairy Commission.

The content of the minister's statement recognizes some of the difficulties in the industry. However, its success relies heavily upon the producers' ability to match supply to demand. I am confident that the producers will fulfil their obligations, but I doubt that this government will be equally successful in meeting its obligations.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, in considering the statement the minister has just made, the only thing I can say is that it is not worse than we anticipated, but obviously it does not make the situation much better. If the farmers of Canada supplying the dairy manufactur-

ing industry were to receive $11.45 on 100 per cent of supply management quotas, those farmers would be very happy. The farmers do not receive that kind of money. While it is true that as a result of the government's policies we have been able to raise the price of industrial milk by 43 cents a hundred, we have at the same time reduced the anticipated size of global consumption as a result of increasing the price of butter by five cents and the price of skim milk powder by four cents. One of the problems results from the fact that the federal dairy policy does not, through market sharing quota arrangements, allow for a longer period of time, which is absolutely necessary in designing a program to meet the needs of dairy farmers.

The minister says we can increase production per cow. A dairy farmer operates on the basis of a herd and he has to make plans before deciding how much production he should have. If this is to be changed every three months, as has been the case in the past year, there is no way the dairy farmer can remain in a healthy state. For those farmers who are producing over 94.5 per cent of their quotas there will be a reduction, bringing the return below the farm cost of production. It would be much more honest on the part of the minister if rather than saying that the federal subsidy rate will be $2.66 per hundred, he had said the subsidy would be $1.31 on quota milk. Right now there is a deduction from all in-quota milk of $1.35, which leaves the federal subsidy at $1.31, not $2.66.

If we reduced the over-quota milk and the in-quota milk, the farmer would be left with something like 20 cents a hundred for producing milk. We should be very interested in this aspect of the matter because of its great implications not only for the dairy industry but in respect of the production of beef, pork and probably poultry as well.

If the farmer is to receive something in the neighbourhood of 20 cents a hundred for the milk he ships over quota, has $8.60 plus $1.31 deducted, and has to pay a transportation cost, he will find that shipping the milk to market will cost him money. The farmer is smart enough to know that he should buy a couple of pigs or start raising some veal. In this way the farmer will have to operate the dairy production safety valve on his own.

One of our major tasks in this country is to create a dairy industry that is able to meet Canadian requirements as well as producing for the export market. If a farmer has to decide, on a daily basis, how much milk he puts into the bulk tank, and knows if he puts too much in and only receives 20 cents per hundred it will cost him money, he will then open the safety valve and move into other production. This is particularly true if the farmer has to pay a transportation charge of, say, 75 cents. He will then end up with a net loss of considerably more than 50 cents. This will result in an increased production of beef, pork and poultry products.

As the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wise) said earlier, dairy farmers are concerned about the deal the minister made last November in relation to the export market. I gather from the November statement that we agreed to relate 10 per cent of our total manufactured dairy production to our imports of dairy products. The $50 million we have agreed to import in cheese production represents about 5 per cent of our manufactured production. It is not difficult to envisage that we will be importing other commodities, bringing us to that 10 per cent range without any exports at all.

Like the egg business, we have more exports than imports. We import eggs at the full table price but we export them at the breaker trade price. We export more eggs. But this is much like the skim milk powder business; we export a considerable amount of powder, but we do so at a loss. Who accepts that loss? I suggest it is not the government, but the loss is being absorbed by the farmers themselves.

● (1600)

I think it behooves every member of this House, whether interested in consumers or producers, to demand of the government that we develop a much more far-seeing dairy program than this, get away from the yearly quota and make a decision concerning what we anticipate to be the needs of the Canadian public. We should meet those needs and get whatever export sales we can. This should be done in conjunction with the provinces. The province of Ontario recently signed an agreement with the minister and that province is very unhappy with the agreement: it has written a long letter to the minister outlining ten or 12 reasons why it is dissatisfied. The province of Quebec has given the year's notice that will allow it to get out of the national share quota arrangement.

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Peters: Because there is not enough money. It is not satisfactory to the province of Quebec. The dairy farmers there are not satisfied. They are getting out for that reason. I am sorry the minister did not indicate that the dairy industry, through government assistance, would be able to go into the international markets through CIDA. We are quite pleased with the amount of $20 million he announced for the skim milk proposals in respect of CIDA. However, I think we have an opportunity to get into some of the other markets again. This may have to be subsidized, but it would not have to be subsidized to the amount the farmer now has to pay if he pays the two levies for in-quota and above-quota milk.

I think the farmer would be willing to make a contribution to an export levy more in keeping with the total requirements of the Canadian dairy industry. No farmer will be particularly pleased with the announcement made by the minister today. In the long run, I think we will see again, as we did last year, that when the consumer has to pay more, there is a reduction in the amount he will consume. This will be true in respect of butter, cheese and fluid milk.

I think it behooves the minister to really give some leadership in the development of a school milk program. I think it is interesting to note that a sister commonwealth provides free milk in all hotels. There is a milk bar in all the lobbies, and they provide milk in all the hotel rooms. They also provide milk in the schools. I do not think we want to interfere with the brewery industry, but surely we could get rid of the pop drink machines in the schools and put in milk. The minister is interested in this, but I suggest he has not done a very good job in selling this program to his colleagues. He should get some help from the backbenchers who represent consumers, if not the agricultural

industry. The establishment of a program which on a long-term basis will keep the Canadian dairy industry healthy is absolutely necessary for all segments of the Canadian population.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, industrial milk producers had been waiting the minister's statement since March 29. It should be particularly recalled that on March 29, during the producers' demonstration on Parliament Hill, the minister said he would make a statement on the dairy policy for 1976-77 before April 1. However, he made this statement only today, April 13. I had an inkling that the delay would spell bad news for the producers.

For several months, industrial milk producers have seen their income shrink considerably and they fear the worst for the year 1976. The producers organized meetings with their hon. members to make governments aware of their problems and during these meetings, there was a clear indication that it was at that time, and that it is still today, a political problem and that in order to maintain the producers' incomes at the 1975 level, the federal government must inject a supplement of $40 million in the economic sector. By the way, I should like to say that any government investing in agriculture makes an excellent investment because this is the basic industry of a country. As the government party claims to be on the side of power, he had to decide whether the producers would see their income reduced in the year 1976.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of power, we must be clear on this. Does government majority represent the real power or, on the contrary, is real power represented by high finance which commands the majority government to the extent that they are restricted in their financial means, which prevents them from acceding to the fair demands of industrial milk producers? People can think anything they want but it remains that the dairy industry is very important since it provides more than 300,000 jobs throughout Canada, including the producers themselves. It gives work to many truck drivers, it creates many jobs in manufacturing, packing, transportation industries and so on. It means that this industry helps the other sectors of activity of our economy.

When we talk about subsidies to support the dairy industry some people think it is the only industry that is subsidized in Canada. We often forget to evaluate how many millions of dollars in subsidies of all kinds are given to national and multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to underline the following point: milk subsidies are some kind of additional revenue which is beneficial to consumers. If some day the consumer is asked to pay from his own revenue the real value of such or such dairy product he will realize that it will be even harder on his budget and that he will have to spend a major part of his revenue for food.

On the producers' side if a part of the products is paid directly by the consumers and the other part by the government it does not really change the situation, provided the producer can, when selling his product, recover his production costs plus a reasonable profit margin to earn a living at least equal to that of those working in other sectors of the economic activity.

In some countries, Mr. Speaker, the government subsidize up to 75 per cent of dairy products value. It is from those countries that we import some products and indirectly the problems we now experience are caused in part by those overly massive imports.

The minister tells us that we must reduce our dairy production to get better prices. The minister should know that it cannot be controlled like a water pipe can be controlled with a tap.

Two years ago producers were asked to increase their production. They responded. Nature helping, production was excellent in 1975. Another factor that prompted producers to improve production was the drop in beef prices. More cows were kept in the herd while farmers waited for better prices to take them to the slaughterhouse.

In any event, the president of the APU and the president of the Federated Cooperative sent a letter to the Prime Minister to bring to his attention the very nature of the problem and suggest possible solutions. First, they asked for a basic price of $11.42; second, that the subsidy of $2.66 be maintained; third, that cheese imports be reduced to 39 million; fourth, that the support price be raised by $30 million and an additional budget of $19 million approved to compensate the producer who must cut down on his production.

Well, the minister's reply today is that he will boost the price of milk by 43 cents a hundredweight to offset higher production costs. On the other hand, in another part of his statement, he informs producers that the export levy will be $1.35, 70 cents more than in the fall of 1975.

In brief, the situation will be worse than in 1975-76. In 1975-76, the government spent $270 million to support producers' prices, a subsidy of $2.66 a hundredweight, and at the same time last year the levy was 45 cents a hundredweight and the basic price $11.02. In 1976-77, the government anticipates $253 million will be paid directly to producers, the subsidy will remain at $2.66, on the other hand, the levy will be $1.35, the basic price $11.45, which means that compared with the same time last year, that represents 47 cents a hundredweight less when producers asked precisely for a raise at least equal to the increases provided by the Anti-Inflation Board through Bill C-73, and the opposite happens, we will have a drop in incomes.

Well, the way things are going, I do think indeed that it will be very difficult for young people to get into farming with any hope of success. Agriculture will slow down and one day or another our production will not be sufficient and we will have to import. When a country imports too much food to satisfy its needs, it becomes dependant on others. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should not agree to a policy that is different for everyone. Because of a light surplus, the incomes of industrial milk producers are being reduced and on the other hand, as far as labour is concerned, wages are not reduced because there are 800,000 unemployed, because some people do not work. Those who do work are paid for what they do.

The same should apply to the dairy industry. To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I want to note that millions of dollars are being wasted in various departments for all kinds of reasons. One only has to check the accounts of the Auditor General to realize that there is mismanagement in many

places. When it comes to agriculture, they immediately say they cannot give more and farmers are being called a "bunch of bawlers".

People who cannot take care of their own affairs are always obliged to complain to the state. I wish these people who behave in this way would set an example by going to the country; let them buy a farm, make up a herd and show us their turnovers, which will enable us to check whether they can do better than those we are referring to today. It is a matter of simple reasoning and common sense.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we took a step backward today with this reduction of the incomes of industrial milk producers. In closing, I wish I will see the day when we can have in Canada a milk pool so that this dispute between fresh milk and industrial milk producers may come to an end. At that time, I believe we shall have a very valid solution to our problem and be able to hope that this industry will survive and that those who are involved in the dairy industry will receive higher incomes.

● (1610)

[*English*]

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, the minister giveth, and the minister taketh away. I asked a question of the minister a few months ago, and in it I pointed out that farmers this year are getting less than they did 18 months ago. That was denied, but I checked and it is true. A farmer staying within his quota—and goodness knows, without his quota he will get no money—will actually get 47 cents less than he got last year. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) says 46 cents, but I say 47 cents less.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, it all depends on what the production is. The farmers agreed with this policy, and agreed to pay the storage costs, the marketing costs of this product on the world market, etc., and we put in an extra $200 million last year. We are putting in an extra $49 million this year. We are putting approximately $84 million more into the dairy industry this year than last year. The cheques of dairy farmers may be less because they are paying—and they agreed to pay—for the world distribution of the surplus product. That is what they are involved in, and that is what the levy is for. That is what the hon. member is talking about. They will have to pay the extra levy. If the hon. member thinks I am happy about that, he is wrong. This is not all my doing. It is partly their doing and also the doing of the provincial marketing boards.

Mr. Ellis: The fact is that the farmer is getting less in his pay cheque every month than he was getting last year. In order to stay within the quota, I should like to ask the minister if there is any other way—other than in fact killing off producing animals—to cut back a farmer's quota in this dairy year.

Mr. Whelan: I do not fully understand what the hon. member means by "killing off" animals. We know that there were many dairy cows which should have been called from herds last year, and they were not mainly because, as was said by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wise), beef prices were low, so those cows were kept in production one year longer. We estimate that there are at the present time between 150,000 and 200,000 dairy cows which should be called from dairy herds. Whether they will be, I do not know; but we do know there is a larger number going to market at the present time because the price for kill cows is better than it has been for over two years. Good kill cows bring about 30 cents per pound. The hon. member is trying to intimate that we are giving dairy farmers less, and that the government cares less about dairy farmers. The reason I did not bring in this program before April 1 was that we were trying to work out the very best program we could.

It amounts to approximately $84 million more being put into this program. The farmers will have to pay part of that back, but they agreed to do so. The dairy farmers of Canada agreed to that kind of policy. It will create hardship for some dairy farmers; there is no doubt about that. But if hon. members are suggesting we should put in a few hundred million dollars more, they should say so.

Mr. McKinley: Mr. Speaker, regarding cheese imports, we know that they have been held at 50 million pounds this year. The minister mentioned that in his statement. What happens next year? The minister says he now has a long-term dairy policy. We have asked for that for years. But will he change the rules in the middle of the game next year? Will he go back to what he originally decided upon? Just how can people make plans for the future?

Mr. Whelan: Never before last year did we have an import control system. We initiated the import permit system for bringing specialty cheeses into Canada. Never before did we have that. It was hailed by dairy farmers and by the dairy processing industry as a good thing because they needed that protection. We said that we would work toward allowing increased imports into our country, but at the same time we also said we would work toward making Canada self-sufficient in its own dairy needs. That may sound contradictory, but we also made a statement to the effect that the figure will not increase above 50 million pounds this year.

We are also negotiating with the countries which are subsidizing those cheese products into Canada and trying to work out a proper program so that their treasuries will discontinue the high subsidization of some of those cheese products coming into Canada. As it stands, our cheese producers and dairy farmers cannot compete. I do not intend to allow this figure to increase, and as long as I am Minister of Agriculture I will work toward decreasing it and making sure that farmers do not have to compete unfairly with regard to these products.

These products come mainly from 16 countries, but as many as 27 countries export specialty cheeses to Canada. Some of them export in small amounts. Our processors would never process cheese in the minute quantities which are coming in, because it would not be economic for them. They have told me that with the present facilities for cheese manufacturing in Canada, the most they would be able to produce would be 75 per cent specialty cheeses.

● (1620)

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, the minister on more than one occasion has expressed his concern over the importation into Canada of heavily subsidized dairy products from abroad. He said at one point the government may be

prepared to take some action with respect to this. Assuming the minister is unsuccessful in persuading foreign governments who are currently subsidizing dairy products which they are dumping on the market in Canada, is the minister willing to make representations to his colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, to decrease the quota of cheese allowed to be imported into Canada?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, that was seriously considered. We thought of decreasing the quota from 50 million pounds to 40 million pounds of cheese a year. I work very closely with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and naturally his officials and mine are in consultation on this matter at all times. They are the ones who are trying to negotiate in this matter. The United States was successful in negotiating with the exporters of cheese to their country so that they no longer have highly subsidized cheese coming into the United States. Often the United States is pictured as having a great system of free marketing, but in fact they only allow 3 per cent of their dairy products to be imported into the country. Our country allows 5 per cent.

Mr. Beatty: What I am trying to get clear from the minister is how long he will continue to allow foreign countries to dump heavily subsidized dairy products on Canadian markets. When will the government be prepared to take action if these other countries refuse to change their policy, and when will the government decide to impose much greater restrictions on the importation of heavily subsidized dairy products into Canada?

Mr. Whelan: I think we must recognize that many of the cheeses that come into Canada are high-priced cheeses. We are negotiating in particular with countries which are exporting highly subsidized commodities to Canada. If we do not make the progress which I think we should, I will be recommending to my colleagues in cabinet that we take some other form of action to make sure that our producers do not have to compete in an unfair manner with this type of product.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I intend to put an end to these questions by recognizing the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), then the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), and finally the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain).

Mr. Beaudoin: Mr. Speaker, following the meeting the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) has had with his provincial counterparts, can he inform the House whether limits on margarine production, or butter substitute, as well as synthetic ice cream were discussed as they were before 1960? The minister knows, of course, that before 1960 the provinces had control over margarine production and volume. At the present time, I believe they have very little control and margarine accounts for an ever larger slice of the market.

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not discussed that with the provinces. We have discussed with them an advertising program to sell dairy products, not just put them on a shelf in some supermarket or dairy store and hope people will buy them. We have a high quality product which we think can be sold, and we just hope people will buy it. We know there are many uses for dairy products of which perhaps the public is not aware. For instance, even with the increase in the price of skim milk powder, people will be paying approximately 18½ cents for a 40-ounce drink. With one pound of skim milk powder you get four quarts of milk, which means that you have 40 ounces for 18½ cents. You could not even get the best soft drink at that price, and it would have none of the protein, minerals and vitamins that skim milk powder has.

● (1630)

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I will probably have to ask a twofold question, since I think my time is running short. The minister is aware of the representations which have been made by the federation that storage costs be fully absorbed by the government, and that the deduction not be increased but remain stable at 65 cents. If this deduction has gone up to $1.35, and the minister is referring to an additional credit of $84 million under the dairy policy, I figure that those $84 million the minister is referring to will be shared between the producer and the government. What thus would be the percentage the producer will have to contribute in those $84 million? Since the minister said that the producers had accepted these proposals, I would like him to tell us clearly whether the producers have accepted the program he has submitted to us this afternoon.

[*English*]

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I said in my presentation to the House earlier that it would be $24 million. In the past we have paid, automatically, $9 million in storage costs, etc., but this year it will be $24 million. However, the very fact that CIDA is putting $20 million into the program to take ownership of approximately 75 million pounds of skim milk powder will mean that dairy farmers will not have to handle storage, financing costs, holding charges, etc., for the product. On world markets that could mean between 75 million and 80 million pounds of skim milk powder sold, and this would alleviate the storage problem here and it would eliminate the surplus problem. The storage problem and costs are of great concern to producers, and CIDA's action in this respect will alleviate it greatly.

Mr. McCain: In order that the minister's program works, the provinces must know what the individual provincial quotas are, and the governmental structure of the commission itself must have ways and means of verifying the amounts of milk delivered province by province. Is the machinery in place so that each province will get its fair quota of milk, and can they be confident that the statistical reports in this regard will be accurate and fair?

Mr. Whelan: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because last year each industrial milk producer was on a strict quota. They will be monitored month by month and watched closely, something which could not be done in the dairy year 1975-76.

Order Paper Questions

[*Translation*]

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

CONCURRENCE IN NINTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Saint-Henri) moved that the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders, tabled in the House on April 7, 1976, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

[*English*]

REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

CONCURRENCE IN EIGHTH REPORT OF STANDING JOINT COMMITTEE

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants) moved that the eighth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments, presented to the House on Thursday, April 8, 1976, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

PROPOSED MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER FEES PAID BY BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE COMPANY RESPECTING BILL S-11

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 99, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds):

That the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders be authorized to consider and make recommendations upon the fees paid by the British Columbia Telephone Company in relation to Bill S-11.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member would require the unanimous consent of the House in order to present the motion at this time. Is the House agreed?

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If there is the unanimous consent of the House, perhaps we might put the matter over until a later date, at which time we would ask the permission of the House to revert to motions to deal with the matter.

Mr. Speaker: There not being unanimous consent, the motion cannot be put.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

[Mr. Whelan.]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,161, 4,162, 4,163, 4,440, 4,612, 4,769, 4,923, 4,943 and 4,949.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO QUEBEC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,161—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What are the criteria for admission of an inmate to the Quebec Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): The same criteria apply to all Regional Psychiatric Centres. The major group of cases which receives priority for psychiatric treatment is, naturally, those suffering from acute mental illness and then those whose illnesses are either sub-acute or chronic. This is comparable with the criteria used in any psychiatric treatment to such patients, the Psychiatric Centres of the Canadian Penitentiary Service have also been given the task of developing pilot treatment programs for such groups as sexual offenders, drug addicts and offenders with personality disorders.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO THE ONTARIO REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,162—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What are the criteria for admission of an inmate to the Ontario Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): See reply to Question 4,161.

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO PACIFIC REGIONAL PSYCHIATRIC CENTRE

Question No. 4,163—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

What are the criteria for admission of an inmate to the Pacific Regional Psychiatric Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): See reply to Question 4,161.

PROGRAMS IN PENITENTIARIES FOR PERSONS OF NATIVE ANCESTRY

Question No. 4,440—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Do penitentiaries have programmes for persons of native ancestry and, if so (a) which penitentiaries (b) what types of programmes and, in each case, are they staffed by the government or by volunteers from outside groups?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Yes. (a) Springhill Institution, Dorchester Penitentiary, Westmorland Institution, Millhaven Institution, Prison for Women, Collins Bay Institution, Regional Reception Centre (Ontario), Joyceville Institution, Warkworth Institution, Bowden Institution, Drumheller Institution, Rockwood Institution, Saskatchewan Penitentiary,

Saskatchewan Farm Annex, Stony Mountain Institution, British Columbia Penitentiary, Mountain Prison, Matsqui Institution, William Head Institution, Agassiz Correctional Camp, Robson Centre, Ferndale Institution, (b) Outside participants include community members and families. Native community organizations are awarded contracts to provide services to particular institutions by means of a Native Liaison Officer delegated by that organization. The programs consist in providing liaison services with native inmates, native communities and families of inmates. Some provide an alcohol and drug abuse training program. They help the inmate to maintain an identification with the people to native origin. The members are often involved in developing folklore and learning native crafts. The groups meet regularly and guest speakers are invited occasionally.

(a) and (b)

Order Paper Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE—STOLEN WEAPONS AND UNACCOUNTED INVENTORY LOSS OF WEAPONS

Question No. 4,612—**Mr. Whiteway:**

For the year 1975, were firearms or other military weapons stolen, or inventory unaccounted for in the Armed Forces and, if so, in each case (a) what was the model name, (b) how many, (c) what was the value?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): From the large number of fire arms used in the Regular Forces as well as in the Reserves and in the Cadet units including weapons lost on training exercises less than 20 weapons are currently unaccounted for. Details are set out in the following statement.

Summary of
Stolen Weapons and Unaccounted for Inventory Loss of Weapons
in the Canadian Forces During 1975

	Incident	Quantity	Weapon	Total value	Quantity recovered	Quantity unaccounted for	Value of unaccounted for weapons
1.	Lost from Militia Unit	1	9mm pistol	$252.	0	1	$252.
		1	9mm SMG C1	130.	0	1	130.
2.	Lost from Cadet Unit	3	.303 rifles (.22 bore)	105.	2	1	35.
3.	Lost from Militia Unit	1	.22 pistol	25.	1		
4.	Lost from Cadet Unit	7	.303 rifles (.22 bore)				
	245.	0	7	245.			245
		3	.22 rifles	159.	0	3	159.
5.	Lost from Militia Unit	1	9mm pistol	252.	1	0	
6.	Lost from Militia Unit	1	7.62 FNC2 rifle	328.	1	0	
7.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	1	9mm pistol	252.	0	1	252.
8.	Lost from Commercial Carrier	10	M61 Grenades	25.	10	0	
9.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	2	M61 Grenades	5.	2	0	
10.	Loss by Cadet Unit	1	.303 rifle (drill purpose)	35.	0	1	35.
11.	Loss by Militia Unit	1	7.62 FNC1 rifle	275.	0	1	275.
12.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	1	9mm pistol	252.	1	0	
13.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	1	7.62 FNC1 rifle	275.	1	0	
14.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	2	9mm pistols	504.	2	0	
		1	9mm SMG C1	130.	1	0	
15.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	1	9mm SMG C1	130.	1	0	
16.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	1	9mm pistol	252.	1	0	
17.	Training loss by Regular Force Unit	1	9mm SMG C1	130.	0	1	130.
18.	Lost from Regular Force Unit	1	9mm pistol	252.	1	0	
19.	Loss by Militia Unit	1	7.62 FNC2 rifle	328.	1	0	
		2	7.62 FNC1 rifles	550.	1	1	275.
		3	9mm pistols	756.	3	0	
		5	.22 rifles	265.	5	0	
		23	FN Breech Blocks	345.	3	20	300.
20.	Training Loss by Regular Force Unit	1	9mm SMG C1	130.	0	1	130.
				Total $6,387.			Total $2,218.

Order Paper Questions

(c) Total values of:

Lost weapons	$6,387
Recovered weapons	$4,169
Unaccounted for/not recovered weapons	$2,712

SECTION 7 OF POST OFFICE ACT

Question No. 4,769—**Mr. Symes:**

How many persons have had their mail service and mailing privileges revoked (a) under section 7 of the Post Office Act since such provision came into force, (b) for attempting to distribute hate literature through the mails?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): (a) Seventy-nine persons and/or firms. (b) Five persons and/or firms had their mailing privileges revoked for using the mails to distribute hate literature, actions taken under Obscenity Section 164 of the Canadian Criminal Code prior to section 281.2 being adopted as law in 1969. No action was taken under Section 281.2 of the Canadian Criminal Code (Hate Propaganda).

CONSUMER FRAUD

Question No. 4,923—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

Since January 1973, has the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or any other governmental agency responsible for products inspection imposed any fines on Canadian merchants guilty of consumer fraud and, if so, what (a) was the total amount, (b) was the total number of merchants involved, (c) was the number of merchants involved by province, (d) was the average amount of fines, by province, (e) use was made of the money derived from the fines?

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Since January 1973, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has prosecuted Canadian merchants for consumer fraud offences. The fines of course, were imposed by the courts. (a) $64,620; (b) 227; (c) Newfoundland, 3; P.E.I., 0; Nova Scotia, 2; New Brunswick, 1; Quebec, 113; Ontario, 93; Manitoba, 3; Saskatchewan, 7; Alberta, 4; British Columbia, 1; Total, 227. (d) Newfoundland, $200; P.E.I., not applicable; Nova Scotia, $137 New Brunswick, $50; Quebec, $230; Ontario, $275; Manitoba, $2,200; Saskatchewan, $421; Alberta, $175; British Columbia, $100. (e) The money derived from fines is put into the consolidated Revenue Fund for use by the government.

FATTAH REPORT

Question No. 4,943—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. What was the cost of Dr. Ezzat Abdel Fattah's report on public attitudes toward capital punishment in Canada?

2. How many persons did Dr. Fattah interview and, in each case, what was their (a) religion, (b) language, (c) age?

[Mr. Richardson.]

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. $5,762.

2. Dr. E. A. Fattah did not interview anyone. The report reviews the existing research literature on public attitudes towards capital punishment in Canada. This literature included a variety of systematic surveys of adults representing all major religion, language and age groups in Canada.

MR. MICHAEL McCABE

Question No. 4,949—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

1. Was the position of Assistant Deputy Minister in the Bureau of Consumer Affairs, recently filled by Mr. Michael McCabe, advertised and, if so (a) in what locations, (b) was a previous competition held for the same position prior to Mr. McCabe's appointment?

2. Did Mr. Michael McCabe run as a candidate for the Liberal Party at any time, either federally or provincially?

3. Has Mr. Michael McCabe worked previously for a cabinet minister and, if so (a) on what dates, (b) in what capacity?

Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. No, the position was filled following an internal competition within the Public Service. (a) Not applicable. (b) The previous incumbent was appointed as a result of a similar competitive process.

2. No.

3. Yes. (a) April 1963, June 1968. (b) Executive Assistant.

● (1640)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT (NO. 1), 1976

MEASURES FOR BETTER PROTECTION OF CANADIAN SOCIETY AGAINST CRIME

The House resumed, from Monday, April 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-83, for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Four-thirty.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being 4.30 o'clock, pursuant to order made Thursday, April 8, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) to Bill C-83, an act for the better protection of Canadian society against perpetrators of violent and other crime, and every question necessary to dispose of the second reading stage of the said bill. Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division.

(Division No. 125)

YEAS
Messrs.

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allard
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Beaudoin
Benjamin
Brisco
Cadieu
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Caouette (Témiscamingue)
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Darling
Dick
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Firth
Forrestall
Fraser
Friesen
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grafftey
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Holmes
Howie
Huntington
Jelinek
Johnston
Kempling
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lavoie
Lawrence
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacKay
MacLean
Macquarrie
Malone
Marshall
Masniuk
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinley
McKinnon
Mitges
Muir
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Sullivan
Paproski
Peters
Reynolds
Ritchie
Roche
Rondeau
Rynard
Schellenberger
Scott
Smith (Churchill)
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Marquette)
Watson
Whiteway
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—90.

NAYS
Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Anderson
Andres (Lincoln)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blackburn
Blais
Blaker
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campagnolo (Mrs.)
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Condon
Corbin
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Ethier
Faulkner
Fleming
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Haidasz
Harquail
Herbert
Holt (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Joyal
Kaplan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lee
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Loiselle (Saint-Henri)
Lumley
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Martin
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Parent
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Philbrook
Pinard
Portelance
Poulin

Adjournment Motion

Messrs.

Prud'homme
Railton
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Rooney
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Symes
Tessier
Trudeau
Turner
Yanakis
Young—129.

● (1650)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The question is on the main motion in the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it. The motion is carried on division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

● (1700)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt)—Finance—Monitoring of income of insurance agents in British Columbia—Government position; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) Trade—Effect of repeal of section 272 of Railway Act on flour and grain exports—Government action.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to order made Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills. Is it understood and agreed that the public bill standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Bill C-311, shall be considered at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Citizenship

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[*English*]

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE TIME OFF WITHOUT LOSS OF PAY FOR APPEARANCE IN CITIZENSHIP COURT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved that Bill C-311, to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act (time off without loss of pay for appearance in Citizenship Court), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-311 is a very short bill which would add just one new clause to the Canadian Citizenship Act. I think I could best indicate what the new clause would do if I were to read its actual wording, which is as follows:

An applicant for a certificate of citizenship who is required under any of the provisions of this Act to appear before the court, when such applicant is regularly employed during the time he is required to appear, shall be granted by his employer such time off work, up to a maximum of three hours for any one appearance, as may be necessary to enable the applicant to appear before the court, and no employer shall make any deduction from the pay of any such employee nor impose upon or exact from him any penalty by reason of his absence from his work for the length of time specified in this section, provided that the absence is for the purpose specified herein.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that those words as set out in Bill C-311 are proposed by the bill to be made a new section 29.1 of the Canadian Citizenship Act. The only change that would have to be made relates to the question of where that new clause would be inserted. As hon. members are aware, a new Canadian Citizenship Act is under way, Bill C-20; indeed it will be under debate later today.

When I suggest that the new clause be numbered 29.1, that is in relation to the act as it now stands. After all, I have no alternative but to seek to amend the law as it stands; I cannot at this point propose to amend a law that has not yet been passed. Offhand I would say that perhaps the best place to put this proposed clause in the new bill would be following clause 26. In other words, if it were made section 26.1 instead of 29.1 it would fit in the new bill quite appropriately.

I suggest that the idea contained in this bill is one of those good ideas—call it a motherhood provision if you wish—to which no one can really take any objection. Despite the difficulties that private members have in this hour with their bills, I hope that this bill will be looked upon sympathetically. Certainly I would have no objection if instead of passing the bill as it is, the House would refer the subject matter to the appropriate committee, but I hope that the House will be quite ready to accept the idea itself.

I have borrowed the idea from the Canada Elections Act. As all hon. members are aware, there is a provision in that legislation that permits an elector on election day to have a certain amount of time off work without loss of pay in order to enable him to cast his vote in a federal election. If—and I am sure we do—we regard the applying for and obtaining of Canadian citizenship an important matter, I think that those persons who take this step should be encouraged to go through with it, should be encouraged to appear before the court when they have to make an application, and should be encouraged to appear before the court when their citizenship certificate is granted. In some cases this does present a hardship, namely, that pay is lost. In the case of the Canada Elections Act, of course, we made a provision that could apply quite often in a person's lifetime. Here we are making a provision that could apply only once in a person's lifetime.

So, Mr. Speaker, I present the idea to the House. I do not think it needs to be argued at length; it is a very simple proposal. I have read the whole of the clause. As I say, the proposal is quite direct, namely, that applicants for citizenship who have to appear before a court of citizenship for any reason should be given up to three hours off work without loss of pay in order for them to make that appearance.

In the explanatory notes to the bill I have explained what it does, but I have this sentence at the end:

It is felt that persons seeking Canadian citizenship should be granted this recognition of the importance of the step they are taking.

That is the way I feel about it, Mr. Speaker. Applying for and obtaining citizenship is an important step, and this bit of recognition is well worth the favourable consideration of the House of Commons. I hope the House will pronounce favourably on the idea during this private members' hour.

Hon. Martin O'Connell (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has drawn to our attention a financial difficulty that may be faced by some applicants for citizenship in Canada. The question he has raised is well worthy of our attention—the possible financial cost of taking time off from work to appear before a citizenship court in the course of acquiring Canadian citizenship. He has said this is a very important step in the life of an applicant, as indeed it is. It is taken once in a lifetime. It is a very solemn moment not only for the applicant but, indeed, an important moment for all citizens of Canada. The hon. member has suggested we should give some recognition to that importance. I am going to argue that the government and the Parliament of Canada have given very great importance to that moment and, in fact, have taken more appropriate means than those suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to cope with what may be for some a financial difficulty.

● (1710)

The hon. member proposes that employers be required by law to grant up to three hours in time and pay for any one appearance by an applicant for citizenship. He suggests that such a requirement in our law would be similar to the requirement in the Canada Elections Act regarding time off and pay regulations. I think this is very different from that circumstance, as I will attempt to show in the course of my remarks.

While the hon. member's objective of removing any possible serious financial obstacle is a desirable one, the means proposed do not appear to me to be necessary nor, indeed, appropriate, and may in fact be of doubtful constitutional validity, although it is not on that latter point that I would rest my argument.

Other means have been developed and are in the course of being developed to accomplish the same thing; that is, to alleviate possible financial difficulties and to do this in a

way that does not transfer the burden to the employer. We should, therefore, assess rather carefully what appears on the surface to be an attractive proposal. We should assess how difficult or serious the problem is and whether it can be resolved better in some other way, as I believe it can, and whether in fact it is being resolved better in some other fashion, as I believe it is.

Under the present act, an applicant for citizenship must go to the office of the citizenship court on three occasions. He must go first to make an application and this involves documentation. On the second occasion, the applicant attends a hearing before a citizenship judge and this involves an assessment of whether the applicant meets the requirements of the act. On the third occasion, the applicant attends a presentation ceremony during which he or she takes the oath of allegiance.

The time-frame mentioned in the hon. member's bill is undoubtedly appropriate and covers any one or all of these three occasions when the applicant goes before one of the offices of the court, that is to say, three hours. Some of these occasions may be over within 15 minutes and some may in fact extend for roughly three hours.

What is being done currently to face up to the possible problem raised by the hon. member? Over the past three or four years the Department of the Secretary of State has developed an outreach program to meet the very problem raised by the hon. member, as well as to encourage landed immigrants to come forward with applications and to take that very important and solemn step of becoming a citizen of Canada. The outreach program consists of three services: first, storefront offices, second, mobile teams of examiners; third, night courts. One could add a fourth, the practice of the courts of scheduling appearances by appointment or arrangement. In addition to these outreach services, which I should like to describe at greater length, there are 15 citizenship courts in Canada and some 12 sub-courts to meet the convenience of applicants.

Let us consider for the moment the outreach services. The storefront offices have been established in the centres of greatest pressure, that is to say, in Toronto and Montreal where there are now four such storefront offices. They are open in the evenings and on weekends when applications for citizenship can be made. If the demand arises, the Department of the Secretary of State is prepared to extend these storefront offices to other locations; that is, the applicants can meet that first occasion or appearance where the pressure has been the greatest and where the demand is the greatest, and they can do that in a manner which does not involve loss of work time or pay. There are now four mobile teams of examiners operating in Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver and Hamilton. In these four cities some 78 per cent of all applications are currently received. These mobile teams also take applications in such prearranged locations as schools, community halls, places of work, and so forth.

These two services enable applicants to make their application at times convenient to them, with no loss of time whatever. They are available in cities where over three-quarters of citizenship applications are currently being received. Again, it is a service that may be extended if communities seek it, if volunteer organizations ask for it and demonstrate a need. These two services of the outreach program are in fact being used, so it is evident they are responding to a problem of the kind raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre but in a different way from that which he has proposed.

For example, in the most active of these storefront offices, the Dufferin Street store in Toronto, last year—and the office was open, I think, for only six months—some 12,536 applications were received. This represents something under one-fifth of all applications in Canada. They were received either during the day, if convenient, in the evening or on weekends without requiring any loss of work time to the applicants.

The two storefront offices in Montreal handled about one-quarter of the applications in that city; over 5,000 out of over 18,000 applications. The mobile teams in Toronto, in 1975, took over 2,400 applications—and this is a service which is still in the early stages of development. So these outreach services are in fact supplying an answer to a certain need, not only financial but of convenience.

In addition to the storefront offices and the mobile teams, the department has tried to respond to needs by establishing night courts, again to avoid inconvenience and unnecessary financial hardship. These night courts have been established mainly in Toronto on an experimental basis in response to an initiative taken in the community of Toronto. The night courts are not for applications but for hearings and for ceremonies, the other two occasions when applicants go to the offices of the citizenship courts.

● (1720)

Moreover, it is now practice in respect of citizenship courts to arrange appointment times for these hearings for applicants to avoid the situation where persons have to attend and wait for extended periods of time in a line-up. This meets the need of those who may be on shift work. Persons ask for the most convenient times for an appointment and arrangements are made. These night courts and arranged appointments should alleviate the kind of problem raised by the hon. member

Again, this is a service the department is prepared to extend to other communities should a request for such arise. It is perhaps natural that the request should have arisen first in Ontario, where over half of all applications occur, and that the first response would be made there because of the activity of voluntary associations which requested it. Such activities are open to other communities which wish to seek the same thing without, as I say, the necessity of passing a law of parliament which would place the cost on the employers of those applicants for citizenship.

Some problem may remain in respect of the visit to the court for the citizenship ceremony. However, this to some extent has been alleviated by the night courts in Toronto and by night courts which have in fact been held in other cities, although not as frequently as in Toronto but, again, in response to community pressure and requests. To the extent, therefore, that a problem may remain, it seems to relate rather to the state of the community organization and voluntary community association activity rather than to the absence of a means to respond. Some exploration, in fact, of the remaining problem in respect of the night courts is presently under way in Montreal. The department

is prepared to respond in a similar manner should the need and demand become effective. The first storefronts and mobile teams were established in Toronto about three years ago and, as I say, may be expanded into other cities.

There is a certain other argument which I think should be raised in this House relative to points made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I refer to the possible constitutional problem with regard to his proposal. His proposal, if adopted, might in fact be applicable in law only to companies which lie in the federal jurisdiction. It may be, if adopted, that it will not be applicable to companies that have been incorporated under provincial law and lie in the field of provincial jurisdiction.

In addition, I think the hon. member cannot argue that the granting of citizenship ranks in the same order or measure as general elections which establish this very parliament. The elections establish the government of the country. It is obviously an essential national process. It is a requirement of our constitution that elections be held at least every five years. It is a democratic need that all citizens be able to participate. It is very difficult indeed to extend that need to the citizenship process, which is an individual choice, an individual act which occurs once in a lifetime, important as it is for all of us. It is extremely difficult to extend that argument to Canadian elections to the circumstances of citizenship applicants. It is more a matter of convenience to the case of the hon. member, but it really weakens his case because of the doubtful constitutional validity on which it rests. There is a very evident difference between a general election and the taking of citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say this is an important problem. The problem is being met partly by means already developed and by means which are capable of extension by a department which took the initiative to meet this problem in innovative ways and is trying to bring the citizenship process to the people. This is a process which can be extended by community action in other cities in a better manner than through statutory or legal action by this parliament which in any case would be of doubtful constitutional validity.

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, at the outset permit me to establish my position. I will be opposing Bill C-311 because I do not feel we should have to pay people to become Canadian citizens. Certainly it would almost appear to be a shame for me this afternoon to have to oppose a private member's bill standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), a gentleman whom I respect greatly as a member of this House. Ever since I came here as a new member I have had great admiration and respect for the proposer of Bill C-311. However, as I shall demonstrate in my remarks I do not feel this to be a wise move or one in which the government should be involved. It would place an additional burden on the employer by requesting that he expend additional funds to allow persons desirous of becoming Canadian citizens time off from their duties.

During the vote this afternoon I had time to reflect on the fact that since it is so rarely that the New Democratic Party votes against our government, it is almost a shame that I have to speak against Bill C-311 as proposed by the

[Mr. O'Connell.]

hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, a member of that party.

However, one does wonder from time to time, when this type of suggestion is made in the House, whether it might just be another thread of the socialist fabric that we sometimes see appearing on the scene in Canada. Let me say, on behalf of the Liberal Party, that the buck stops here and we do not endorse or support this type of program. On the contrary, I would say we should be emphasizing and encouraging the necessity for greater productivity in this country. We have acknowledged and accepted our responsibility in this regard in this time of restraint. The restraint legislation, by the way, as stated by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and other authorities throughout the country is working, contrary to some of the mutterings by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark) and members on the other side of the House. However, it is always somewhat amusing to me to hear recommendations from the opposition parties for the spending of more money, or the spending of someone else's money, to be more precise.

● (1730)

Bill C-311 asks for a contribution of money to persons who aspire to be Canadians. That money will, of course, be spent by someone other than the New Democratic Party. It will be spent by employers and by people who will have to carry the burden.

Hon. members who have travelled throughout the world know only too well the feeling of pride one has on returning to one's native land. We acknowledge that pride when we think of the freedom, the good life, the prosperity, the availability of medicine and education, and all the excellent facilities and programs which are available to Canadians. I am hard put to understand why we should entertain Bill C-311 under which we would be reimbursing prospective Canadians.

I suppose it could be said, after listening to some of the allegations and innuendos from the other side of the House, that this could almost be considered a form of a bribe to entice an individual to become a Canadian. Perhaps that is an exaggeration, but there are some who have this type of warped mentality, and sometimes we witness it in the House.

However, if we consider this proposition, we would not want to support Bill C-311 because we would be encouraging a situation where we might be accused of offering some sort of incentive, which I suggest might be called a bribe, for someone to take on the great honour of becoming a Canadian citizen.

If we are going to encourage law, order, peace, security, and justice in Canada, as is the case we hope with the New Democratic Party, I think we should be urging programs which will encourage people to respect authority, to respect police, and to respect teachers in schools. That is the type of program we should be supporting, and we should not start new Canadians who are coming into the country and who want to become Canadians off on the wrong foot by giving them the impression that this is the way it works in Canada. They should not be given the impression that they can be paid to become Canadian citizens.

I think this is a weak proposition. It would only foster an attitude on the part of prospective Canadians that this country is weak and that everyone is paid or rewarded with money to do certain things. I believe anyone who sincerely wishes to become a Canadian, who meets all the criteria, who takes it upon himself to qualify and who takes the necessary steps to become a Canadian, should not in any way expect to be paid to do this.

When we consider the amounts of money which have already been expended by Canadians for citizenship courts, subcourts, store fronts and mobile teams operating across this country, together with other services rendered to prospective Canadians, surely we should not be asked to pay a potential Canadian to become a Canadian.

There are many people in my constituency who are from foreign countries and who have become Canadians. A good many of them are in the professions and would not expect to receive remuneration or monetary rewards for becoming Canadians. Those whom I have had occasion to befriend and with whom I have become acquainted have taken their places in Canadian society. In one particular family I can think of, the son is now a general practitioner in Halifax, and the daughter is a dietician. These people came to Canada and accepted it with all its beauty and opportunity. At no time did they expect any reward to be held out to entice them to become Canadians. They made the decision and sincerely wanted to become Canadians.

Once in private members' hour when one of my colleagues introduced a bill which would have involved the expenditure of money outside this country—I refer to the bill proposing construction of a road corridor in the United States—I was convinced then, and I still am, that it was my duty to speak against that bill because of the need for the upkeep and construction of highways in our own country, particularly with regard to the situation in my riding in New Brunswick. I found it necessary to speak against that bill, and I understand there will be another similar private member's bill soon, one which we expected to be before the House last week. The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) introduced that bill with respect to the proposed construction of a tunnel between Dartmouth and Halifax. I will attempt to be placed on the roster to speak against that bill because adequate moneys have already been expended in that area, something to the tune of $80 million, for existing bridges. I do not see any need for a tunnel. What I am leading up to is that when I see the type of proposition contained in Bill C-311, I am convinced that we must discourage it because it would be poor legislation.

In the time afforded to me I have expressed my disagreement, but I also wish to profit from this opportunity and to go on record, as a new member in this House, to say that notwithstanding my disagreement with Bill C-311, I have the utmost respect for the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question before he sits down?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Harquail: With just one qualification, provided it is a fair question.

An hon. Member: Forget it, then.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the fact that the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) views my bill, which would require employers not to deduct one's pay for the time spent appearing in citizenship court, as a bribe to persons to become Canadian citizens, how does he feel about the same provision in the Canada Elections Act, put there by the Liberal government, which permits people to take time off work without loss of pay in order to vote? Is that also a bribe?

Mr. Harquail: I believe I indicated that I would be disposed to respond to the question. With all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker—I will not be making a ruling—I wish to say that I agree with my colleague that the question is not in order and does not apply to what I said this afternoon. Let the record be clear that that is not what I said nor was it my intention to say that. That is contrary to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has just indicated. However, let me assure him—and I know he supports this and so has his party in the past—that we certainly take credit for most of the good programs we have introduced in the House, and when I say we I mean the Liberal party.

● (1740)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, is that the end of the debate on Bill C-311?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): No, the debate is still continuing.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to raise an issue which under the rules I am required to raise at the first opportunity following any incident that occurs in the House. I appreciate the hon. member's suggestion that perhaps my point is a question of privilege, therefore I will enclose my remarks within the ambit of a question of privilege also.

I appreciate the difficulty that any Speaker of the House has in the hub-bub that occurs in the Chamber on the taking of a second reading vote on any bill, but for the record I want to point out that at the end of the Chamber there were seven hon. members on their feet requesting that a recorded vote be taken on Bill C-83 this afternoon. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker was not able to determine whether those people were here or were leaving.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Under the rules the hon. member is not allowed to comment on votes which have already taken place. The hon. member should bring up his point of order tomorrow when Mr. Speaker is in the chair.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is to be congratulated for having brought forward this idea in the form of a bill. It is a thought expressed in the form of an amendment the content and thrust of which is irresistible.

It is positive and, as the hon. member himself said, it is in the category of motherhood proposals. We on this side of the House must admit and recognize that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is a grand master at that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am not a grand master, I am a grandfather.

Mr. Caccia: I cannot recall in the past eight years since 1968 one motion put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that did not fall into this category. The hon. member has a real ability to catch a certain idea and put it into legislation or into proposed amendments. Nevertheless it remains in the category of motherhood, and I will explain why I have come to this conclusion.

On examining the statistics on citizenship over the past 20 years I find that there are hundreds of thousands of Canadians who became citizens in the course of time since Canadian citizenship has been made available, and they have done this regardless of whether or not they lost a day at work. To them Canadian citizenship was important enough to disregard any monetary consideration. When you decide to acquire it, for reasons that are different from individual to individual and therefore for which there is no set, general law, you set you mind on it and you obtain it no matter what.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: I fully understand the best intentions of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but somehow I believe that a measure such as this one would cheapen the whole concept of the acquisition of Canadian citizenship, and I will explain why. Over the past 10, 15 and 20 years good employers have had a sense of pride in being Canadian and have done what the hon. member is proposing here today. So in that sense the proposal has already been adopted by people who are usually regarded as good employers. Those who are lousy employers—excuse that expression, Mr. Speaker—still do not recognize this fact and withhold the wages or salaries of those who go to acquire Canadian citizenship.

In order to meet these situations, which unfortunately still occur but which are rapidly disappearing, which arise because of these bad employers who are so narrow minded that they do not see that the day when a new Canadian acquires his citizenship is a day to celebrate, and therefore requires that recognition on the part of the employer who will say, "All right, Pasquale, or Joe, or whatever, go down town and get your citizenship; this is our way of recognizing this great day in your life", the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) has carried out a number of additional measures which were already so clearly and effectively outlined by the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. O'Connell).

Our hope on this side of the House is that these programs, such as Outreach, Storefronts, and the other fancy names that go with them, will not be limited only to large metropolitan centres like Montreal and Toronto but will also be implemented in centres such as cities in western Ontario where a large number of new Canadians live, and where services of this kind would be most definitely well received. There would probably be a constant need for them for a number of years to come, not only in southwestern Ontario but also in the west and perhaps in the east.

When listening to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre I could not help asking myself—and I must say in advance that my thought was not totally serious—why should there not be a bill that would legislate compensation for loss of wages when a person goes out to get married? Indeed, why not? The day you become a Canadian citizen is almost like your wedding day. You have decided that your relationship with your motherland should evolve into a new relationship with the country of your choice, namely, Canada, to which you are in a way becoming married on the day on which you acquire Canadian citizenship. I am the first one to admit that the similarity is somewhat shaky, nevertheless it has some validity because it is an event of such importance in an individual's life. Therefore to talk about loss of pay on such a day does not do justice to the event itself and to the idealism of the person who decides to become a citizen and therefore is ready to give up certain hours and a certain amount of income, and in fact even pays a $20 fee for the fine privilege of becoming a Canadian citizen.

Let us look at something greater than just money, particularly in the process of acquiring Canadian citizenship.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caccia: I should like to conclude my remarks—because I know others would like to speak—by saying that when applying for Canadian citizenship I can see a matter of greater concern than the matter of loss of pay. I look with great concern at the requirement, which is being introduced in the new bill which will soon be before us for debate in the House, for adequate knowledge of one of the official languages on the part of applicants and candidates for Canadian citizenship. I have looked at this matter with great distress and a deep sense of uneasiness, because from my experience over the years I have learned that Canadian citizenship involves more than facility in an official language and knowledge of the history and geography of the country.

● (1750)

Many new Canadians came to the east, central Canada, and the west before the first world war, between the wars, and after the second world war. Many never acquired command of or fluency in one official language, let alone adequate knowledge of it. They have not learned the capital cities of provinces or the lengths of certain rivers, but functioned well as citizens in their communities. They have raised families, sent children to school, respected the law, paid taxes, and been active in church and secular associations in their community. And they did this often without knowing English or French, history or geography. But they were damned fine citizens, even though they lacked scholastic, theoretical knowledge.

I have made known my concerns, as they are important. These matters should be aired in the debate on the bill sponsored by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre whose intentions, I am sure, are of the best and whose fine parliamentary record we all respect.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be brief and allow other hon. members time to speak. Frankly, this proposed measure reminds me of the Canada Elections Act. This is an urban-oriented, you might say union-sponsored type of bill. It is like a fringe benefit under some wage agreement. What about the man from Spirit River who must go to Grande Prairie? His journey will take a whole day. He must be prepared to take the whole day off.

I agree with something the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) said. Canadian citizenship is an important matter. Yet coming out of his mouth some of the things he said sounded strange, as did the applause of the hon. member's colleagues. Tonight we shall debate Bill C-20, which will provide for the downgrading of the citizenship ceremony. It says that in many instances the ceremony can be performed across a desk. The bill removes the discretion of the judge in the citizenship court. The grant of citizenship will become an act of ministerial administration. What utter nonsense! I hoped that the hon. member for Davenport would insist on the dignity of the ceremony in court when new Canadians, in open court, before fellow citizens and friends, renounce their allegiance to their countries of origin.

I have participated in more citizenship court ceremonies than any member of this House. Since citizenship courts came into being I have made it a regular practice to appear in citizenship court ceremonies in Edmonton. One must be impressed at the attitude with which candidates for Canadian citizenship approach the final ceremony. One sits with great pride alongside the president of the court, on the bench, and sees the emotion, in young and old, when people go through the ceremony. One sees people who have been here above 40 years and now wish to take out Canadian citizenship. With great pride they repeat after the president of the court the oath of allegiance. I fear that, deliberately, we shall downgrade that ceremony.

I join hands with the hon. member for Davenport in saying that a man will be compensated in many cases if he will make this voluntary gesture affecting his status. But nobody is going to pay the Dutch farmer who must travel many miles to Edmonton from some outlying area. Farmers will not get paid. Why should anybody else get paid for this sort of thing? Why should anyone be paid, by law, for an exercise in good Canadian citizenship? I agree with the hon. member for Davenport. I think the reasonable employer will be the first to encourage the employee to take out citizenship as soon as possible. Only the most hardhearted employer will refuse his employee time off; and frankly he should be publicly criticized for his attitude. Or the employer will refuse when a collective agreement is narrowly interpreted by the business agent of a union. In those cases the employer will react in the same way.

Normally when a husband and wife want a little time off in order to sign papers for purchasing a house, the average employer says, "Surely to goodness the enlightened employer will give his employee time off to do these things. If in some industrial cities there are to be special night sittings of the citizenship court, that too will be a good way of doing it.

My final word—I see it is almost six o'clock—is this: in no way should the citizenship ceremony be downgraded. The discretion should be that of the judge and the award of citizenship should not be a mere administrative act. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

QUARANTINE ACT

AMENDMENT TO EXTEND APPLICATION TO DANGEROUS DISEASES

Hon. Otto E. Lang (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill S-31, to amend the Quarantine Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Lang (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a very few comments before the final adoption of this bill. It has received active scrutiny by members on all sides of this House. The standing committee concerned examined witnesses from the private sector as well as carefully examining government officials. We have had, as well, the benefit of study by members of the other place. We are very grateful for the attention they paid to the bill.

It is significant that the bill has proceeded to this point with no amendments being put forward either in the other place or here. I want to say on behalf of the minister that he is grateful for the co-operation and the interest shown by all members. We look forward to the final adoption of this bill, to its early proclamation, and to an opportunity to put the bill into effect.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take too much time. We have already discussed this bill in some detail when it was before the House at second reading. However, I want to express a few reservations about some of the inadequacies which surround the bill.

When the bill was first presented in the House, the parliamentary secretary indicated that it was largely to allow Canada to prepare for two large international events to be held in Canada this year, namely, the Habitat Conference in Vancouver and the Olympic Games in Montreal. Strangely enough, when the parliamentary secretary appeared before the committee, and indeed others, they tended to deny that this bill had anything to do with these two major movements of people in and out of this country in one year. It struck me as rather strange that, for some reason, they were afraid to tell us that this bill is going to have a significant bearing on these two conferences or, vice-versa, that these two conferences had a significant bearing on the bringing forward of this bill.

The bill proposes to give the minister and his officials some extraordinary powers to detain people at the port of entry, or anywhere within this country, if they have sufficient reason to believe those people may have been exposed to some communicable disease, whether it is one listed in the international agreement or some other one which is not listed.

Mr. Paproski: They are going to find many.

Mr. Yewchuk: That is right. I was not satisfied with the explanations provided by the parliamentary secretary. Indeed he was somewhat reluctant to let the officials speak on this bill in committee and insisted on answering the questions himself. I must say I was not all that confident in his expertise on these matters.

It appears that one of the diseases which the government seems to be worried about is the one known as Lassa fever, a virus disease found largely in west Africa, generally along the southern portions of the Sahara Desert. We found from testimony before the committee that Canada has a number of people involved in CUSO working in these regions. I am quite concerned about the fact that there does not appear to be adequate protection for those working in that area, particularly because of the lack of proper facilities for treatment, and indeed for isolation, and perhaps for some other reasons.

A couple of years ago Canada made an application to the World Health Organization to have Lassa fever placed on the list of communicable quarantinable diseases for international purposes. The World Health Organization rejected this application. They said in no uncertain terms that the reason, which was based on the advice of many experts, was that quarantine as far as is known is of no value from the point of view of containing the spread of this particular disease.

We also discovered during the investigation of this bill that even if we wanted to quarantine those whom we suspected of having been exposed to Lassa fever, and perhaps of having Lassa fever in the early stages as they come into this country, we do not have the facilities in which we could safely quarantine them. This is a matter of great concern to me because the approach we are using here is not to try to prevent people from coming but to delude ourselves that we can look after them once they get here, isolate them, and thus protect our own population. This happens to be a completely erroneous assumption.

• (2010)

The fact is that if someone comes into this country with that disease we have no way of protecting the people of Canada from it simply because it is not amenable to containment through quarantine. It is my impression that the officials of the Department of National Health agree with that proposition. I believe we should be looking at something different.

If we are concerned about that disease being brought into Canada perhaps we should consider the possibility of not allowing people to come here if they have been exposed to it, or if we have reasonable grounds to believe they may be carriers. I am not satisfied the government has considered the possibility of excluding these people rather than allowing them to come and pretending that we can isolate them safely, when in fact we cannot. Both Britain and the United States go much farther in this direction than we presently do. For example, those countries reserve the right to prevent arriving passengers from disembarking from aircraft. Suspected cases are sent back to their country of origin which then has the responsibility of dealing with them.

As to our own overseas workers it would appear from evidence given by a representative of CUSO that some of them are presently exposed to unusual danger and that the Government of Canada is taking virutally no steps to protect their health. There seems to me to be some confusion as to what should be done if one of our workers in Africa acquired Lassa fever—whether he or she would be treated there or brought home. No one was able to tell us in the committee what would happen, and I think that was rather a poor showing. It seems to me the people of Canada deserve an explanation of what the contingency plan might be. The CUSO workers themselves deserve some kind of reassurance and a clear-cut statement on what they can look forward to if they should contract this disease. There was a suggestion that an educational program might be aimed at people working in this area designed to enable them to increase their ability to protect themselves. This might be useful, but as far as I can gather there is no such program in existence at this time.

We are left then with a situation in which the government proposes changes in the Quarantine Act. I have no objection to the changes which are proposed, but I do object to the fact that the government is basing the case for those changes on the premise that the legislation will protect the population from strange and unusual diseases whereas, as I say, it will simply not do that. We know from our experience with Lassa fever in particular that workers involved in a facility where a patient is held acquire the disease themselves at a fairly high rate, whether they are attendants on the ward or laboratory workers trying to isolate a virus. So while we do not object to the passage of this legislation—it could be useful in many ways—we are expressing reservations about the government's lack of action with reference to certain specific diseases which were mentioned during the course of the study of this bill.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I think it is useful that the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) should have placed on record the concerns he feels. He has done so both in the standing

committee and here in the House. Even so, I note that he and his colleagues are prepared to give this bill third reading, and that is our position. On balance we feel the government should have the extra authority set out in the bill to cope with strange and unusual diseases, and our examination of the text does not cause us any concern as far as civil liberties and rights of that kind are concerned. We are therefore prepared to support the motion for third reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH CONDITIONS AND PROVISIONS GOVERNING CITIZENSHIP

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-20, respecting citizenship, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Benno Friesen (for Mr. Jarvis) moved motion No. 1:

That Bill C-20, an act respecting citizenship, be amended in Clause 5 by

(*a*) striking out the word "and" in line 38 at page 4

(*b*) striking out line 42 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"section 18; and

(*f*) in the opinion of a citizenship judge, is not shown to be of other than good character."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in addressing the House on the report stage of this bill. We have been through the committee stage, and again it was an experience of mixed ennui and surprise. The surprise stemmed from the fact that the minister chose to introduce a number of amendments at the committee stage which we had not anticipated. Certainly I am not critical of some of the amendments that have been made which were very necessary. Others were housekeeping and simple editorial amendments. For example, I will commend him for closing the loophole in regard to deportation orders.

Another very substantial change to the bill deals with assigning jurisdiction to the provinces for land ownership in the case of non-resident aliens. I think this is a much needed amendment, one that needed to be dealt with since this has become a matter of great concern all across Canada.

● (2020)

It was also an experience in ennui in that we had a repetition of what occurred when we were dealing with Bill C-58. Again the minister very tightly organized the number of witnesses who were to appear. In this case something like four witnesses were allowed to appear before the committee. None of the witnesses whom members of opposition parties wanted to appear before the committee were allowed to appear. I remember specifically the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) recommended to the committee that we hear one of the judges, but this raised the hackles of government members. We could not by any means offend any of the regulations, even though it had already been pointed out that a precedent in this regard had been set. Therefore some of the people who could have given us a wealth of experience, information, and sound guidance in discussing the amendments were kept out.

Still the government blithely keeps repeating that it wants legislation that is in the best interests of all Canadians. As I say, Mr. Speaker, under a pre-structured committee system where government members are asked to vote preferably without thinking about what they are voting on, and where opposition members are not allowed to bring in any suggestions that would at all disturb the neat orderliness of the minister and his members, it was once again an exercise in ennui.

As is his custom, the minister gave us a copy of the statement that he presented to the committee, which I appreciated because it gave us an opportunity to deal in a concrete way with his point of view. It also gave us an opportunity to review the amendments that he was presenting, as well as some of the original provisions of the bill.

In addressing myself to the bill I want again to deal with what the minister said. I might add that the amendments, he presented to the committee during committee stage made the bill, in the language used in this House, not substantially the same as it had been but very substantially different. The minister began with one of the arguments that has been a concern of members on both sides of this chamber. He said:

It—

That is the bill.

—clearly lays down certain steps the applicant must follow and certain qualifications the applicant must satisfy. Upon satisfaction of those conditions, then citizenship should follow as a right.

The operative term used by the minister there, one that expresses his philosophy, is that citizenship is a right. There is where I disagree violently with the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner). I would point out that if citizenship really is a right, then it contradicts the bill itself. The Canadian Citizenship Act provides an elaborate procedure whereby a prospective citizen has to come before a quasi-judicial board and a judge in order for his case to be heard, and by that process become a citizen. Yet the minister says that upon satisfaction of certain conditions that are laid down in the act, citizenship shall follow as a right. In other words, it is an automatic process.

The most obvious question we must ask ourselves is this: if all one has to do is to meet the qualifications on the application form for citizenship and the criteria that the minister has laid down before citizenship follows as a right, why do we need a citizenship judge in the first place? Why go through the judicial system to provide citizenship for our immigrants? As I have said, it is a contradiction in terms.

When I was serving on the special parliamentary committee on immigration, commonly called the green paper committee, I remember very clearly that one of our witnesses was the chairperson of the Immigration Appeal Board. She was a very astute woman who had a lot of experience in immigration as well as citizenship.

One of the members of the committee at that time spoke about providing leave to appeal to an immigrant before deportation. His argument was that landed immigrants or prospective landed immigrants should have the right of leave to appeal. The chairperson of the Immigration Appeal Board very wisely contradicted him and pointed out by means of a very good analogy that this certainly is not the case. She used the analogy of a gate to the yard before one even enters the house. She said there is nothing stopping anyone from knocking at the gate to ask permission to enter the yard and then to enter the house. That is the right of every prospective immigrant who comes to this country. We always want to adopt a welcoming attitude to immigrants. But there is no right to enter, just as there is no right for anyone to enter upon your personal property or enter your private home. Entering the yard or entering the home is more a privilege, not a right.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, why does the minister insist that citizenship is a right when it contradicts the very process by which an applicant gains citizenship? If it is a right, why go through this whole process? It seems to me that the host country, Canada, has the right, indeed the obligation, to examine each applicant and to refuse those she chooses not to accept.

The minister went on to add in his statement:

As a corollary to this second great principle of citizenship as a right we have built into the law the possibility of forgiveness of certain conditions at certain times. The main reasons for this is that I and my predecessors responsible for Canada's citizenship law have, through the years, received letters from unfortunate people who have somehow got tangled up in the machinery of government through no fault of their own or the circumstances of whose birth and subsequent movements around the world have been such that no framers of law could have predicted.

I will readily concede, Mr. Speaker, that under any kind of system or law, circumstances might arise which would bring about unfortunate results for some applicants who apply for citizenship.

The minister is reserving unto himself the right of forgiveness. As the amendment I am proposing tonight points out, the minister has already taken away that right at this point from the judges. They are not supposed to make any assessments of character of applicants who appear before them. The minister wants to have that privilege go in the opposite direction. If there is someone who feels he has been unjustly treated by the process, he wants the opportunity to forgive him some of those things that would hinder his becoming a citizen. He wants to be granted that privilege, and I suppose that is his right as a minister of the Crown. At the same time, why take away some of the prerogatives of judges who are now performing a very good and useful function? As a matter of fact this could take away some of the burdens from the minister in the later stages of the application.

● (2030)

The minister went on to say that the bill gives him certain limited powers of forgiveness, and gives to the governor in council the power to help people for compassionate reasons. He then assures us that this latter power will be used with great care. I have become somewhat cynical of this kind of assurance. It is not good enough for me to have a minister tell me that he promises not to abuse these powers but that they will be used with great care. If that is the case, then why not outline these powers within the act so that we know exactly how the minister is going to use them?

We have all too many examples in our country of people who have come here not for the welfare of Canada but for selfish or spurious reasons, not thinking of the good of our country at all. I am thinking especially of one who gained national notoriety about a year ago, a man by the name of Hardial Baines, an openly avowed Marxist. He came to this country 16 years ago, he is a landed immigrant, he applied for citizenship and was refused, but is still in the country. He openly speaks of the need for people to revolt against the capitalistic form of government. Are we to forgive that kind of man? Why is he still in the country? There is no measure in this bill or in the Immigration Act that provides powers to deport those people who have gained landed immigrant status, who have been refused citizenship, and who remain in the country. Nothing of that sort is in here.

The minister went on to say that this issue is one that quite frankly surprises him, referring to this reduction in residence requirement from five to three years. Why this should surprise him I do not know, unless he has been speaking only to those people in Peterborough or some areas of Toronto. I assure you that is not the unanimous opinion across Canada. As a matter of fact in my last mailing to my constituency I had as one of my questions whether they felt in their opinion the citizenship requirements as to residence should be reduced from five to three years. While I have not finished the entire tally, I can tell you that even on a partial tally the response has been two and a half to one in favour of maintaining the five-year limit.

Members in the House will perhaps realize from the questions I have asked in this Chamber that I have a lot of immigrants in my riding, people who have come to Surrey-White Rock within the last two or three years. These people are saying we should keep this at five years. In fact I have had letters suggesting it should be seven. I think there are some very sound reasons for maintaining the five-year residence requirement. Let me take a minute or two just to rehearse some of these reasons for the edification of the minister who is here tonight.

An hon. Member: Why don't you move an amendment?

Mr. Friesen: The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) would like me to move an amendment. That just might come, but I would assure the hon. member that he does not need to prompt us for too long to get that kind of amendment.

The minister says there are some people who are ready to become citizens within three years. I do not deny that. There are a good many people who are ready for citizenship within three years. In fact there are some who are ready as soon as they arrive, and no one would deny that. Some people who have fled from very authoritarian governments felt the breath of freedom as soon as their feet touched the shores of Canada. They are thoroughly in love with the democratic system as we enjoy it here, and are ready for citizenship as soon as they come. If they are ready when they arrive and ready three years later, surely

they will still be ready in five years time. Those are the very people who appreciate citizenship so much and appreciate being members of the Canadian family to such an extent they are completely willing, perhaps inpatient at times, to wait five years before officially becoming Canadian citizens.

There was a time when immigrants coming to Canada were predominantly from Commonwealth countries. They were thoroughly familiar with the kind of parliamentary system as we practise it here, and as it is practised in other Commonwealth countries. It is completely understandable that those people from Commonwealth nations would be so familiar with our form of government as to be ready for citizenship within five years and, conceivably, ready within three years or less. The pattern of immigration has changed very much in the last decade and we can no longer assume that the majority of the people coming to our shores are familiar with our form or government.

Mr. Lang: But they are fast learners.

Mr. Friesen: They are fast learners. Thank you, Mr. Minister of Transport. There is something you do not learn through speed reading, and that is tradition. If the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) can speed read tradition I should like him to give the formula to a lot of immigrants who come to our shores. They would love to have it.

Mr. Lang: Their desire is all we need.

Mr. Friesen: Their desire is all we need, the minister suggests. It seems to me it would be helpful to all prospective citizens to experience at least one federal election so as to become totally familiar with our process of government. It may be in the intervening years government members could pick up a few votes, and perhaps—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not wish to limit the hon. member's time, and he is entitled to 40 minutes as mover of the motion, but I want to bring to his attention that he has spent a good portion of his time on subjects away from the subject matter of the motion before us. The amendment has to do with the character of the applicant, and I think the hon. member should return to the subject matter.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, as you say, the amendment has to do with the good character of the applicant. I am speaking of those ingredients that contribute to the good character of our immigrants and our citizens, so I do feel I am on topic.

As I was saying, I think it would be good for prospective citizens to experience at least one federal election compaign in order to know a little bit more of what our system is all about.

Why is it we think we are injuring people by asking them to wait for five years? The minister wants to make it as easy as possible, and this is where the amendment comes into play. The minister at the committee raised a point regarding Clause 5, sub-clause (1), paragraph (*b*), sub-paragraph (i) regarding the matter of residency required. The operative part states:

(i) for every day during which he was resident in Canada before his lawful admission to Canada for permanent residence he shall be deemed to have accumulated one-half of a day of residence,—

● (2040)

The minister was the picture of injured innocence in the committee when he raised the matter that we would object to that particular clause in the bill whereby someone could come to Canada and receive half credit for the time he was here before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret that I must remind the hon. member that my interpretation of the rule of relevancy is not the same as his. I believe he should come back to the motion. The amendment the hon. member was defending so well at the beginning is very far away from the section to which he is referring at this time. I think the amendment is very narrow in scope and reflects mainly on the good or bad character of the applicant, and not the time he is in Canada.

Mr. Stollery: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would entertain a question.

Mr. Friesen: I did not hear the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member asked if the member who has the floor would accept a question.

Mr. Friesen: After I have completed my speech I would entertain a question. Mr. Speaker, I will show you that really I have not been moving away from the amendment. It really is apropos of what I have been saying. I was relating to the fact that the minister wants to give half credit to people who have been here in this country before they are here officially as landed immigrants.

We have had experience in the last decade in respect of people who have been here unofficially or without permission before they received landed immigrant status. The minister himself alluded to such cases. In the last decade thousands of people have illegally come to Canada. I might refer to the American draft dodgers who in many cases may have been fine, upright, and upstanding young men. However, they were here illegally.

While these people were here they were granted landed immigrant status in one fell swoop and, presto, chango, they were legitimate residents. According to this bill in three years they would qualify to become citizens. I suggest that although there may have been some very fine prospective citizens among those thousands of people who came to Canada, at the same time there may have been many of them whose reasons for coming to Canada we do not know. Were those reasons spurious; were they legitimate? Were these genuine conscientious objectors, or were they afraid of war, or were they here because their parents did not want them to go to Viet Nam? They were here illegally, but it was not long after they were here illegally that they became legitimate landed immigrants.

According to the bill before us there is no process by which the judge can assess whether or not the person appearing before him should qualify. According to this bill, with the deletions of the minister, the judge does not have the prerogative to examine a particular applicant to deter-

mine whether or not he should be admitted to Canada as a citizen. This is the matter which I believe must be raised. For this reason I believe the amendment I have submitted to the House should be considered. I believe it is a sound amendment. We need to give the judges the kind of authority that will ensure that the people who come to Canada and become part of our family are the kind of people who are here because they are interested in our country.

Many things have changed in the last few years that have induced people to come to Canada. We know that for the first 100 years, or for the first 200 years of the life of our nation there were thousands of people who came to Canada because they saw it as a land of opportunity, because of all the advantages it would provide for them—the freedom that exists here, the opportunities there would be for their children and their grandchildren, and the economic possibilities. Then within the last 60 years events around the world changed the nature of immigration. The seven days in Russia in 1917 changed entire immigration patterns around the world because one of the fundamental tenets of the Russian revolution was that there was a need incumbent upon a good communist to export the revolution. One cannot call himself a good communist if he does not in fact militantly try to export the revolution.

I was a member of the committee which studied the green paper on immigration. Hearings were held across Canada. When we were in that great bastion of free enterprise, Edmonton, Alberta, we saw, as we did in other cities, demonstrations in front of the hotel where the meetings were held. These were demonstrations by members of the Maoist organization.

Mr. Nystrom: Conservatives.

Mr. Friesen: These were Maoists. My hon. friend would know them. Not only were we called verbally fascist pigs but were called the same thing by bulletins and newspapers which were passed out. One of the handbills passed out announced the next Maoist meeting for the purpose of reorganizing their troops in order to attack the fascist pigs who were coming to the immigration meetings. Mr. Speaker, do you know where this next meeting was to be organized? It was to be organized at the office of the Company of Young Canadians in Edmonton, an organization which this minister was supporting in his budget until a few months ago.

I suggest there are men and women who want to become citizens of Canada who are not necessarily men and women of good character who are here for our interests. They are not interested in the welfare of Canada. The committee on energy went to the northland. It visited Yellowknife. There the members of the committee met a couple of workers who were working very piously for the members of the Dene nation, supported by Mr. Mel Watkins and also supported by the Secretary of State. He was there supporting the Dene nation. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we have not heard the last of that.

I am simply illustrating the fact that not everybody who comes to Canada necessarily is thinking of the welfare of this country when he does come here. We need to provide for the judge the kind of power that will give him the authority to make a decision concerning whether or not such a person should be admitted even though on paper, as the minister suggests, he meets all the qualifications. There ought to be some way in which the judge would be able to decide right there and then whether this person will contribute to the welfare or to the harm of our nation.

I would recommend to the House the acceptance of this amendment because I think it is a good and wholesome step in order that we might ensure the preservation of a Canada that will be integrated, harmonious, and co-operative, and which will provide for us a reservoir of citizens who will look out for our welfare.

● (2050)

Mr. Stollery: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member informed me that he would entertain a question after his speech. He suggested that the time required for citizenship should have some relation to general elections. Over the past 20 years in Canada there have been general elections every two to two and a half years. How does he equate that with his four year term for general elections? I should like to hear his response because I think since 1957 elections have come every two to two and a half years.

Mr. Friesen: Very simple, Mr. Speaker. The way this government is performing it will not have an election before it has to, and that will be in 1978 or 1979. By that time the three years will have elapsed, and many more people will have qualified.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to commend the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) for moving the amendment to Bill C-20. I intend to make some comments on the amendment. Throughout the debate on Bill C-20 one of the underlying factors which has affected the thinking of many hon. members is that Canada has been a receiving country of immigrants for the last number of years, with an average immigration of approximately 200,000 per year, so the question of how a person who wants to become a Canadian citizen can become one is a little critical. In the debates at second reading and during committee stage frequent comparisons were made with other countries, especially in view of the reduction of the residency requirement from five years down to something less, in this case, three years. Comparisons were made with countries which have very few immigrants. Those countries are not considered receiving countries.

During the debate at second reading and at committee stage a number of people wrote to me and, I imagine, to other hon. members as well, expressing the fear that we are moving toward a bureaucratic citizenship, or what some referred to as rubber stamp citizenship. When the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) appeared before the committee he gave a fair amount of attention to the fact that once certain conditions and requirements are fulfilled, citizenship is a right. I think this is also an area in which we disagree, not only with regard to immigration but also with regard to citizenship.

Many of us feel that immigration and citizenship are privileges which are bestowed upon individuals by this country. Granted, there are certain conditions whereby an immigrant can come into Canada. There are conditions whereby a landed immigrant can become a citizen. I accept that, but I prefer the system where judges grant citizen-

ship only after certain qualifications have been met, including the qualification of good character. I am fearful that we are moving toward an across the counter citizenship, or as some people have said, rubber stamp citizenship.

I should like to come directly to the amendment, which reads as follows:

(f) in the opinion of a citizenship judge, is not shown to be of other than good character.

In his presentation to the committee on February 24 the minister suggested that the qualification of good character was too hard to determine. In other words, there is not a set norm, and therefore, it being arbitrary, he felt that that consideration should be removed from the legislation. The argument was that it was too arbitrary, too subjective, and that the evaluation simply would not stand up in a court of law. I believe those were the three arguments the minister made to us at that time. He also mentioned that with regard to the question of good character an applicant could be refused citizenship, to use the example quoted by the minister, if he towed a person on water skis without another person keeping watch, which is a criminal offence. After that conviction the qualification of good character could be judged as not having been fulfilled and the application at least held in abeyance. On the other hand I think there is some merit in the suggestion that at the present time violations of the Criminal Code or the Narcotic Control Act should be retained.

I think this amendment also addresses itself to the problem of good character, which is just another extrapolation of the provisions as they presently stand in the bill. I gave this concept a fair amount of thought, and I also had difficulty on how to judge good character. I suppose we all have our own standards, but to my mind that condition should remain. A citizenship judge who has been given the responsibility to evaluate people, once the criteria in the act have been established, should be able to make the judgment.

There was very interesting testimony given in the committee, and one person who appeared before the committee expressed it rather well. He might not have had an exhaustive list of good character traits, but I will refer to the testimony which was given before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts on Thursday, March 4.

This testimony was given by, I believe, a constituent of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), who has been a very strong proponent of the bill and who does not like the arbitrary concept of good character. The witness gave a very good definition of how this condition would work. The person was Mr. J. Carraro, director of social services for the Labourers International Union of North America, local 183. Mr. Carraro was a strong supporter of the provision in Bill C-20 wherein the five year residency requirement is reduced to three years. I will be very frank about this. On the one hand I am quoting him, but I will freely admit that on the other hand he thought the requirement could be reduced to three years. At that time I said to him that if the conditions he placed before the committee were embodied in the legislation, I would much better understand the validity of the argument of the minister regarding the reduction from five years to three years. However, that is another matter, and we can address ourselves to that at third reading.

Specifically on the question of good character Mr. Carraro said that his union held citizenship classes. They tried to teach people—I take it primarily of Italian background—their rights in Canada, but very strong emphasis was also placed on the responsibilities which we have in a parliamentary democracy such as Canada. I was very impressed with the testimony of Mr. Carraro and the sincerity with which he tried to answer the questions we put to him.

He had some specific recommendations to make on what he thought should be done in order to make the Citizenship Act and the citizenship procedure more equitable for those with landed immigrant status who wanted to become Canadians through the citizenship procedure.

Quoting from page 38:6 of the committee proceedings, Mr. Carraro said:

● (2100)

Finally, I would like to read some recommendations:

1. That in examining the suitability of an applicant for Canadian citizenship, the judge give priority to the personal and family habits of the applicant over the knowledge of the language and geography of this country.

I had the opportunity, as did a number of other members on the committee, to question Mr. Carraro on how he would define those conditions which he names, such as personal and family habits, as part of the good character clause which he wanted to see retained in the new citizenship act. In response to a question on how he would define good character, Mr. Carraro's list was not exhaustive, but here is what he said. I am quoting from the minutes of the same meeting at page 38:7: He said:

What I would look for is whether a man—let us speak of a man in this case—is a steady worker. I feel that is an objective measure for good character. He is contributing with his work to the betterment of the society. He is a good provider. I think that is good measurable character criterion for good character. Also, whether he is paying his mortgages on time. I think that is also a good character.

I thought that here was a person who had gone through the immigration procedure, had applied for citizenship, had appeared before a Canadian citizenship court and a Canadian citizenship judge, had become a citizen, and now was using his abilities and his association with immigrants to try to teach them the responsibilities and rights that each one of them would enjoy once he becomes a Canadian citizen. I think it was a practical illustration of what one person thought, having gone through the procedure relatively recently, spelled out good character.

It is a pretty practical approach, and while we might not want to incorporate into the act a provision which states that if a person pays his mortgage he should get his citizenship and if he does not pay his mortgage he should not, I do believe that here is a gentleman who was trying to establish for the committee that there are certain acceptable norms of behaviour which we expect from Canadian citizens. He was simply showing to the committee that surely a citizenship judge with certain responsibilities under the act can judge good character or, to make it easier perhaps, he can definitely see when the person before him is not of good character.

What will happen under the new act is that the judge will not now have the judgmental ability to assess what has been the accommodation of the applicant to Canadian life. I believe that this is especially valid in view of the fact that Bill C-20 will reduce the residency requirements from five years to three.

While some people will argue that this provision is arbitrary, I believe that this type of evaluation takes place every day. It takes place in our courts every day, and I think the minister should take a hard second look at whether or not the quality of good character should be reintroduced into Bill C-20.

I intend to speak again on third reading on other provisions of the bill, but I want to impress upon the minister and his colleagues that while he might argue that it is a subjective evaluation, it is one that has widespread support and one that takes place on a daily basis in the courts of this land. Our judges, having the responsibilities and qualifications that they do, are well capable of using a good character clause. Not only do they feel they are capable of using the parameters which the good character amendment would bring to this bill, not only are they capable of evaluating candidates, but they feel the good caracter clause should be reincorporated in the act to give them the judicial scope which they require at present.

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the amendment which attempts to retain good character as one of the criteria for qualifying for citizenship of this country. I suggest that it becomes essential to talk about some of the other criteria in order to plead for the retention of this one because so much has been lost and is being lost in the bill when citizenship is considered a right rather than a privilege if certain criteria are met. It becomes absolutely essential when we read two excerpts from the minister's statement in the committee when the bill was first discussed there. He said:

> What makes this bill unique and a leader among nationality laws of the world? First, it treats absolutely everyone equally. An applicant is an applicant, whether the person be male or female, young or old, from Austria or Australia. This quality is rare in citizenship law.

Then he spoke about citizenship as a right, and eventually about the possibility of the time limit and the language requirement. He said that some citizens will of course have an advantage when they come to this country. He added:

> It is to recognize the fact that some people are ready to try to meet the qualifications for citizenship more quickly than others. It is as simple as that. It only takes a moment's thought to realize that an applicant who already speaks one of Canada's two languages, has close family connections within Canada, is familiar with the Canadian form of government, has visited the country, and so on, has tremendous advantages over people who came from a country where they speak neither of the languages, which has a totally different form of government and so forth. There is certainly no guarantee that a person will receive citizenship after three years.

I submit that there is a contradiction in these two statements. It cannot be one and the other at the same time. I suggest that if this bill treats everyone equally it means that the criteria have to go. The criteria used to be five years of residence, security, knowledge, language, character, and something called "other" that I gather is judicial discretion.

Certainly security had some play around 1951, and I suspect the trial which was started off by Igor Gouzenko had something to do with security being a factor when this nation lost the innocence it had acquired through World War II and the hope that we would live in peace forever after. But I gather that the minister was very young in 1950 and has somehow retained his innocence and believes that now in 1976 we live in the same euphoria in which we lived in the years immediately following the war.

This is the time of detente, and security is gone—it was not used in 1974-75. Knowledge is gone as well. It did not matter in 1961, and in the last six years on record only one person a year has failed to acquire citizenship because of lack of knowledge of this country, and that was after five years of possibility for study. Language has been a factor but will cease to be.

There were attempts to amend the bill in order to eliminate the adequate knowledge of one or the other of the official languages. If you are going to treat everyone absolutely equally whether they come from Austria or from Australia, language will have to go and will not be able to stand as a criterion for rejecting a citizenship application. So we are left with character as a factor.

● (2110)

It was hoped that character would play some role in distinguishing between the applicant who failed and the one who succeeded, even though the time of residency was reduced. It seems to me that it is easier to disguise lack of good character for three years than for five years. In five years basic character becomes apparent. It is difficult to hide it for that length of time. But no, we are to reduce the waiting period to three years.

I am not at all convinced that granting citizenship at the end of a three-year period is good. I cannot understand why the government wishes to do this, after wishing to remove all traces of British subject status. Today we put in motion provisions which will eliminate all traces of the British subject from the elections act, as if it were a taint. The provision is to be removed. Some people who have lived in this country many years will not be able to vote at the next election because they will not have applied in time for Canadian citizenship. Is that how the governments means to demonstrate the value of Canadian citizenship? I submit that the value will go down.

In this busy world, time represents value. Actually it represents more than money. If you reduce the waiting period, you reduce the value of citizenship. I suppose it is too much to expect the government, which has reduced the value of our money to 40 per cent of what it was, to make the value of citizenship greater than 40 per cent of its original value.

I have been sent a great many letters in recent days. People write to me about the gun laws, that other infamous bill being put through by the government, and about the death penalty. A common thread runs through the letters, a desire to retain something worth while in this country, to protect this country. Some feel that this country is threatened. I wonder what people like this have been doing in the past year when the government has moved deliberately and cynically to reduce the value of Canadian citizenship.

Why will people not rise to the defence of something so worth while as citizenship? What has the Committee for an Independent Canada been doing? What has happened to the professors' report on Canadian studies in Canadian universities? What happened to that report this past year, when this bill was working its way through parliament? Thomas Symons said that there are few other countries in the world which have developed a post-secondary educational system that pays so little attention to the study of the country's own culture in the university curriculum.

We shall require that prospective citizens learn the language, attain a job, and reach some measure of self-sufficiency. We do not require that they shall spend enough time to learn something about our culture and about the essential factors of the country. Why bother stressing the value of citizenship if it can be so easily attained?

I know that in this last-ditch struggle we shall meet with no more success than our amendments met with in committee. We wanted to amend the provisions governing the time factor. The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) said, "Move an amendment." I moved an amendment in committee, but it received, I am afraid, short shrift from the government that was bent on building a monument to the minister rather than on the retention of the value of citizenship.

In closing, I wonder what is the attitude of those who have sought a Canadian identity and who endeavour to inculcate the Canadian identity in our universities and in the economic systems of this land. I say, to paraphrase the old song:

Yet Hurtigs and ye Symons,
Oh, where hae ye been?
When they gave away the citizenship for
Half of what it's been.

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief and non-provocative. I hope sincerely that we can read this bill the third time tomorrow, and I shall not do anything which may upset that hope.

I admit that at the committee stage there were genuine differences of opinion between myself and certain hon. members opposite who served on the committee, on the question of good character. One can say that we will agree to disagree. We both stand for principles we are trying to defend.

Hon. members opposite know my concern about good character and know I am not trying to promote bad character. They know, as the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) was good enough to say, that I consider a good character provision as too subjective. It is not measurable in law. I feel that in a piece of legislation like this we should try to avoid subjective provisions of that kind which are, as has been said, interpreted by individuals according to their own views, culture, background, and traditions.

We are not avoiding the issue. We propose to replace the good character provision with a provision which can be measurable in law, namely, one to do with indictable offences. This provision is found in clause 20, which reads in part:

Notwithstanding anything in this act, a person shall not be granted citizenship under section 5 or subsection 10(1) or administered the oath of citizenship

(*a*) while he is

(i) under a probation order,

(ii) a paroled inmate, or

(iii) confined in or an inmate of any penitentiary, gaol, reformatory or prison,

pursuant to any enactment in force in Canada;

And now comes the especially pertinent part, the provision which takes the place of the good character provision:

(*b*) while he is charged with, on trial for, subject to or a party to an appeal relating to an offence under subsection 28(1) or (2) of an indictable offence under any Act of Parliament . . .

I do not think we can reconcile our differences. It is my contention that the government's approach is measurable in law. I am not proposing anything inconsistent with the spirit of the law. I think this provision makes more sense than retaining the notion of good character. I made the point several times in committee. I have not been able to persuade hon. members opposite; nor have they been able to persuade me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

An hon. Member: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Jarvis) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The House will now consider motion No. 2, in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes).

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie) moved motion No. 2:

—That Bill C-20, An Act respecting citizenship, be amended in Clause 18 by deleting sub-clauses (2), (3) and (4) and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The Minister shall appoint a tribunal consisting of a Superior Court Judge or Judges who may review any declaration made by the Governor in Council pursuant to sub-section (1) hereof.

(3) Upon an application for such a review the Minister shall advise the applicant of the particulars of the grounds upon which the Governor in Council has declared that to grant citizenship or issue a certificate of renunciation would be prejudicial to the security of Canada or contrary to public order in Canada, without disclosing the names of witnesses or sources of this information.

(4) The tribunal shall hold a hearing at which the applicant and the Minister shall be entitled to be present or to be represented by Counsel.

(5) The tribunal shall make recommendations to the Minister as to whether the declaration by the Governor in Council should be imple-

mented or withdrawn as the case may be and shall state its reasons therefor in writing to the applicant and the Minister.

(6) A declaration made under sub-section (1) ceases to have effect two years after the day on which it was made.".

● (2120)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to present this amendment at the report stage of this bill because I think the committee, having spent a good part of two sessions dealing with it, recognizes the importance of the problem that relates to the amendment I have moved.

Basically the situation is that in the bill we have before us there is a provision in clause 18 whereby the governor in council, in practice the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner), can deny an applicant Canadian citizenship on the grounds that to grant the application would be prejudicial to the security of Canada or contrary to public order in Canada.

That is an important clause in the bill. I do not argue with it being there. It is important that the minister have that discretionary power to deny citizenship because of security reasons, as so stated. What I take exception to is that there is no provision in this bill, nor has there been in the past, that when a minister denies an applicant citizenship for security reasons that those reasons have to be explained to the applicant. Nor does the applicant have an opportunity to appeal those reasons or present to the minister contrary evidence and argument, in other words to have his day in court.

As it stands, the clause seems to be a denial of natural justice. It is a denial to the applicant to be given clearly the reasons for rejecting his citizenship and the opportunity to put forth counter-argument. That is why I have moved the amendment that is before us.

The amendment does not remove the minister's discretionary power to turn down a citizenship applicant for security reasons. Nor does it force the minister to disclose the sources from which he has received the information that led him to conclude the applicant would be a security risk. What the amendment would do is set up an appeal tribunal consisting of superior court judges. It would allow the applicant to see the reasons why he is being denied citizenship without disclosing the sources.

This would provide an applicant with a change to dispute those reasons and present evidence that may contradict some of the arguments the minister has received from his sources. I submit that the confidentiality of the sources of the minister would be maintained. That is important. If security agencies want to continue to receive information from sources, obviously the confidentiality of those must be protected.

I have therefore designed an amendment which I think is reasonable and moderate. It does not demand that the cases be held in open court under normal legal practices. It at least allows the applicant some opportunity for a hearing, although it is a very limited hearing. As it is now without this amendment, a person is simply told he has been denied citizenship for security reasons. They are not enumerated or elaborated. Nor does he have a chance to challenge that decision.

I submit that the amendment I have moved falls in line with general government policy or at least with some of the recommendations made in 1969 by the Royal Commission on Security which recognized the very problem I have described, namely, that there is a denial of natural justice without this right of appeal. That royal commission made what I thought was a very sensible recommendation. I quote from page 301 of the abridged report:

[Mr. Symes.]

We recommend that the grant of citizenship should normally be refused on security grounds only if actual illegalities or criminal acts have been committed and proved in court, and not merely for membership in subversive associations or even the communist party. However, we recommend that ministerial discretion should be retained to deal with certain cases in which it may remain appropriate to withhold citizenship for particularly significant security reasons. All persons whose applications are rejected on security grounds should have access to the Security Review Board.

Because the royal commission stated that no group in Canada has been designated as subversive, if someone is going to be denied citizenship on that ground he should have the right of appeal. The royal commission recommended that a security review board be set up. Seven years have passed since that recommendation was put forward. We still have many applicants for Canadian citizenship being turned down for security reasons without any opportunity to appeal that decision. My amendment falls in line with the conclusions of a royal commission.

I do not accept the arguments that we heard in committee from the minister's officials. They stated that the problem is so difficult that the government cannot come up with some kind of security review board or appeal tribunal at this time. They further said it was beyond their mental capacity to design such a board that would guarantee a right of appeal and at the same time protect the minister's discretionary power and confidentiality of sources. If we do not make a move at this time to set up some kind of appeal procedure, how much longer must we wait?

The royal commission made some very important conclusions in 1969 and we should be acting on them. If that royal commission is not enough to convince hon. members of the importance of having this kind of review procedure, I draw their attention to a case that was brought before the Federal Court of Canada in 1973 by an applicant who had been turned down for security reasons. He was not given any argument or any chance to appeal. He took the then Secretary of State to court. I wish to read the decision of the Federal Court judges because I think their conclusions are very relevant and appropriate to my amendment.

The case was T. Lazarov v. Secretary of State of Canada. I read from the decision of Mr. Justice Thurlow of that case in 1973. He stated:

● (2130)

Whenever the reason for contemplating refusal of an application is one that is peculiar to the particular applicant the nature of citizenship and its importance to the individual are such that the applicant ought at least to have an opportunity of some kind and at some stage of the proceedings to dispute its existence.

Further, Mr. Justice Thurlow, with two other justices concurring, ruled that:

The status of citizenship carries with it rights and advantages and to refuse the application of a person to whom it would otherwise be granted on the basis of matters of which he is not apprised and which he is given no opportunity to dispute is shocking to one's sense of justice even though he may lawfully apply again after a comparatively short time. It suggests that the applicant is not being fairly dealt with and fairness demands that he at least be afforded an opportunity to state his position . . .In my opinion, therefore, the rule *audi alteram*

partem applies whenever the minister proposes to excercise his discretion to refuse an application on the basis of facts pertaining to the particular applicant or his application and where he has not already had an opportunity in the course of the proceedings before the Citizenship Court he must be afforded a fair opportunity in one way or another of stating his position with respect to any matters which in the absence of refutation or explanation would lead to the rejection of his application. This is not to say a confidential report or its contents need be disclosed to him but the pertinent allegations which if undenied or unresolved would lead to rejection of his application must, as I see it, be made known to him to an extent sufficient to enable him to respond to them and he must have a fair opportunity to dispute or explain them.

That was the considered opinion of a Federal Court justice in a case which is most pertinent to my amendment. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a royal commission arguing the need for an appeal procedure, and we find a Federal Court justice also stating that an appeal procedure is necessary. I understand that the Department of the Secretary of State is appealing that Federal Court decision before the Supreme Court and that the matter is still unresolved. Nevertheless I feel strongly that there ought to be some kind of appeal procedure provided.

I have heard departmental officials argue that though a person might be denied citizenship for security reasons he can reapply after two years. That is true, but neither the officials nor the police agencies are obliged to prepare a new report or submit new evidence which might be on the side of the applicant. All they have to do is resubmit the original files, and the minister denies the application once again. This process could go on every two years. For his part, the applicant has no opportunity to get hold of the reasons for the denial of his application and produce counter arguments. So the two-year provision is no solution; it only puts the applicant back to square one every two years.

We heard an official in the security branch say he recognized the merit of the appeal procedure but he feared that if any such procedure were introduced the government's sources of information might dry up. I presume he was referring to the RCMP or to police agencies or to organizations such as the FBI or the CIA. But my amendment would take care of such a situation by providing for a hearing in confidence—the reasons need only be stated to the applicant in a general way, and the sources of the information need not be disclosed. Thus there should be no fear on the part of the government that its sources of information would dry up.

I might say, as an aside, that I am rather skeptical and, indeed, highly critical of the government's sources of information if they include the CIA, which has become infamous for its illegal activities, as we saw during the Watergate affair, and for carrying out all kinds of spying for a former president. We should remember that in the United States a law has been passed requiring the FBI and the CIA to present any dossier concerning a person when that person requests it. And these agencies have not gone to ruin because such a basic right has been granted with the object of protecting civil liberty.

I realize the government is preoccupied about the secrecy of information, but in an area such as this which so closely affects natural justice I believe it ought to recognize that my amendment does not, in fact, jeopardize its sources of information. It is of great importance that an applicant should have an opportunity of appearing before a tribunal to hear the evidence and comment upon it.

There is historical precedent in Canada for such an amendment as I propose. During the second world war and thereafter, in the course of what I consider to be a sad chapter in Canadian history, when citizens of Japanese origin and other so-called aliens were interned, the government set up an appeal procedure whereby anyone who was to be interned had a right to appeal along the lines I have suggested here. Government sources of information were protected, but at least the person concerned had a right to his day in court, as it were.

When we look at the history of the denial of citizenship on security grounds we cannot but be concerned over what has been happening in recent times. The government has never been obliged to define precisely what is meant by "protecting the security of Canada" or "prejudicial to public order". There are phrases which can be interpreted by bureaucrats and by the government as they go along.

One has only to look at the pattern of denial of citizenship for security reasons to see how irregular the definition of these phrases has been—how it fluctuates from time to time as people interpret the situation according to the vogue of the period. When we look at the statistics provided for us we find that since 1949 2,173 applicants have been denied Canadian citizenship for security reasons. This figure represents 39.9 per cent of the total number of rejections year by year. It is a significant proportion. But when we look at the pattern of the number of rejections in each year something very interesting emerges.

In 1949, 28 people were denied citizenship for security reasons. By 1951 the number had jumped to 170 and remained at about that level, between 150 and 190, from 1951 to 1959. Then it began to drop off, falling to 70 in 1963, and 11 in 1973. Hon. members will notice that the high watermark of rejection occurred during the McCarthy red scare era in the United States which spilled over into Canada as well. There followed a kind of hysteria when people looked for security risks behind every door and in every closet. This shows how unregulated and widely interpreted this concept of a security risk can be.

When we questioned the minister's officials in committee, my confidence that the interpretation would be fair was not in any way strengthened. For example, when I asked them how they interpret "prejudicial to the security of Canada" or "contrary to public order in Canada", Mr. Nichols, as reported at page 44:7 of the minutes for Tuesday, March 23, had this to say:

● (2140)

On the matter of how we will interpret the words of the bill, again I am at a great disadvantage. The words of the bill, as I have said, are simply a phraseology to describe what is now done. The present act does not talk about security. It evolved. Canada has been in the security business regarding the naturalization of aliens since about 1918. Various methods have been used through the years. Most of them just grew.

I suppose they just grew like Topsy, Mr. Speaker. It is something that has evolved without any kind of definition or regulation. I worry when bureacrats make definitions according to their whims and fancies as the days go by. If we are going to have this kind of latitude in interpretation, we must have some appeal procedure to guarantee basic human rights.

I am not speaking abstractly, Mr. Speaker. I have pointed to figures showing people who have been denied Canadian citizenship for these reasons. I have quoted a court case, and there have been other cases as well. The most current one concerns an individual called Mr. Offley who came to Canada a few years ago. He applied for citizenship which was approved by a citizenship judge, but he was turned down by the minister for security reasons. Because he renounced his U.S. citizenship and cannot get Canadian citizenship, he now finds he is without a country, unable to move out of Canada.

To show in human terms what happens when people are caught up in the regulations, I should like to quote a letter Mr. Offley wrote to the Secretary of State on April 9. In part he said:

Your decision to refuse my application means that I am, and will stay, a permanent domiciled resident in Canada. I am stateless, and thus immune from deportation, as no country will accept me either as a visitor or as an immigrant.

However, if my rejection has no substantial consequences for you, it has quite immense ones for me. It means that my legal status will remain one of living in limbo, with no possibility of gaining citizenship, without even the alternative of leaving. I have been conferred this status without a trial, without access to the allegations on which the decision was taken, without a right to confront my accusers, and without right of appeal. It is a decision that has been taken without reference to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Security and without regard to the decision of the Federal Court of Appeal.

I think that points out in a quiet, dramatic way how this law affects individuals. There may be good reasons for turning down applicants on security grounds; I do not dispute that. Nor do I dispute the minister's right to do so. But surely in this country, which prides itself on its democracy and long tradition of basic human rights, we should at least allow the accused, so to speak, to have his day in court, although in this case it certainly is a rather restricted one because of the circumstances.

We discussed this very thoroughly in committee, and it was my feeling that because members were generally concerned with trying to wrestle with the problem, that they felt deeply about it. The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery) was very sympathetic and argued that we must move in this direction.

I do not have much hope that government members will support my amendment; it will probably go down to defeat. Nevertheless I wanted to put on record something that concerns me as a Canadian and believer in liberty and justice. I hope my arguments, if they do not move the government to bring in a security review board or appeal procedure at this stage, will give the government added impetus to take action and bring in such a review procedure in the near future.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) not going to reply to this excellent appeal that the hon. member has made to him?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I was going to resist the temptation to reply, having one eye on the clock, but I will be very brief. As the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) has put it, this is a subject that was given an awful lot of thought and consideration in committee. He has raised a number of extremely important questions. The formula that we have put forward in Bill C-20 I think he will agree is an advance over what we had before. I do not believe we have found the ultimate answer to the concern that he raised tonight, but I think it is important to recognize that we have made three changes that are an improvement over the present situation.

First of all, we have stated the nature of the discretionary power involved in rather plain language, so that applicants are not refused without reason being given. Secondly, the discretionary act is moved to a higher authority and the decision will be collegial. In other words, it will no longer be a simple act of discretion on the part of the minister but will also involve the governor in council. Thirdly, for the first time we will make available to a refused applicant the reasons for his refusal. He will be told in so many words that he has been refused citizenship for security reasons, and he will be given this information in confidence.

I think that is an improvement over the present situation. I do not think I would argue, though, with a great deal of personal conviction that it answers all the questions that the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie raised tonight. I think those will be subject to further reviews down the line.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 2 (Mr. Symes) negatived.

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie) moved Motion No. 3:

That Bill C-20, An Act respecting citizenship, be amended in Clause 33 by deleting sub-clause 6(e).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be much more brief in my explanation of this amendment. It deals with the amendment proposed by the minister regarding property and how it relates to ownership and citizenship.

● (2150)

Briefly the situation up to now has been that under the constitution the provinces have control over property. What has happened in many provinces, certainly in my

povince of Ontario and in Prince Edward Island, has been that foreign ownership of land has become a great problem. Recreation land was bought up by non-Canadians and a lot of land speculation took place. The only way a province could put a stop or a slowdown to this process of foreign ownership and the purchase of land was to pass regulations denying ownership on the basis of non-residency. That is to say, if you wanted to buy land in Prince Edward Island you had to be a resident of Prince Edward Island. This was felt to be rather restrictive. By denying ownership to anyone not a resident, not only do you deny the right of foreign nationals to buy land, you prevent other Canadians from buying land in that province.

What the bill before us does is widen the scope of action on the part of a province. It will allow a province to deny ownership of land on the basis of residency, as has been the case in the past, and also on the basis of citizenship. That it to say, if a province designs the legislation, a non-Canadian would be prohibited from owning certain types of land. Of course I agree with that. What I object to is one clause in the amendment presented by the minister which states that if the Foreign Investment Review Agency, which is a federal agency, decides that an ownership acquisition by a foreign company is in order, then that is to overrule any provincial law which may deny ownership on the basis of non-Canadian citizenship.

I moved an amendment to deal with the clause relating to the Foreign Investment Review Agency for a number of reasons. First of all, it is a fact that many of the provinces object to the clause itself on the basic ground that it is an intrusion of federal jurisdiction into what is clearly defined by the constitution as a provincial right, namely, the right of property. It also means that the rules can be changed at any time because the Foreign Investment Review Act can be amended at any time by the federal government without consultation with the provinces. Some of the provinces, therefore, are in dispute over this clause. Because we did not hear from the witnesses for the provinces at the committee it would be more appropriate to delete this clause until the federal government can talk to the provinces in an attempt to hammer out something agreeable to the majority.

In addition, I think the foreign investment review clause negates the general thrust of the amendment which is intended to broaden the scope under which provinces can act. It may well be that a province might want to deny ownership to a foreign company buying up real estate for land speculation purposes, either on the outskirts of an urban centre or in the urban centre itself, or deny the right of a foreign land corporation to buy up agricultural land, as has been going on in many of the provinces.

We could conceivably have such a foreign company being given the right by the Foreign Investment Review Agency to buy up Canadian companies and the land on which they reside or which they control. This would be contrary to the intent of the amendment, to give the provinces some power to restrict ownership on grounds other than just residency. That is to say, they could restrict ownership on the basis of not being a Canadian citizen.

It is my feeling that it would be best at this time that the clause be deleted for the reasons outlined. I do not wish to go into more detail as we discussed it in committee, but again I felt it was important to put this on the record and I commend my amendment to the House.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 3 (Mr. Symes) negatived.

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State) moved that Bill C-20, respecting citizenship, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): When shall the bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, by leave now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): This can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Faulkner moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Adjournment Debate

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRADE—EFFECT OF REPEAL OF SECTION 272 OF RAILWAY ACT ON FLOUR AND GRAIN EXPORTS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the last should always be first, but I did not know that I would really be first that quickly. I count on you and other people for small mercies. Now to get down to business.

My business in being here tonight is to deal with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) in connection with what I think is a great travesty as it affects the people of Halifax, the people of Saint John, the people of Montreal, the millers in all parts of eastern Canada, and the western grain growers, more particularly those of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I hope I have covered the ground adequately for that with which I intend to deal. This is probably my sixth appearance on the late show in the last three or four weeks in connection with this particular subject.

What concerns me is that the Minister of Transport, who should be the custodian and guardian of Section 272 of the Railway Act, is going to repeal this by virtue of Clause 15 of the bill which is item no. 87 on the current hit parade; that is, the restraint program before us in parliament. That is the reason why I appear here tonight, as I have on a number of occasions, to appeal to the Minister of Transport, my dear friend; the President of the Treasury Board, a dear friend of mine also; the Minister of Agriculture, also a dear friend; and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, also a dear friend. I hope I have proven in previous debate that what they propose will cause a loss to the Canadian economy of at least $100 million a year. Whether we like that or not I think that is an important figure.

● (2200)

I believe I have proven that this has been an ill-contrived program. It is something that not only I will fight but which also will be fought by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax-East (Mr. Forrestall). The hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Landers) also will be dragged into this fight before it is over. There will be 22 or 25 members from the city of Montreal who will be dragged into it, as well as members from the western grain growing areas of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. In other words, it will be one hell of a good fight in this House of Commons. I can say without even taking a second breath that that is exactly what will happen. Why will this come about?

Before asking the spokesman for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to reply I will venture to suggest the reason this will come about is simply that when the new Minister of Transport, the hon. member for Humboldt,

[Mr. Faulkner.]

took his place he was told that he would have to achieve a certain amount of savings. He went back to his department, which admittedly has been in a mess not only since the days of the minister who preceded him but since the days of a couple of ministers back.

He asked what he could do in order to effect savings in his department. He was told that the flour-grain subsidy could be dealt with because no one would protest it. He was told that it might affect Halifax, Saint John or Montreal, but that the people involved are all very supine and that no one would be smart enough to spot it. The darned trouble was that quite a few people did spot it very quickly. Many of them were very quick to raise a resentful voice. I was one who raised the matter, and the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was another. Between the two of us we batted this thing back and forth for the last couple of weeks. I will tell you, Sir, that I think the new Minister of Transport now realizes this. This does not involve merely the two of us. There are about 20 and probably more members of parliament who are prepared to start raising a very large fuss about what he proposes to do.

This has been scouted thoroughly in the past. I do not wish to go into the fact and figures, but I am prepared to debate the facts and figures in respect of this matter with anyone. The fact is that the Port of Halifax will not be dealt with in the way suggested, nor will the port of Saint John. I may stand as a rather small figure compared to the large number of figures who have not yet spoken in respect of the port of Montreal. Before this is over not only will the members from Montreal be involved is this but also the members from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the two grain growing provinces.

When we return after Easter there will be a large number of people fighting for what I am fighting for tonight, and I will not feel too much alone at that time. I will be able to say that at least I was a pioneer. What I am fighting for, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not throw out an old policy until we can come in with something new that is better. Until the Minister of Transport does that, I will be fighting for an old policy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. colleague mentioned that he did not want to be last, he certainly raised a problem that was the subject of many discussions. I personally raised that problem many times in the Department of Transport. When he mentioned the Department of Transport, the Treasury Board and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as having something to do with this problem, one sees how complex the problem raised by the hon. member is.

The government came under numerous protests for repealing section 272 of the Railway Act. Of course, the decision to eliminate the "At and East" subsidy was made to reduce government expenditures. It may be easy to blame the government for its excessive expenditures—and we hear about it virtually every day during the question period in the House—but it is even a lot more difficult to suggest means of reducing those expenditures without clashes. All budget cuts were made after consultation with the bodies involved and after considering regional submis-

sions and needs within an overall policy dealing with socio-economic aspects, or still within an economic policy for the whole of all Canadians.

[*English*]

With respect to the ports of Saint John and Halifax, the Minister of Transport has indicated that the removal of the subsidy may encourage beneficial developments, such as the movement of grain by unit train to these ports.

Flour exports from most traditional exporting countries, including Canada, Australia, and the United States, have been declining for a number of years. This is due to several factors, including a trend toward national self-sufficiency in milling capacity throughout the world. Nonetheless, as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce advised the hon. member, he intends to have discussions with the Minister of Transport and his officials on this subject.

I congratulate the hon. member who raised this question, and I assure him that it is very important. I hope the decision will reflect the needs of all Canadians.

FINANCE—MONITORING OF INCOME OF INSURANCE AGENTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I should like to start on a pleasant note by congratulating the parliamentary secretary for doing double duty this evening and representing the forces of the government in such an adequate and astute way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The forces of evil.

Mr. Leggatt: I didn't say that.

The question I raised several weeks ago was with regard to the increasing evidence that incomes for insurance agents in British Columbia have gone up dramatically as a result of the increase in auto insurance rates in that province. It was not raised out of any petulance or envy of those incomes. It was raised because any anti-inflation program worth the name must develop some kind of consensus within the population, and differences in raises within that population must be seen to be fair for any anti-inflation program to work.

The evidence is that the average rate for auto insurance in British Columbia has doubled, and the charges insurance agents make for collecting those premiums have remained approximately the same. They have reduced their rate from 7 per cent to 5 per cent on the basis of statutory coverage and it has remained 10 per cent on the optional coverage. The collision coverage, which is now optional, goes into that optional area. Let me give you an example.

● (2210)

The commission that an agent would get on a 1973 Toyota between last year and this year has increased by 83 per cent, given the same risk. With the same work force, the same number of people, the same staff, that increase is not justifiable under any kind of meaningful anti-inflation program. As a result of that I decided I would drop a note to the Anti-Inflation Board to see what steps the chairman of that board would be able to take with regard to what appears to be an excessive increase in the incomes of one section of the community. I should like to quote from a letter from Jean-Luc Pepin, dated March 30, and directed to me in response to my letter. He writes:

> Increased earnings derived from direct commission in a guideline year are not subject to legal restraint, providing the formula by which the income is determined does not change from the base to the guideline year.

Later he goes on to state:

> The increase in remuneration would be attributed to an increase in productivity.

It is that quote from the letter in which the chairman suggests that somehow the increase in the incomes of insurance agents in British Columbia has something to do with productivity which makes me think that the government is living in an Alice in Wonderland world, and the legislation it has proposed in terms of controlling inflation does nothing meaningful whatsoever with regard to the incomes of such people.

I would like the parliamentary secretary to put himself in the shoes of a lumber worker in my constituency who finds, first, that his wages are frozen; second, that his insurance rates have been tripled; third, that the export levy has been removed on the lumber that his company sells abroad, which means that it can make just as much profit as it likes because it is not under the anti-inflation guidelines; fourth, when he buys his insurance he finds his insurance agent no longer flies to Hawaii every year, he can now go around the world if he likes. That kind of program does not give any hope of a consensus on anti-inflation measures. From time to time people in our party are critized as being carping critics, but I am trying to be positive on this.

I hope the parliamentary secretary in responding to this question will deal with what the legislation can do to control this excess of income and will tell us what specific proposals his government is now prepared to make to bring the incomes of professional people and people at that level under some control. I suggest it has to be in the form of income taxation. This should be done so that the people who work with their hands in the mills, who have their wages frozen, and people who are on low incomes can have some confidence that the program is not being carried on their backs, which certainly evidence concerning incomes of insurance agents in British Columbia would seem to support.

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to thank the hon. member for his kind remarks and I hope he will be satisfied with the reply I intend to give him.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) has asked if the income of agents selling insurance on behalf of the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia (ICBC) is being monitored under the guidelines of the anti-inflation program. I would note, first of all, that the province of British Columbia and the federal government are in the process of negotiating an agreement under the anti-inflation program. Until such an agreement is signed, none of the provincial public sector, including any of its

Crown corporations, is covered under the anti-inflation program.

Second, the minister indicated quite clearly to the provinces on February 10, 1976, in reply to a question on whether the ICBC would be covered by a Canada-B.C. agreement on the anti-inflation program, that we would be quite prepared to discuss the inclusion of provincial agencies under such an agreement. The procedure that has been followed with provinces that have signed an agreement has been to annex to any memorandum of agreement the specific schedule listing such government bodies that are to be covered. The final decision on which bodies will be covered by the government remains with the provinces.

In this regard I wish to bring to your attention Premier Bennett's statement of February 27, 1976, in which he indicated his government's intention to have the national anti-inflation guidelines apply to pricing and compensation decisions in the British Columbia public sector.

With respect to the specific question on monitoring of income of agents of ICBC, it is the minister's understanding that such agents are not salaried employees. They operate under a contractual agreement with ICBC, and are paid on a commission basis. Furthermore, the minister is given to understand that commission rates vary by type of insurance sold. An agent's remuneration would depend, as well, on the size and number of contracts he negotiates.

If such a case were to be brought to the attention of the Anti-Inflation Board, it is the minister's impression that they would be guided by their compensation regulations which provide for review of commission rate structures for those employers subject to monitoring under the program. I would note, however, that the anti-inflation guidelines are not intended to penalize those individuals whose productivity increases. In this case, any increased income of agents which is attributable to an increase in the size and number of contracts they negotiate would be within the guidelines under the anti-inflation program.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.18 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 14, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PROPOSED MEETING WITH PREMIERS OF ATLANTIC PROVINCES TO DEAL WITH ECONOMIC SITUATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, in view of recent confirmation by Statistics Canada and Canada Manpower of sharply increased unemployment in Atlantic Canada over last year, in some instances one third greater, as in my own area; the urgent demand by the premiers of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island for assistance for unbearable electrical costs; and the federal government's announced intention to increase transportation costs in Atlantic Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean):

That the Prime Minister convene an emergency meeting of first ministers of the Atlantic provinces to deal in particular with the alarming situation in respect of seriously deepening unemployment, escalating electrical costs and impending transportation cost increases;

that this House instruct the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to report within thirty days on the impact of the government restraint and anti-inflation programs which are creating increased regional disparity;

that the President of the Treasury Board be instructed to present a re-allocated program of government expenditure which recognizes the necessity of flexibility to assure that regional disparities will not continue to increase.

Mr. Speaker: Such motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

SUGGESTED SUSPENSION OF IMPORTS TO PERMIT REVISION OF POLICY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion dealing with a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Since the footwear and textile industries as well as poultry farming in Canada are all three threatened by massive imports, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Allard):

That the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, responsible for licences on import quotas, suspend for a three-month period all import licences on those products to undertake a complete review of any import policy to stabilize the Canadian production for threatened producers.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF POLICY WHICH RESULTS IN INCREASE IN PRICE OF BUTTER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request the unanimous consent of the House to move a very urgent and important motion.

Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture made public the new dairy policy for the coming year. Considering that the minister's proposals will force consumers to pay 5 cents more for a pound of butter, considering also that the policy as a whole will mean a sure loss of $2,000 or more for milk producers, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Grafftey):

That the House unanimously request that the minister responsible summon the CDC before the Committee on Agriculture to reconsider the announcement made by the minister yesterday and which is totally unacceptable at the moment to consumers and producers.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion cannot be put.

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS CONCERNING LICENSING OF AIR CREW—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion is prompted by the fact that as of Friday, April 9, approximately 3,500 pilots whose licences have expired are breaking the law, in particular the Aeronautics Act. Air regulations section 400 states that, except as provided in this part, no person shall fly or attempt to fly as a flight crew member of an aircraft unless he is the holder of a valid and subsisting licence or permit appropriate to his duties issued under this part.

Because this law is being broken, there being no air safety inspectors because of the strike in Ontario and Quebec, and because of the safety hazard, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Portage (Mr. Masniuk):

● (1410)

That the Minister of Transport take immediate action to enforce the Aeronautics Act, air regulation—section 400 and that the appropriate action be taken to see that this law is not broken again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can only be presented for debate with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR RECOGNITION OF ABORIGINAL NATIVE RIGHTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that the Native Council of Canada presented a position paper on aboriginal rights to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the cabinet on April 15, 1975, and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister has not yet responded to the Native Council of Canada position paper although an answer was promised within three months of presentation, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth):

That this House urge the government of Canada to recognize the aboriginal rights of native peoples, including Mètis and non-status Indians, and enshrine these rights in the Canadian Constitution in a way which will enable them to preserve and protect their languages and cultures.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

FINANCE

SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF EFFECT ON CANADA OF INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY SITUATION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43, I request unanimous consent of the House to present a motion dealing with an important and urgent matter. As the United Kingdom pound has plunged one third in value in the past year, the Italian lira is falling to new lows, while the French franc is under severe pressure, it is urgent that the government inform this House and the Canadian public if any call has been made or any commitment given by Canada to support or indirectly aid any foreign currency and, secondly, review what consequences, if any, may develop in the Canadian economy as a result of this international currency turmoil. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies):

That this important matter be immediately referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs with a view to hearing the Minister of Finance, his officials, the governor of the Bank of Canada, his officials, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, his officials, and other authorities, on the topic and that there be provision for the committee to make recommendations to the government on this subject.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL ON MARRIAGE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is a rather special question of privilege. I hope I may have just one minute of the time of the House. There is precedent for this. On March 5, 1971, the then Acting Prime Minister felt compelled to take note of a certain event. I want to do the same today and return the favour. I will do it by replacing my name with his name in what he said on March 5, 1971 in *Hansard:*

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for not having given notice yesterday of the intention of our esteemed government House leader to get married . . . The trouble is he did not consult the members of his Cabinet on this essentially private affair, but I am sure all members of the House will join me in wishing great happiness and long life to the happy pair.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. On behalf of the members of the opposition, I want to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for bringing this event to our attention in this almost unique way. I ask him to express the very best wishes of the members of the opposition on this act of great wisdom by the government House leader. I

ask him to express to his seatmate our very best wishes for a long and happy married life.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) rose I had the rule book in my hand. I was thinking of proposing a motion under Standing Order 5 to give the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) leave to be away. However, since he has taken that leave himself, we join with the Prime Minister and with the spokesman of the official opposition in extending our best wishes to the Honourable and Mrs. Mitchell Sharp.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues of the Social Credit Party of Canada, I join the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as well as the official opposition and hon. members of the New Democratic Party in extending to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) our best wishes of happiness on the occasion of his wedding and we hope he will enjoy many happy and gratifying years.

[*English*]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DR. G. S. DHILLON, MINISTER OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT FOR INDIA

Mr. Speaker: Before beginning the oral question period, which I will extend for a few minutes after three o'clock so that before we are away for a few days, hopefully, hon. members will enjoy a full and ample question period, I draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in our gallery of a very distinguished visitor who is here today in his capacity of Minister of Shipping and Transport for India. He is much better known to us in his former capacity as a very distinguished Speaker. He was one of the Commonwealth's most outstanding Speakers for seven years in his role as Speaker of the LokSabha, Dr. G. S. Dhillon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REASON FOR INCREASE IN PRICE OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, after the announcement of dairy policy by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday I will put my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and ask him whether he will inform the House why we are faced with the worst of both worlds, namely, an increase in dairy prices to the Canadian consumer at a time when the Minister of Agriculture is asking dairy producers to reduce production?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): First, allow me to congratulate the hon. gentleman for his new role in the shadow cabinet; I hope he remains in the shadows for a long, long time. As a member who represents a farm region he is in a position to understand the intricacies which have resulted in this situation. The dairy farmers of this country have been victims of a world-wide phenomenon, basically that of a world-wide surplus of skimmed milk powder which has unexpectedly reduced their incomes. Accordingly, all segments of Canadian society have been asked to help the farmers in this situation.

The Treasury Board has aided substantially, farmers themselves are voluntarily cutting down production in this coming year and we have asked the public to absorb 5 cents on the price of butter, knowing full well that if the price of butter continues to rise farmers will eventually see a diminishing market at home, something which would only add to their problems in the long run. I can only hope that the announcement made by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday, with the object of avoiding this situation next year, will have a beneficial effect on prices as well.

Mr. Grafftey: Before I put a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Consumer Affairs on his appointment and assure him we shall not be in the shadows for long; I shall keep galloping along with my leader.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: In the hope, again tentative, that for the next two weeks, hon. members may be deprived of the scintillating questions asked during the question period, perhaps members on both sides would agree to stay with questions and answers.

* * *

● (1420)

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE OF NEW DAIRY POLICY TO COMMITTEE AND TO ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the Minister of Agriculture. Because of the disastrous dairy policy announced last April setting the target support price too high for dairy products, which resulted in over-production, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture why the Canadian consumer and producer should pay such a penalty for his mistakes? Considering the price increase anticipated for Canadian consumers and the fact the individual producers will suffer to the extent of $2,000 to $3,000 a year, would the minister refer his announced dairy policy to the appropriate standing committee of this House, and if not, why not?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost the dairy farmers of Canada last year presented figures to justify their request for $14 a hundredweight for milk. We did not give them what they wanted and they are still condemning us for that. I would

dare the hon. member to go into his constituency and tell the dairy farmers that I paid them too much, which is what he has suggested. There is nothing stopping the agriculture committee dealing with dairy policy. I understand that they were supposed to deal with it today but they could not find a quorum since not enough members were going to be present.

Some of my officials are meeting at the present time with some of the dairy farmers of Canada and discussing the proposed policy and program for this year which I announced yesterday in the House. If it is creating a hardship on farmers, then I did not tell them to produce over 100 million hundredweight of milk last year. If the hon. member would read the announcement I made last April, he would find that I told them to produce 100 million hundredweight of milk and no more.

Mr. Grafftey: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister explained to the Anti-Inflation Board how the consumer can pay more at a time when he is asking the producer to restrict production; and in view of the anticipated increase in the price to the consumer, has the minister referred the proposed dairy policy to the Anti-Inflation Board?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the Anti-Inflation Board has been having discussions with the Canadian Dairy Commission and is perfectly aware of the formula the commission is operating under. Let me tell the hon. member that if labour and business in this country were like the dairy farmers, who are operating under a stricter program than we are suggesting for labour or industry, there would be no need for an Anti-Inflation Board.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR JUSTIFICATION OF INCREASE IN PRICE OF BUTTER

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Considering that the storage of butter surpluses is extremely expensive and that the price of butter increased by 5 cents a pound, which may well reduce consumption, how can the minister justify in the eyes of the consumer such an increase in the price of butter when we have surpluses which cost us so much?

[*English*]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not tried to justify to the consumer why our dairy policy has resulted in a five cent increase in the price of a pound of butter. On the contrary, I have expressed my regret that this is one of the end results of the policy. Having said that, I am pragmatic enough to know that the farmers, as a result of a world-wide surplus of skim milk powder, are facing extraordinary storage charges. We are asking all segments of society to bear the cost of that particular problem which is bearing on a particularly important group of people. We cannot develop the type of society in which each and every one of us would be selfish enough to share the benefits and not be prepared to share some of the problems of other segments of society. We have helped the dairy farmers, even if the opposition does not agree.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT PAYING ENTIRE COST OF STORAGE OF BUTTER

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a second supplementary for the Minister of Agriculture.

Considering that, according to what he said yesterday, it seems already certain that the credits for storage cost are insufficient, will the minister ask the producers to pay for the storage cost if necessary or is he prepared today to ensure that this will be provided by the government?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am confident that if the dairy farmers do what they have said they are going to do about production and domestic consumption, they probably will not need all the money we are providing. I am hoping this is going to be the fact. My officials and our dairy farmers, yours and mine, advise us that they are going to adhere to this kind of program but they are not going to produce for waste, and are not going to produce to give away their products. We do not ask anybody else in our society to do that.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN DECISION ON WAGE SETTLEMENT OF URANIUM MINERS

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that workers in Canada who work for the uranium mines are subject to a totally disproportionate degree of risk of acquiring both silicosis and lung cancer, and given the fact that the trade union negotiating for such employees in the Elliot Lake region negotiated as part of the package an early retirement provision, designed precisely to protect the health of those workers, will the minister assure the House that the government will intervene in the extraordinary decision of the Anti-Inflation Board that held down the proposed negotiated settlement to 12 per cent, the bare guideline in this case, thus putting in total jeopardy the package negotiated by the union, accepted by the company, and intended to protect the health of those employees?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the assurance that we will intervene, although my colleague, the Minister of Labour, in particular, has been concerned about the efforts the federal government would like to take to assure better safety standards in uranium mines at Elliot Lake and elsewhere in Canada. I should say that the Anti-Inflation Board will be meeting on Tuesday next, April 20, with parties to this particular settlement for the purpose of clarifying the

decision. I will be looking forward to a report from the board after that time on reactions expressed at that meeting to see what further action might be taken. I might just add in this regard that as soon as Bill C-89 is adopted by the House that would provide a route for either the company or the union to seek a review of the decision. For the time being, the board has agreed to meet with the parties to discuss it further, and I will await the results of that discussion.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the board, of course, refused to meet with those workers in the first place. Considering that one of the provisions of the law now on the books would enable the board to make a ruling that would provide for an increase beyond the 12 per cent level, that is the provision relating to the fact that the 12 per cent increase might result in a lack of workers going into the industry, in which case they would be exempt, and given the fact that everyone knows there is a profound health hazard associated with working in uranium mines, rather than waiting for the results of that meeting next week or two weeks, will the minister assure the House that the government will make known to the Anti-Inflation Board that it does not accept this extraordinarily bad ruling in this instance?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that the hon. gentleman is correct when he says there was a refusal to communicate between the board and the union in question. It does seem to me, however, that the board has been given the responsibility by parliament for negotiating between parties in this kind of situation. It does remain sensible for the board to engage in that kind of negotiation such as the kind of discussion that is implied next Tuesday. Under the circumstances, I think it would be far wiser to await that discussion and see what the conclusions would be. As to the application of the particular exemption referred to, that of course is a matter which will be before the Anti-Inflation Board and it will want to take it into account in its decision on this matter.

● (1430)

POSSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN DECISION ON WAGE SETTLEMENT OF MINERS AT THOMPSON, MANITOBA

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): As a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a question with reference to another decision made by the same brilliant board. Does the government plan to take any action concerning the settlement the board has deemed to be appropriate for miners working at Thompson, Manitoba which again has been set at the 12 per cent level and will leave miners in the Inco Corporation in that part of Canada being paid substantially less than the miners in the Sudbury region who work for precisely the same company? I should like to ask the minister if the government will not make it clear to the board that the same provision for companies to be able to ensure a supply of workers, and thus have an exemption under the guidelines, applies in the Thompson case and that here again the decision should have been one that would have provided workers there with an increase well above the 12 per cent limit.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the board would have taken into account that particular consideration, but certainly I would be glad to mention that point of view to the board. It seems to me, however, that the same principle applies where parliament has given this board this authority that it should have the opportunity to exercise its best judgment on the matter.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

NEW DAIRY POLICY—INQUIRY WHETHER MINISTER WILL MEET PRODUCERS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

According to the law of supply and demand prices would tend to drop when supply exceeds demand. This is the case with the dairy industry.

The second part of my question is this: since the government dairy policy was announced yesterday and in view of the reports we have received and the pressure we are made to feel, did the minister have any communication with the APU asking for a meeting for today or so, in order to discuss this overall policy concerning the dairy industry in Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware if UPA has made that request. We have met with representatives of La Belle Province industrial milk producers at the Sir John Carling Building this morning.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT PRODUCERS BENEFIT FROM INCREASED PRICE OF MILK

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary, which is also directed to the Minister of Agriculture.

Given the fact that the support price for butter has been increased by five cents a pound and that the price for milk powder has been raised by four cents a pound, which represents roughly 50 cents a hundredweight to be absorbed by the consumers, may I ask the minister, even if he would be tempted to answer that this is not under his jurisdiction, whether he would be prepared to exercise his influence in order that processing plants give industrial milk producers the benefit of the full amount of this price increase as compensation for producers having to pay the 70 cents a hundredweight increase for export?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, that is the general intention, but I would just remind the hon. member that over 80 per cent of the dairy products which go to the industrial markets are marketed by co-operatives owned by the farmers themselves.

[*Translation*]

METHOD OF DISPOSING OF SURPLUS MILK

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a supplementary.

Could the minister tell the House how the Canadian Dairy Commission will dispose of the surplus milk subject to the $8.60 a hundredweight penalty? Will these surpluses be turned into butter or some other products to be marketed at the same prices as those for milk subject to quotas?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, any surplus milk that the hon. member talks about that will suffer a penalty of $8.60 per hundredweight will not be wasted. We are hoping that it will just not be produced because farmers will be producing it for a few odd cents a hundred. This just does not make common sense or economic sense.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR MEETING WITH PREMIERS OF ATLANTIC PROVINCES TO DISCUSS ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Finance I should like to direct to the Prime Minister a question arising from the sharply increasing unemployment level in Atlantic Canada as indicated by Statistics Canada yesterday. Since one purpose of the control program was to contain inflation without increasing regional disparity, would the Prime Minister give us a commitment or advise the House whether the Minister of Finance will hold formal talks prior to final budget preparations with all four governments of the Atlantic region to reach some kind of open understanding on employment goals and on common fiscal action.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that such talks have been held by the Minister of Finance with all the provincial ministers of finance just a few weeks ago.

SUGGESTED NARROWING OF REGIONAL DISPARITY AS GOAL IN PREPARATION OF BUDGET

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, can the Prime Minister indicate to us whether the Minister of Finance in going into the preparation of his budget now has some common understanding with the premiers of the four Atlantic provinces regarding the impact of the federal policy upon those regions, and if he has not will the Prime Minister give us an undertaking now that there will be that kind of consultation prior to the final preparation of the budget so that the budget will not have another devastating impact upon that region of Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can give the House the assurance that the finance minister's budget will take into account not only the effect of that budget on the maritimes but on all parts of Canada. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the unemployment figures fluctuate from time to time. In the past two years the growth in investment in the maritimes has been much higher than the national average and employment growth has been much higher than the national average.

An hon. Member: That is silly.

Mr. Trudeau: It is not silly. Those are the facts. These figures vary from time to time. I am rather surprised that the Leader of the Opposition wants a budget to be designed only for the maritimes. Surely all parts of Canada are important.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is losing his touch even in diversionary tactics. I would invite him to read the documents prepared by his colleague the minister responsible for DREE which indicate that capital formation in Atlantic Canada will continue to lag substantially behind the national average. In light of that I wonder whether the Prime Minister can assure us now—and I stress that I am not asking him to anticipate any specific budgetary decisions—that the goal of narrowing regional disparity this year will be a priority consideration—I emphasize "priority" consideration"—in the over-all approach of the Minister of Finance to the forthcoming budget.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I would want to point out to the Leader of Opposition that the very documents to which he refers if he looks at them well will indicate that my statement about capital formation in the past two years is correct and that it is higher in the maritimes than in the nation as a whole. The hon. member cannot quote a document and then deny what is in the document.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister depart from these diversions and answer the question as to whether or not the Government of Canada is going to follow the goal of narrowing regional disparity this year as it applies to Atlantic Canada and take that as a priority consideration in the preparation of the budget which is to be presented sometime in May. Will he answer that question.

An hon. Member: Yes or no.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes.

PROPOSED RECONSIDERATION OF SPENDING PRIORITIES TO BETTER AID THE ATLANTIC REGION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might direct a supplementary to the Prime Minister with regard to the economic slowdown possibly as a result of the controls where the impact has been severest, in Atlantic Canada. Can he say whether there is now underway a reconsideration of the spending priorities of such key departments as DREE, Industry, Trade and Commerce, Transport or Manpower with a view to a possible redistribution of their existing budgetary allotment to better aid the Atlantic region in at least regaining the ground it has lost this past two years and if such a review is not now

underway what type of immediate assistance is the government contemplating?

● (1440)

An hon. Member: Yes or No?

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

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Petulant child!

Mr. Trudeau: Hon. members opposite should know that.

An hon. Member: Remember your blood pressure.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the House is very serious, judging by the interventions.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am really quite disappointed that the Prime Minister feels unable to answer a basic question with respect to what he considers to be so fundamental. The reason I am so concerned is that in my area unemployment has risen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member has a supplementary question, will he put it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): In view of the more than one third increase in unemployment which has occurred in some areas, I should like to ask whether the Prime Minister would establish some form of interdepartmental or government co-ordination specifically addressed to the problem of rising unemployment and, if not, would he convene at the earliest possible moment a meeting of first ministers from the Atlantic provinces to consider these major problems in unemployment, escalating electricity costs, transportation, etc., which are crippling the economy of the Atlantic region?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I am really amazed at the opposition members making suggestions now of things which the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has been doing for several years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That is the reason for the higher growth which has taken place in the Maritimes in the past few years. I am pleased that they are jumping on our bandwagon. Of course, we will continue our programs.

An hon. Member: What absolute balderdash!

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister of Labour met with Air Canada and CALEA last night. If that is so, I should like to ask the minister if he could inform the House of the results of that meeting?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Could you not have asked it in caucus?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I thank the hon. member very much for his interest in this troublesome dispute. I would indicate that the parties did meet last night and they are continuing to talk now.

An hon. Member: Oh, bully for you!

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

AWARDING OF CLEANING CONTRACTS IN OTTAWA TO COMPANY OWNED BY CIVIL SERVANT

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister in view of the absence of the Minister of Public Works. Has the Prime Minister been advised that a company whose principal owner is a fairly senior employee of the Bank of Canada has been awarded at least four cleaning contracts in federal government buildings in Ottawa since 1972 and, if so, does the minister consider that to be a conflict of interest?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of these facts but I will take note of them.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

EXTENSION OF INVESTIGATION INTO CLEANING CONTRACTS TO OTTAWA—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Unfortunately the Solicitor General is not here either, so I will direct my supplementary question to the Acting Solicitor General. Has he been advised that the RCMP investigation into the awarding of cleaning contracts in Toronto has now been expanded to include Ottawa, and if this is the case, can he tell us what the terms of that investigation are?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is not the practice of the House to report on RCMP investigations.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

ELECTIONS

REASON FOR DELAY OF BY-ELECTION IN OTTAWA-CARLETON

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this question of the Prime Minister in view of his reference to the bandwagon. Is the reason he is holding back in providing for an election in Ottawa-

Carleton that he feels the Liberal bandwagon will turn out to be a funeral procession?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I want to answer this, Mr. Speaker. It might be a funeral procession and we will bury some of the hon. members opposite.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Let us have the election.

An hon. Member: You won't need an ambulance.

Mr. Lawrence: Actions speak louder than words.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO BOARD OF PRICE INCREASE BY "MACLEAN'S"

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance. It concerns the responsibility of the Department of Finance for anti-inflation measures. My question arises from information in yesterday's press stating *Maclean's* magazine is raising its price from 50 cents per copy to 60 cents per copy, and the question is this: Since *Maclean's* magazine is the chief calculated beneficiary of recent legislation passed by this government and since they have recently stated that they wish to serve urban areas in Canada, abandoning any rural contact, will the government and its Anti-Inflation Board allow that magazine to benefit from this 20 per cent price hike which I am sure is far above any permitted increase according to anti-inflation guidelines?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the guidelines apply to corporations as well as to other sections of society and most generally they apply through the profit margin. I imagine they have raised their price because they want to maintain their profit margin after the publicity they gave the Tory leader in one of their recent issues.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Bryce did all right.

An hon. Member: Mackasey for leader.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—EFFECT OF ATTEMPTED FINANCIAL REORGANIZATION OF COMPANY

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. The president of Lockheed stated yesterday that Lockheed has agreed to the investigation of itself as a necessary prerequisite to finalizing their recapitalization plan with 24 banks. Lockheed is clearly in the throes of a very difficult financial reorganization. Does this reduce the minister's enthusiasm for the Lockheed contract, and, if so, is he going to do anything about Lockheed's worsening situation?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): The government has an option to complete the contract, an option which terminates at the end of this month. Our objective is to achieve the contract before that time. We are now in the process of holding discussions with the U.S. government to receive the assurances that we need before signing the contract, and Lockheed itself is discussing the financing arrangements with the Canadian banks.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—RETENTION OF RIGHTS IN ELECTRONIC PACKAGE IF DEVELOPMENT COSTS PAID

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, apparently yesterday's sad financial news for Lockheed makes no difference to his determination to deal with them. If the Lockheed LRPA contract is signed, I understand that Canada will be paying all the research and development costs of the S3A electronic package, which may be as high as $100 million. Is the minister ensuring that Canada will retain residual equity rights to these technical developments if there are future sales beyond the Canadian 18?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): It is obvious that Canada is not paying for the development of the S3A. The S3A equipment is already in service in the United States in their carrier borne aircraft. It must have been developed long before Canada got into the picture. We are, of course, putting that type of equipment into the new aircraft, and there will be one-time engineering costs involved, but we are certainly not involved in the development of that equipment.

* * *

● (1450)

NATIONAL REVENUE

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF DEPARTMENTAL POLICY OF EMPLOYING HANDICAPPED

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue. Can the minister inform the House whether there is a conscious effort on the part of his department to employ the handicapped, and if so, would he use his influence with his cabinet colleagues so that they might follow his laudable example within their respective departments?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is a conscious policy.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cullen: It just makes good sense that people who have minor handicaps—we all have one handicap or another; look at the opposition—should be helped in this way. For example, some changes should be made in buildings so that people who are handicapped and have to use

wheel chairs can move about. Perhaps we should take some initiative in that area.

CONSULTATIONS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS TO DESIGNATE SPECIFIC POSITIONS FOR HANDICAPPED

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Revenue. Would he consult with his colleagues, the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, in order to have specific positions in the public service designated for handicapped people, including members of the opposition, who always have aspirations to get to the other side of the House, and will he follow the example of other countries which have advanced social policies in this respect?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): No, Mr. Speaker. I do not agree with designating certain jobs and saying that they will be done by the handicapped. My experience has been that the handicapped can handle most jobs, and we should not limit them by setting quotas or designating jobs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

TRANSPORT

POSSIBILITY OF INQUIRY INTO SINKING OF "SAN JUAN" TO DETERMINE CAPABILITY OF SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Yesterday the minister tabled in the House the summary report of the in house investigation into the sinking of the fishing vessel, the *San Juan*, off the east coast of Newfoundland. It followed on the heels of a statement the minister released last week in which he admitted that present marine search and rescue capabilities are inadequate. Since this in house investigation raises more questions than answers, does the minister now intend to order a full scale inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the sinking of this vessel and the loss of the lives of two fishermen which would address itself to the whole situation?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker. It is my view that the investigation answers the questions raised by the events surrounding the sinking of the *San Juan*. The hon. member is quite right that there are other questions in relation to the total search and rescue capability, and as he knows, at the moment we are making a very determined effort to take those in hand and to ensure that there will be improvements. Those improvements will be announced in due course.

MEASURES TO ENSURE EFFICIENCY OF SEARCH AND RESCUE ORGANIZATION PENDING REPORT OF TASK FORCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): In view of the fact that the statement of the minister last week indicated that the report of the task force on search and rescue procedures, to which the minister just referred, will not be ready for the cabinet before mid-summer, and in view of the fact that we are now embarking on another full scale fishing season, what immediate plans does the minister intend to put into operation to cover the inadequacies to which he referred? Surely there will be maximum efficiency in whatever search and rescue capability we now have.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): The statement from my office, which was a very long one outlining all the things which have been done and some very fine improvements in our basic qualities, did indeed indicate the need for additional efforts. I know the hon. member is disturbed that that straightforward statement on my part left him without a charge to lay, but I would say that I believe the hon. member is misreading the statement which, as I recall, said the report would be presented before mid-summer, which is rather different from his statement, which was "not" before summer.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DATE OF DECISION ON CLOSING OF MILITARY BASES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. The minister has indicated that because of his timetable he would be preparing a submission to cabinet by the end of March. Would the minister advise whether the cabinet now has the schedule of reductions in military bases, and in particular, when does he expect a definitive decision? Will it be made during the parliamentary recess, or will it be deferred so that we can discuss it in the House?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure rationalization paper is now before a cabinet committee. There will be no announcement during the recess.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REASON MISS CARRIÈRE WROTE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT CONCERNING SKY SHOPS

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. What possible reason would Miss Carmel Carrière, then the executive assistant to the Minister of the Environment, for whose actions the minister obviously must be held responsible, allegedly send a handwritten note on ministerial stationery to Andrew Chatwood, executive assistant to the then minister of transport, under date of October 26, 1971 pertaining to the Sky Shops lease?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I missed the first part of the question, but if the hon. member is asking about a matter which is under investigation, I told the House yesterday that the RCMP had made their report to the office of the provincial attorney general, that it would be up to them to assess the evidence they have, and if they laid charges, we would await the verdict.

If they do not lay charges, I hope the opposition will stop laying charges.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): You know it's true.

Mr. Lawrence: I have no knowledge of the RCMP investigation because we cannot get that information. However, I wonder if that handwritten letter would have anything to do with an alleged letter written on November 23, 1971—obviously in reply—by Mr. Chatwood to William Huck in the air transport division of the Ministry of Transport with a copy of the letter going to O. G. Stoner, deputy transport minister, saying that the hon. Mr. Marchand was insisting that no competitive bids for that lease be called.

Mr. Trudeau: I would not know, but I would be glad to draw that piece of evidence to the attention of the RCMP, in whom I have confidence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, come on.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF COPPER MINE AND SMELTER IN CHILE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government of Canada directly or indirectly, through the Export Development Corporation, the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank, assisted in financing a very large proposal by Noranda Mines Limited, a Canadian corporation, or any of its subsidiaries for a copper mine and smelter in Andocollo, Chile? If it has not done so, has it undertaken to do so?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there has been no approval by the government of Canada to support financially a copper project by Noranda in Chile. I understand there may be some such proposal in mind, but to my knowledge no application has been made by Noranda for government assistance or government assurance through the EDC.

In order to complete the picture and to avoid misunderstanding later, I should say that Canada has joined the World Bank in support of a loan for copper development in Chile, but it is not, to my knowledge, the Noranda development. It is a globally supported development in that country.

Mr. Brewin: In light of the fact that this government, as well as the United Nations, has condemned the regime of terror and torture in Chile, and in light of the economic situation there, where there was a 340 per cent inflation rate for 1975, will the minister undertake, as far as he can do so, that the Canadian government will not directly or indirectly support investments by Canadian multinational corporations, which would have the effect of bolstering the regime in Chile?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. MacEachen: As the hon. member knows, we have consistently condemned the denial of human rights in Chile, and we have made our voice clear in the United Nations in that respect. However, we have not reached the conclusion that the discussion on multinational subjects at the World Bank or other international agencies ought to be politicized in the way the hon. member suggests. Nor do I accept the notion that these investments are directed to the maintenance in power of the present government. Rather, they contribute to the maintenance of the social and economic development of the country.

* * *

● (1500)

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES ON PATRIATION

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

In view of the documents tabled in the House by the Prime Minister last Friday when he gave details on the correspondence exchanged since April 9, 1975 with regard to the avenues open for patriating the Canadian constitution, and bearing in mind that two federal-provincial conferences are to be held grouping the Prime Minister and provincial premiers in early May and around the middle of June can the Prime Minister tell hon. members of the House whether he intends to broach the subject at one or the other conference, or whether he plans to convene s special conference to discuss this subject alone? If so, when would he propose to do so? If not, does he intend to ask the Clerk of the Privy Council to go and meet the premiers of the Canadian provinces to get their points of view and agree with them on the steps to be taken further to the proposals made in his letter of March 31 last?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to answer the last point the hon. member brought up, I must say that the secretary to the Cabinet for federal-provincial relations is now visiting one of the provinces to discuss this matter, at the request of its premier.

As for the first part of the question, I suggested to the premiers that we discuss the matter when we meet early in May. However, I have yet to receive replies from all premiers and, for the time being, I do not know whether this question will be on the agenda or whether we will have to discuss it at a later date.

* * *

[*English*]

URBAN AFFAIRS

HUMAN SETTLEMENTS CONFERENCE—REASON FOR EMPHASIS ON URBAN RATHER THAN RURAL PROBLEMS

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. The upcoming United Nations Conference on Human Settlements will place great emphasis on problems

urban areas of the future will face, but the agenda places little emphasis on the problem of rural housing. As the minister has said that the vast majority of the world's poor live in rural settlements, why is more emphasis not being placed on solving the housing problem in rural areas, a problem which applies not only to agricultural land areas but also to small villages and towns?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the agenda for the conference is set internationally by the United Nations itself. There is to be great emphasis on rural settlements, an emphasis which I welcome, as do both developed and developing countries. That matter will certainly be emphasized and included in Canada's position as presented to the United Nations.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NEW COMMISSIONER OF NORTHWEST TERRITORIES WILL BE RESIDENT OF AREA

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Without commenting on the specific appointment of the new commissioner to the Yukon, in view of the concern expressed by the people of the Yukon about the appointment of an individual who is not a resident of the territory and a similar concern expressed by the residents of the Northwest Territories, will the Prime Minister assure the House and people of the Northwest Territories that, when the present commissioner of the Northwest Territories retires, his replacement will be a resident of the territories and that the wishes of the elected representatives of the Northwest Territories will not be ignored, as happened in the Yukon?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my information is that the newly appointed commissioner of the Yukon had been a resident of the Yukon for many years.

An hon. Member: Had?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, yes. I think he moved out last year to Edmonton, which is not so remote from the Yukon, because Albertans are often seeking jurisdiction over the Yukon or the territories. I do not think a man is disqualified, and his knowledge of the area erased, just because he has been away from it one year; otherwise, hon. members on both side of the House would be disqualified.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GUATEMALA—REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF SKIM MILK POWDER IN AID TO EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

Mr. Sean O'Sullivan (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. At the end of this month further aid to the stricken people of Guatemala will be shipped from the east coast. Included in that aid will be building and medical supplies. I might say that this special shipment coordinated by the Diocese of Hamilton would not have been possible without the extraordinary efforts of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Labour. I congratulate them both for their humanitarian efforts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'Sullivan: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to go a step further. In the shipment there is room for ten tons of skim milk powder. Will he make representations to the Minister of Agriculture, so that there may be included in the shipment ten tons of skim milk powder, as this commodity, contrary to earlier reports, can be consumed by the people of Guatemala who need it desperately.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments about efforts being made in Guatemala. I shall not have any difficulty in making representations to my colleague about skim milk powder. He has frequently made similar representations to me and I am happy for a chance to return the compliment.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

POSSIBILITY OF AGREEMENT ON METHOD OF AMENDING PRIOR TO PATRIATION

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. If the federal government were to patriate the constitution unilaterally, in line with the Prime Minister's suggestion, the British parliament would need to amend certain key provisions. I ask, how would these key provisions be amended when the provinces cannot agree on the amending formula?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had dealt in detail with that matter when I answered in the House last week. The short answer is that we have three formulae whereby patriation would be possible. All three indicate a procedure for amendment which, in first instance, would be based on the unanimous consent of the provinces. That is to say, all provinces would be involved when any amendment is adopted or when any amending procedure is adopted. Surely, the hon. member would not expect more than this. You cannot have more than unanimity.

* * *

ENERGY

OIL—INCREASED COST TO BRITISH COLUMBIA CONSUMERS AS RESULT OF SARNIA-MONTREAL PIPELINE—REQUEST FOR SUBSIDY

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The minister has been advised by the minister responsible for energy in British Columbia that the phasing out of oil exports through the Trans Mountain Pipe Line to the Pacific northwest will increase the tariff per barrel for

B.C. consumers by an estimated 74 cents per barrel, for an estimated total cost of $37 million in the year 1977. As this volume will be flowing through the Sarnia-Montreal pipeline, to an area receiving a $20 million pipeline subsidy and an area which also benefits from subsidized, imported oil, can the minister say if the federal government will subsidize this new $37 million annual cost to B.C. consumers, a cost caused by this new direction of flow?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the same story said that the B.C. minister was writing to me, to set out his arguments. I have not yet seen his letter.

* * *

OLYMPIC GAMES

ALLEGED FALSE ADVERTISING OF GOLD COINS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. Does the minister know that high powered, national week-end advertisements for the $100 Canadian Olympic gold coin represented that the coin is destined to become one of the most exciting coins in history and that all previous Canadian gold coin issues have increased dramatically in value? But that same advertisement did not say that all previous Canadian issues contained gold content equal to their face value. The currently issued gold coin sells for $105 but contains only $32 worth of gold. If the minister is aware of these advertisements, is he satisfied that they are fair representations to an unsuspecting public? As Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, can he assure the House that this does not constitute misleading advertising?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it is not misleading advertising to say that it is one of the most exciting coins we have ever produced. The fact that the coin has virtually sold out indicates that. It is not misleading advertising to say that all previous coins, or any coins produced in the past by the Canadian mint and circulated by the Canadian government, have appreciated in value. These are facts.

Mr. Bawden: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate the minister's comment on the gold content. While he answers, will he say if he was consulted prior to the publication of this slick gold coin advertising which calls the coin a solid investment and suggests that there may be gains of up to 37 times the original investment, without explaining the difference between the value of gold content and the price at which the coin is being offered. Will the minister assure the House that this shabby and misleading advertising will not reflect on the international standing of our currency?

● (1510)

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the only thing shabby is the question. If people want to buy pure gold, they can do it. However, when you buy a Canadian gold coin with a face value of $100, we do not pretend there is $100 worth of gold in it anymore than with any of our other coinage. You are buying what the hon. member fails to appreciate; the beauty of the coin, the fact that it is related to a once in a lifetime event, the Olympics, that it is a work of art and that it is appreciated all over the world. It is very much in demand. That is one of the reasons it will appreciate in value. This may just reflect the lack of cultural value of the hon. member when putting his question in such a manner.

[Mr. Huntington.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bawden: Mr. Speaker, the advertising virtually assures buyers that their $100 coins will be worth something in the order of $3,000 or $3,500. I think the minister will agree that is going too far.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, it is true that it is almost equal to the percentage increase reaching the oil industry through drilling.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

Fifth report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence—Mr. Dupras.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

TEXTILE AND CLOTHING BOARD

TABLING OF REPORTS RESPECTING OUTERWEAR, MEN'S AND BOYS' SHIRTS, AND ACRYLIC YARNS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table today in both official languages three reports from the Textile and Clothing Board. There are reports of an inquiry respecting outerwear, men's and boys' shirts, and acrylic yarns.

* * *

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSALS TO EXTEND COVERAGE

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement which I hope will be encouraging news to over one half million residents of Canada who are presently deprived of social security benefits earned in other countries because of the absence of reciprocal agreements with those countries.

I wish to announce the government's intention to submit to parliament, in the coming months, legislation amending the Old Age Security Act. Parliament will be asked to

adopt measures, first, to increase the flexibility of the residence requirements relating to eligibility for a pension; second, to remove the all-or-nothing feature of the present legislation, thereby relating the pension to the beneficiary's association with Canada and bringing the legislation into line conceptually with the CPP; and third, to build into our program the possibility of its inclusion in international reciprocal arrangements with other countries, such as Italy, the United States, and the United Kingdom, so that our residents who have earned social security rights in foreign countries can receive them in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Canadians haves good reason to be proud of the present old age security program. It is a generous, non-contributory universal program which few other industrialized countries can match. The changes which I propose will not affect the conditions under which lifetime residents of Canada, or those in their immediate pre-retirement years, can qualify for or enjoy their pensions.

Its essential features will remain: universality, payable at age 65, or 60 in the case of the spouse's allowance, eligibility subject to a minimum of ten years residence after age 18 or a minimum of twenty years residence in Canada if it is to be paid on a permanent basis to a beneficiary living abroad. The proposed changes I am announcing today are to enable the program to address the inequities which are arising because of the increasing number of persons whose active working life and retirement are not all spent in Canada. When the program was first introduced, mobility across international boundaries was much less, and migration was usually once-in-a-lifetime event. But the situation is changing and the present act, which takes no account at all of the pension credits which Canadian residents may have acquired in other countries nor provides for international agreements, should also be changed.

[*English*]

These proposals will make the present residence rules fairer and will also make them simpler over the long run. I would like to sketch out the changes and explain our strategy for implementing them.

The government will propose that the old age security pension be "earned" by residents at the rate of one fortieth of the eventual full pension for one year of residence in Canada after age 18. This would mean that legal residence in Canada for 40 years would qualify a person for the full OAS pension, and residence for less than 40 years after age 18 would qualify a person for a portion of the full pension. This change will achieve several worth-while objectives. It will eliminate the inequities which result in a small but significant number of cases from the rigorous application of the current eligibility rules.

At present to qualify for the pension at age 65, one must (a), have resided in Canada for 40 years after age 18 ("40 year rule"); or (b), have resided in Canada for any consecutive 10 year period from age 55 onward ("10 year rule"); or (c), qualify under the "three-for-one rule". This last eligibility rule is a formula under which three years of presence in Canada between age 18 and 55 will count for one year of residence under the ten-year rule provided that the applicant resides in Canada during the year preceding commencement of the pension.

These rules created an all-or-nothing situation. The changes we will propose will relate the amount of the pension to the degree of association that the individual has had with our country. This will create a stronger program, and in fact one which is more consistent with the Canada Pension Plan in which benefits relate to contributions made here.

At the international level the changes which we will be proposing will enhance the government's ability to protect the acquired social security credits of our residents who migrate across international boundaries during their active years, by providing for the negotiation of reciprocal agreements. These would be similar to those already entered into by many countries.

There are a great variety of rules in different countries pertaining to the payment abroad of acquired social security benefits. We will seek enabling amendments to include the OAS program in international social security agreements to be negotiated with other countries. Therefore in addition to the authority which the government presently has to negotiate such agreements in respect to the Canada Pension Plan, we will be proposing to acquire such authority in respect to the Old Age Security Act.

Representations have been made constantly over the years by people who do not receive in Canada payment of pension credits accumulated in their country of origin. I have also received frequent representations concerning this issue from members of all parties, and in particular from members on this side of the House. The proposed amendments should facilitate the payment of such pensions through the negotiation of reciprocal agreements. I am convinced that this measure will be welcomed by the many thousands of Canadians of British, Italian, and other origins. Assuming the co-operation of the foreign governments concerned, it would be our desire to reach early agreements with these countries.

It is our firm intention at the same time to protect those who now have the possibility of eventually qualifying for a full pension under the present rules. Our implementation strategy for the new policy will ensure this. For residents who are 25 or over and in Canada at the time the amendments come into force, the more beneficial set of rules, either the present or new ones, would apply. They too would have the opportunity, as they now have, to qualify for a full pension. This choice of alternatives would also apply to those not now resident in Canada but who have had prior legal residence here after the age of 18. To all others, only the new rules which I have just sketched would apply.

I am announcing our intentions as proposals because I will be consulting with the provinces prior to introducing legislation. I would like, in closing, to ask the unanimous consent of the House to table background information on the matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

● (1520)

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity of replying to the minister. May I say first of all that I do not understand why, having looked at the matter over the years, the minister is so late in coming up not with some concrete proposals but suggested proposals which have to be accepted by the provincial governments before he can move a step further.

Secondly, I take an extremely dim view of the attitude and partisanship shown by the minister on page 4 of his statement, where he says:

I have also received frequent representations concerning this issue from members of all parties, and in particular from—

Then he did not want to read the next part, which mentions the hon. member for—

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps to shorten the matter I anticipate that the point concerns the fact that the minister did not speak those words when he made his statement.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, we distribute proposed statements to opposition parties as early as possible as a matter of courtesy. These are "proposed" statements. Obviously it is the right of a minister to modify these proposed statements after they have been sent out, especially on matters of detail. It is really in rather poor taste to raise this point, and I take the strongest exception to the hon. member's trying to use a draft that he has received as words I have actually uttered in the House. If he wants to quote the text, I have no strong objection. Indeed the three members whom he wanted to refer to have been very articulate—and I am glad that they are all on this side of the House—in pressing for changes in this area. However, I felt that in terms of good relations with all members of the House, particularly members on his side, I would not mention individual members. I find the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) acting in rather poor taste.

Mr. Alexander: Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that the minister gave me notice of his statement, but I very much resent that part of the statement which he now finds extremely important was left out. Surely the minister should have the courtesy to advise me that he was not going to mention the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Kaplan), the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia), and the hon. member for St. Catharines (Mr. Parent). He might have called me about it, or his office might have called me.

My point is that there are members on this side of the House who should equally have been singled out if the minister is going to single anybody out. He should also have singled out members from the NDP. He could have referred to the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) and to the hon. member for Hamilton West. All I am saying is that if in the future the minister is going to mention names, to be fair he should mention names of members from all parties.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are into a procedure that has been set down in our Standing Orders since last Easter, almost a year now. The minister has made a statement and the opposition parties are given time to comment on it. It seems to me they can comment on any part of the statement or omission from the statement that is relevant, and this is now taking place.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can have order. What I have to say is for the edification not only of those on this side of the House but those on the other side as well. This statement is obviously a reaction to a bureaucratic oversight and is an attempt to give legitimate power to make international reciprocal agreements, a power that now exists in the Canada Pension Plan. There has now been a recognition of the need of some 500,000 people. It is an astonishing revelation that there are some 500,000 people who are deprived of benefits as a result of the lack of reciprocal agreements. That is the key phrase.

How long has the minister been involved with old age security legislation? Certainly he has since 1973. The act was first brought in in 1951. Now, in 1976, the minister is taking a pie in the sky approach in these proposals, and in the meantime a lot of people are suffering. There has been a cavalier disregard for the plight of thousands of people whose incomes have diminished because of the erosion of the dollar and the high cost of living. Now at long last the government has awakened to the fact that there is significant mobility across international boundaries, and that migration is not a once in a life time matter.

With all respect to the minister, Mr. Speaker, I must say I am somewhat hesitant to give him any praise, even though I like him. He is a nice chap, and although we had a few words of disagreement at the beginning he is trying to do his best. But what disturbs me is the patchwork, ad hoc approach of the minister to our social security programs. At the same time the government is advocating an integrated approach to the entire social security program, and work has been going on now for three years. There is no integration in the minister's proposals; rather it is a patchwork approach that can only lead to further confusion and frustration by denying the rights not of doctors, lawyers, and members of parliament, but of the working poor. This is what I find most discouraging.

We now have a three tiered approach to social security. First there is old age security, and this is going to be affected by the proposed legislation. Old age security is granted universally. We then have the Canada Pension Plan to which a person must contribute. The third tier is private plans. The disturbing thing about private plans is that they are not working. Those who contribute to a private plan are locked in for a 10-year period, and some people leave their employment after five years. I want to know whether the minister is concerned about this. Is he examining the inequities, injustices, and the discrimination that is taking place? I would have thought the minister would have dealt with these questions in his statement.

The minister has now really brought in a fourth tier. The first tier is old age security, the second tier the CPP, and the third private plans. The minister is now taking another approach which puts forward options, and this is why I call it a fourth tier.

Let me just refer to what the minister said on page 5 of his statement:

For residents who are 25 or over and in Canada at the time the amendments come into force, the more beneficial set of rules—old or new—would apply. They too would have the opportunity—as they now have—to qualify for a full pension. This choice of alternatives would also apply to those not now resident in Canada but who have had prior legal residence here after the age of 18. To all others, only the new rules which I have just sketched would apply.

What kind of a mess are we getting into, Mr. Speaker? Once again the government is bringing in confusing, frustrating proposals that are extremely complex. I have every sympathy with the minister, but I must inform him that the members on this side, although very sympathetic to the approach to the over-all picture of social security, want something that is easy to understand, not complex, and, unlike what we have now, non-discriminatory.

I note that there are three objectives in the minister's proposals. The first is to increase the flexibility of the residence requirements relating to eligibility for a pension. There is no question that there is a need for equity and fairness in this regard. The second objective is to remove the all or nothing feature of the present legislation, thereby relating the pension to the beneficiary's association with Canada and bringing the legislation into line conceptually with the CPP. I question whether that is fair or just. We are anxious to meet the minister in debate on this floor and in committee so that the many questions that have to be asked can be answered.

Under this proposal you have a partial payment. Some of those who reach 65 will get full payment and others will not. I do not know how many are involved, who they are, or really what is going on. These are some of the many questions that we must ask. I know the minister will be able to answer them as a result of consultation with his assistants.

● (1530)

There is another question in respect of which one must register some concern. The minister has talked about reciprocal agreements, and I think this relates to Italy, the United States, the United Kingdom, and others. I do not know who the "others" are, and I hope the minister will give us some indication.

An hon. Member: And Germany.

Mr. Alexander: I know we have been involved with Germany, both east and west, but I do not know what the particular situation is right now. The minister is involved with a number of countries and perhaps he could be of some assistance to us in this regard.

The minister also said:

I am announcing our intentions as proposals because I will be consulting with the provinces prior to introducing legislation.

I should like to know what that particular sentence means. This minister has been consulting, consulting, and consulting, for over three years.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: That sounds like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) interjecting, and I have no idea why. I have no idea why he would interrupt as I have not referred to him. I am talking to you, Mr. Speaker, in order to get to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), not the Minister of Justice.

Has the minister been consulting with the provinces in respect of the introduction of this legislation? Is there agreement right across this country? Is Ontario in shape for this, and what about British Columbia? Are all the provinces in shape?

In conclusion, and I know I have over-stepped my bounds—

Mr. Paproski: No you haven't.

Mr. Alexander: I know the minister would like to hear what I have to say. There are many questions that have to be asked and answered. Therefore we are hesitant about giving the minister a blanket endorsation of the proposals at this time. We appreciate what the minister is doing, but there are a lot of questions we have to ask, questions that we hope will be answered.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I want my first words in response to the Minister's statement to be that it is a welcome statement.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I suppose I can say that I have had as much to do with old age pensions over the years as anyone now in this House of Commons, and I take second place to no one in calling for improvements and in pointing out deficiencies and inadequacies.

And the same time, I have to say that in respect of the two matters the minister is now seeking to do something about, his proposals deserve the endorsation of the House. His proposals deal in the main with the residence requirement for old age security on the part of persons who are Canadians, and with the question of reciprocity in the pension field between this country and other countries.

I hope it is not too immodest for me to say that I was asking questions about the residence requirements and pressing for changes at least 30 years ago, and that I started pressing for the government to do something in the field of reciprocity nearly 20 years ago. I recognize that it has taken the government a long time to get to this point, but certainly in the field of reciprocity this does involve negotiations with other countries. Even after this statement the minister may have difficulty achieving as many reciprocal agreements as he would like. So, even though it has taken all this time. I am glad this bit of progress is being made.

I said that the statement deals with two matters: one having to do with reciprocity, and the other having to do with changes in the residence requirements that have to be met in order to qualify for old age security and, consequentially, the guaranteed income supplement.

Despite the fact that my friend who just spoke thinks it is complicated, the general formula that is proposed is better than the one we have now. At the present time we have, as the minister pointed out, the ten-year rule, the 20-year rule, the 40-year rule, the three-for-one-rule, and the last-year rule. It is awfully difficult to explain these

various rules to people. Now we are going to have a rule that says that you earn one fortieth of the old age security pension for each full year you spend in this country as an adult. That will have a particular advantage for persons who spend part of their time in Canada and go to other countries, and it also will have advantage in the long run for those who come from other countries, particularly if reciprocal arrangements can be made with other countries.

Before I go any further in commenting about the new rule, I do hope the minister will let the country know what is happening through the facilities to which he has access. I do hope the press will make the point, and make it absolutely clear, that this change in the legislation does not affect by one cent the pension of any person who is now drawing old age security or the guaranteed income supplement. The minister said that.

Mr. Lalonde: Anybody who is 25.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I will get to that in a moment. The minister said it does not affect anyone who is 25 or over. However, when persons start to hear about the pension being based on the number of years you have been here out of 40 I am sure there will be some senior citizens drawing their pensions, having been here 12, 15 or 20 years, who will wonder whether their pensions are to be reduced. The formula as outlined by the minister says that will not happen. I am satisfied it will not happen and I hope that will be made crystal clear.

The minister has also emphasized by his interruption that neither will this affect anyone in Canada today who is 25 years of age or over. He will have the right if he is not here from 25 to 65 years of age, but meets the other rules, to get the full pension.

The only persons living in Canada who are going to get something less than full pension, that is ten fortieths or twenty fortieths, will be those who come here from other countries. But under the reciprocal arrangements it will be possible for them honestly and openly to receive social security from two countries.

At the present time this matter is abused and is the source of confusion. Some people manage to get old age security in Canada and social security from the United States, going one way or the other. Other people get caught and do not get either, and this is because of the all-or-nothing arrangement, which is now to be changed.

I believe that what is being proposed is something that has been thought out carefully, and something in the long run which will be a lot better. As I say, the provision for basing the pension on the number of years out of 40 that you have been here will make it possible for persons who have been here to age 40 or 50 to go elsewhere and get their share of the Canadian pension along with what they pick up in other countries. It will also be possible for those who come from other countries, under the reciprocal arrangement, to get a total pension income that will be to their advantage. This will be more fair and more equitable, and I congratulate those in the department who have worked this out, and I congratulate the minister for accepting and putting this proposal forward.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

● (1540)

At the same time, and even at the risk of saying what the minister thinks he has already said, because people can get concerned and excited, let it be the clearest word that comes out of this House today that no one who is drawing a pension will suffer any loss whatsoever in that pension and that no one who is over 25 years of age will have any different possibility than he now has.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this will solve many problems. It will certainly get rid of that terribly complex situation we have with the ten, 20, 40, three-for-one, and final year rule. So, in the main I think it is a good arrangement that is being put forward.

If I may go back to the reciprocity question which is half of what is before us today I do urge the government to push this. I know the government has been pushing it for a long time and that other countries have been reluctant to enter into agreements because we were not able to make an agreement involving our old age security.

I know there was the problem when reciprocity was provided in the Canada Pension Plan and not with respect to the Old Age Security Act. This scheme will work satisfactorily and effectively only if we do achieve reciprocal agreements with other countries. The minister mentioned the United Kingdom, Italy, and the United States. I wonder what has happened in respect of the West German situation. I know there is an agreement, but there is much dissatisfaction with it. I hope that that agreement might be renegotiated under the terms of this program. I also notice that France has not been mentioned. I think that is another country with which we should have a reciprocal arrangement.

I press that this be done and that there be pressure to achieve reciprocal agreements because, without this, the whole arrangement has no value for those who come to this country. The new 1/40th per year rule is good for Canadians who go elsewhere, because at present they either get all or nothing. But if this legislation is to have advantage for those who come to this country there have to be more reciprocal agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I see you are getting to your favourite position in your chair, at the forward edge. If you sit back I will be through in just a minute. I simply want to say to the minister that although I welcome what he is doing as announced today, I regret that he tells this House he intends to bring in legislation to amend the Old Age Security Act but has not touched on some important issues, namely, the basic amount of the old age security which should be increased substantially, and the question of the eligible age which, in my view, should be 60 for all those who are out of the labour market. Neither has he told us what he intends to do about the discrimination in respect of the spouses' legislation against spinsters, widows, bachelors and widowers, and I hope that when he gets around to bringing in this legislation these shortcomings will be corrected. It is fine to have the improvements which are proposed today, but surely when the minister brings in the actual bill he will have in it some of the substantial improvements that are needed with regard to senior citizens in Canada right now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I shall do my best not to abuse your patience. However, I would like to thank the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) who in today's statement informed us that amendments will soon be made to the Old Age Security Act to allow greater continuity of old age protection by transferability of acquired credit, through the agreements that he will be able to negotiate and ratify with other governments.

I agree with the minister that the present plan lacks flexibility. This is what my party has always maintained. In the field of old age and social security, there is also a lack of flexibility, as in the income security system, which is outdated. This is why we have long urged the minister to consider seriously the very simple non-bureaucratic and less costly formula of a guaranteed annual income, which would allow each Canadian citizen to be spared the problems of an increasingly costly and inefficient bureaucracy.

Instead of aiming at gradually correcting the present income security program in general, which includes the old age security program, the minister would have advantage, so as to present a comprehensive guaranteed annual income program and improving at the same time the old age security program, the minister, as I say, would have advantage to consider more seriously our proposal so that all Canadians can be ensured of a guaranteed annual income and an old age security pension.

The minister has informed us that 500,000 Canadians are now deprived of benefits which they could receive from other countries and a great number of Canadians who have emigrated abroad cannot receive benefits concerning security of foreigners. This is what caused the minister to propose today amendments which will eventually rectify this situation. When the amendments are introduced, we shall be able to study the proposals in detail, but we still want to thank the minister for having at least taken one step forward in this area today, since, according to what he said, at least 500,000 Canadians cannot receive their old age security pension under the present Old Age Security Act.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The procedure which we have been following in respect of ministerial statements calls for a statement by the minister and then brief responses by members of the opposition. The response from the last member of the opposition, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), was indeed in keeping with those guidelines. The response from the first two spokesmen for the opposition parties was uniformly about twice the length of the minister's statement. I did not intervene, but at this point it is an exercise of my discretion under these practices as to what questions should be allowed.

Bearing in mind those speeches, and also bearing in mind the fact that the purpose of the statement is an announcement of the introduction of legislation which will be coming before the House at another time when there will be a response to questions, I really think that I should extend questions only to allow the minister to make some retaliation to some of the things that have been said about him during the course of the comments. Perhaps one spokesman for each party would be more than adequate under the circumstances.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I accept your admonishment and will try to be as responsible as I can. I shall ask as few questions as possible in the knowledge that we will be getting the legislation.

I should just like to ask the minister some questions regarding the reciprocal agreements, which is a subject with which we have all been involved, particularly in respect of the United Kingdom. I know I have been involved with it since 1973. I think the step that is being taken certainly is in the right direction. The minister mentioned the United States, the United Kingdom, and Italy. What are the other countries to which he is now directing his attention in terms of agreement, so that we can have something on the record in that regard?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, the countries which have been most persistent and pressing in terms of reaching an agreement are the three countries I have mentioned. We already have an agreement with Germany. That is open for revision if the legislation is passed. Obviously France also would be a natural candidate for negotiation.

Frankly it is a matter of dealing with priorities. I must say that the cases of the United Kingdom, Italy, and the United States have been the ones that have been most urgent. However, we will proceed in respect of any country that is ready and willing to sit down and start negotiations.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I will just leave that. I think the minister has answered it adequately for the time being. What about consultation with the provinces? I am wondering whether the minister has had some agreement. Is there some unanimity concerning this particular proposal and will there be an opting out formula in respect of it? Is it a shared cost program?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a slight misunderstanding as to the meaning of the consultation with the provinces. However, before I answer that I might add with respect to the previous question that we will carry on with these foreign countries the exploratory talks that we have been having for the past couple of years in some instances.

Obviously if we cannot find agreement we cannot make anything formal until the law is amended, but we are open for exploratory talks at the present time. So far as the consultation is concerned, this type of amendment does not require consent in respect of anything over which any province has any veto. It does not imply participation as such by the provinces. It is more a matter of courtesy and common sense, since we are discussing the whole field of social security, that I should have a word with them to see whether they have any specific concern with regard, for instance, to some aspects that might have some implications for social assistance, and about which they might want to draw specific points to my attention.

● (1550)

In addition, the fact is that this type of amendment will facilitate reciprocal agreements with other countries. It

will be easier to achieve these agreements if we can include Workmen's Compensation which is under provincial jurisdiction, as well as other federal programs, so this is the purpose of the consultation. The purpose is not to give the provinces a right of veto over our formal approval of these proposals, but to ensure that these amendments will be harmonized with whatever the provinces are doing at their own level.

Mr. Alexander: The minister has answered the question that there is need for provincial consultation and that it will be high on the priority list. I have just one last question. I am a little confused. Suppose someone comes from Italy and someone comes from the United Kingdom, and they are both eligible under the new legislation. If Italy has no reciprocal agreements with Canada but the United Kingdom has, then one of the two people, regardless of his eligibility, will be denied his benefits because his country has no reciprocal agreement. Is that how it will work?

Mr. Lalonde: Yes, the hon. member understands it correctly. In that sense, I could go back to something he said about the half a million people who are not enjoying the full benefits which they have earned in the foreign countries. The proposed amendments will not guarantee to them that they will receive such benefits because we obviously cannot legislate for foreign countries. But we will do everything we can in terms of our own legislation and in terms of opening the doors for negotiations and agreements to ensure a reciprocity of benefits so that there will be what we call prorating and totalization of benefits, both those earned here, and those earned abroad.

Obviously, if a foreign country does not want to pay such pension credits to its former citizens, there is not much Canada can do. In fact, there is nothing preventing any of those countries from paying those benefits at the present time to the roughly 500,000 residents of Canada of whom we spoke, and there is nothing in the present Canadian legislation that would prevent this from taking place. However, those countries are saying that they will not pay unless they have an agreement.

Since our system is based on an all or nothing formula, they say that since we are paying a full pension by Canadian standards, why should they pay anything. That is the situation at present. What we are proposing is to make it much easier for these foreign governments to start paying pensions to their former residents who have earned them abroad in Canada.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, you will be glad to know that the minister in answering the previous questioner has answered a number of my questions, so I shall be brief. I am glad to know that a possibility exists that an agreement with West Germany can be renegotiated, and I am also glad to know that France is on list as well. Can the minister say whether there are consultations taking place with other countries such as Belgium, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries, areas from which we have many people in this country?

When he answers that I should like to ask him a question about the provinces. He has made the point that it is consultation, not a case of their approval having to be obtained. In doing that he referred to such things as workmen's compensation being in the total picture of reciprocity. Is he having consultations with his colleague, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald), with the same idea in mind?

I can get all my questions in at once, unless something comes out of what the minister says. The big question is, when will this legislation be introduced?

Mr. Lalonde: In answer to the first question, I am not aware of current negotiations taking place with any of the countries which the hon. member has mentioned. Obviously we are open to such negotiations, but I am not aware that there are such active negotiations at present.

With regard to the second point, when this matter was considered, it was obviously considered by cabinet and all the ministers involved, including the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. MacDonald). In the course of our negotiations we will take into account all the federal programs which include the possibility of reciprocal agreements such as the Unemployment Insurance Act which has provisions in that respect. We hope to be able to put in the basket all the various federal programs in the field of social security that provide for reciprocal agreements.

Finally, there is the question of when this legislation will be introduced. I hope to introduce it as early as possible during the course of the next session. I would like to be told that there is a possibility that it could be passed before June 30, but knowing what is on the agenda and the difficulty of getting it through the House, I am skeptical that it can be introduced before the fall.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the fact that the date of a new session is an unknown quantity, can the minister give us his answer in terms of a month? Will it be brought in in 1976?

Mr. Lalonde: I would hope to be able to introduce it some time in the fall.

* * *

MAGNA CARTA DAY ACT

MEASURE TO COMMEMORATE SIGNING ON JUNE 15, 1215 A.D.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-435, respecting Magna Carta Day.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to afford to Canadians, as beneficiaries of the gradual development of representative parliamentary democracy, the opportunity to commemorate, with the appropriate ceremonies in schools and other public places, the signing of the Magna Carta on June 15, 1215, an act which marked the beginning of the decline of arbitrary power and the emergence, in Britain, of responsible government from which the entire democractic world has benefited.

[*Translation*]

I take the liberty of reminding hon. members that King John who signed the Magna Carta was one of the first French-speaking monarchs of Britain who eventually became bilingual.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

[*English*]

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

PROPOSED MOTION TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER FEES PAID BY BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE COMPANY RESPECTING BILL S-11

Mr. Hugh A. Anderson (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 99 I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds):

That the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders be authorized to consider and make recommendations upon the fees paid by the British Columbia Telephone Company in relation to Bill S-11.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion can only be put forward by the hon. member with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion moved by the hon. member.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am prepared to second it, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: The mover of the motion left the Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Hughie, you blew it again.

● (1600)

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I was called out of the Chamber.

An hon. Member: Stay in your seat.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Make your motion.

Mr. Epp: You haven't written it out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) stands.

It may be that during the balance of routine proceedings there will be some questions on the order paper or other items which might be dealt with. Presumably, however, if the debate on the motion standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council concludes, the rest of the routine proceedings will not be reached.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I understand there is to be some debate on that motion, so I suggest we deal with the questions on the order paper and notices of motions for the production of papers first, and then carry on with debate on the motion.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to lose the opportunity to present a petition, of which I have given notice.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously it is the desire of hon. members that we conclude routine proceedings before embarking on the motion standing in the name of the President of the Privy Council. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

HEALTH AND WELFARE

PRESENTATION OF PETITION RESPECTING MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition containing the signatures of 17,612 Manitobans who are asking the government, and specifically the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), to reconsider the freeze on medical research funds.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,995, 4,055, 4,078, 4,081, 4,444, 4,767, 4,924, 4,941, 4,959, 4,988, 5,004, 5,121 to 5,127 inclusive, 5,139, 5,140, 5,184, 5,198 and 5,209.

[*Text*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT—SUBSIDIES

Question No. 3,995—**Mr. Saltsman:**

What was the amount of location subsidies granted under the provisions of the Regional Development Incentives Act for each year 1970 to 1975 or for the last year for which information is available by (a) type of industry, (b) province?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: The total estimated amount of development grants under the Regional Development Incentives Program, for net accepted offers as of November 30, 1975, is $534.3 million. This amount is broken down on the attached table as follows: (a) by fiscal period in which an offer was accepted, (b) by type of industry, (c) by province. More recent information is not currently available.

Order Paper Questions

Estimated amount of development grants under the Regional Development Incentives Program for net accepted offers as of November 30, 1975 by fiscal year of acceptance of offer

Industry	1969-70 ($000)	1970-71 ($000)	1971-72 ($000)	1972-73 ($000)	1973-74 ($000)	1974-75 ($000)	April 1 to November 30, 1975 ($000)
Food Manufacturers	5,522	5,103	6,709	4,922	6,548	9,408	3,897
Fish Processors	306	3,248	5,114	2,524	3,414	1,220	3,912
Beverage	644	875	1,040	427	704	456	1,126
Tobacco	—	33	163	—	—	—	—
Rubber	18	1,599	1,058	10,304	1,301	3,544	3,360
Leather	—	166	1,696	463	716	905	436
Textile	760	2,530	8,482	5,999	3,378	1,439	509
Knitting	166	1,411	4,063	1,438	204	—	75
Clothing	113	908	3,108	2,840	3,233	1,821	613
Wood	3,903	12,009	11,170	30,939	21,395	22,858	8,222
Furniture	706	502	1,834	2,144	3,435	3,690	951
Paper—Allied Ind.	445	13,991	14,902	2,139	8,063	2,994	139
Printing—Publishing	134	1,925	1,324	1,138	876	1,146	1,031
Primary Metal	—	20,159	7,462	17,735	8,096	11,829	2,610
Metal Fabricating	252	890	4,815	5,729	3,907	4,676	3,368
Machinery	674	1,094	1,513	4,271	3,175	8,204	3,845
Transportation	2,561	6,115	4,310	4,733	4,696	4,271	1,598
Electrical	304	4,800	4,545	3,075	4,893	2,345	4,615
Non-Metallic	269	410	1,022	2,275	1,485	6,943	6,506
Petroleum	—	—	20	59	11	—	—
Chemical	64	11,617	2,001	4,077	1,313	1,588	455
Misc. Manufacturing	526	2,441	2,948	1,488	1,245	771	1,115
Other Manufacturing	—	409	2,030	1,015	130	515	2,330
Total	17,373	92,234	91,329	109,735	82,219	90,621	50,755

Province	1969-70 ($000)	1970-71 ($000)	1971-72 ($000)	1972-73 ($000)	1973-74 ($000)	1974-75 ($000)	April 1 to November 30, 1975 ($000)
Newfoundland	203	1,161	5,722	1,651	1,958	1,612	4,395
Prince Edward Island	—	887	799	2,124	1,131	481	1,215
Nova Scotia	1,039	19,590	6,803	12,613	4,769	7,625	3,376
New Brunswick	5,251	6,294	8,874	6,149	13,643	11,091	4,678
Quebec	5,601	25,239	54,598	41,290	38,270	40,017	23,900
Ontario	920	12,286	4,967	21,209	9,653	8,474	3,109
Manitoba	1,899	6,124	3,342	18,036	7,031	7,913	4,374
Saskatchewan	619	3,806	1,125	1,998	3,258	4,069	4,424
Alberta	1,510	16,698	2,802	3,938	949	9,050	1,066
British Columbia	331	177	2,297	728	1,558	289	218
Canada	17,373	92,234	91,329	109,735	82,219	90,621	50,755

CBC PROGRAMME "BYE BYE 1975"

Question No. 4,055—**Mr. Cyr:**

1. (a) What was the cost of the Programme *Bye Bye 1975*, (b) what were the salaries and travelling expenses of the artists, (c) what was the number of artists involved in the Programme, (d) what was the number of persons who produced the Programme?

2. What was the cost of (a) *Bye Bye 1973*, (b) *Bye Bye 1974*?

3. Did CBC ask producers to submit a Programme project for 1975 and, if so, what were (a) their names, (b) the prices submitted?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. (a) and (b) and 2. (a) and (b) It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide such details of its internal management and administration. The background of this custom is explained in detail in the reply to Question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975.

1. (c) 101, including 86 actors and 15 musicians. (d) one.

3. (a) No. The CBC assigned producer Richard Martin to the production of the program.

GREENLAND SEAL CATCHES

Question No. 4,078—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Has the number of Greenland seal catches declined during recent years and, if so, what was the reduction for each year from 1970 to date?

2. By year from 1970 to date, what was the maximum number of catches permitted?

3. By year from 1970 to date, how many seals were lawfully taken by (a) large Canadian boats, (b) large Norwegian boats, (c) coasters and small boats?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): 1. The number of Greenland seal catches has not declined since 1970 but there has been some fluctuation from year to year.

Greenland Seal Catches 1970-75

Year	Harps	Hoods	Total
1970	5,747	1,367	7,114
1971	5,001	1,405	6,406
1972	5,591	2,232	7,823
1973	8,700	2,300	11,000
1974	6,422	2,456	8,878
1975	Not available		

The Greenland seal catch has, however, declined since the early 1950's when the catch annually ranged between 10,000 and 20,000. It should be noted that catches referred to are taken entirely by landsmen and small boats operated from Greenland.

2. By year from 1970 to date the maximum number of seals permitted to be caught is as follows:

Year	Harps	Hoods
1970	No quota	No quota
1971	245,000	"
1972	150,000	"
1973	150,100	"
1974	150,100	"
1975	150,100	15,100
1976	127,100	15,100

3. By year since 1970 the following number of seals has been taken by (a) large Canadian vessels, (b) large Norwegian vessels and, (c) coasters and small boats:

	Year	Harps	Hoods	Total
1970	(a)	95,217	1,043	96,260
	(b)	115,200	4,321	119,521
	(c)	47,078	1,826	48,904
	Total	257,495	7,190	264,685
1971	(a)	85,463	348	85,811
	(b)	98,306	14,514	112,820
	(c)	47,197	84	47,281
	Total	230,966	14,946	245,912
1972	(a)	52,455	278	52,733
	(b)	53,300	12,178	65,478
	(c)	24,128	144	24,272
	Total	129,883	12,600	142,483
1973	(a)	20,160	174	20,334
	(b)	58,290	6,255	64,545
	(c)	45,382	138	45,520
	Total	123,832	6,567	130,399
1974	(a)	51,630	178	51,808
	(b)	55,585	9,796	65,381
	(c)	40,420	25	40,445
	Total	147,635	9,999	157,634
1975*	(a)	60,663	5,038	65,701
	(b)	60,161	10,226	70,387
	(c)	56,571	348	56,919
	Total	177,395	15,612	193,007

*Preliminary data

SEAL CATCHES

Question No. 4,081—Mr. Matte:

1. Has hooded seal catching been authorized on the Atlantic coast for several years and, if so, how many were caught in each year from 1970 to date?

2. For the same years, how many hooded seals have been caught in the frontier area, and of that number how many were by (a) Canada, (b) Norway?

3. How many baby seals were killed on the Atlantic coast in each year from 1970 to date?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): 1. Hooded seal catching has been authorized on the Atlantic coast for several years and since 1970 the catches of hooded seals are as follows:

Year	Catch
1970	8,557
1971	16,351
1972	14,832
1973	8,867
1974	12,455
1975	15,612*

*Canada and Norway catch only. Does not include Greenland catch which is unavailable at this time.

2. Canada and Norway have caught the following number of hooded seals in the front area since 1970:

Year	Canada	Norway	Total
1970	1,043	4,321	5,364
1971	348	14,514	14,862
1972	278	12,178	12,456
1973	174	6,255	6,429
1974	203	9,796	9,999
*1975	5,364	10,226	15,590

*Preliminary data

3. The following number of baby seals (less than one year old) have been caught since 1970:

Year	Harps	Hoods	Total
1970	221,544	5,320	226,864
1971	210,579	8,041	218,620
1972	116,810	6,928	123,738
1973	98,335	4,602	102,937
1974	114,825	5,991	120,816
*1975	140,629	7,652	148,281

CBC—DISTRIBUTION AND COST OF POSTER "UNE RADIO BIEN À VOUS"

Question No. 4,444—Mr. Lachance:

1. Was a poster entitled *Une radio bien à vous* distributed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in early 1976 and, if so, what was the cost of its (a) design, (b) production, (c) distribution?

2. To what individuals and organizations was the poster distributed and how many were sent to each?

3. Did the artists mentioned in the poster receive a fee and, if so, what are the details?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. (a) and (b) $8,248. (c) $950.

2. The poster entitled "Une radio bien à vous" is one of the elements of the promotion campaign conducted by the CBC to create audience interest in the programs of the FM network and at the same time to stress the importance of Canadian talent in radio programming. Five thousand copies of the poster were produced. They were distributed as follows: Educational Institutions—conservatories, universities, CEGEPs (junior colleges), and composite schools: 2,500; Advertising agencies and unions: 650; Theatres, libraries, night clubs, record shops, book stores: 250; Newspapers, periodicals, critics: 400; French network stations for distribution in their locality: 700; Political figures: 241; Reserve: 259.

3. Yes. It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide such details as the fees paid to artists. The backgrounds of this custom is explained in detail in the reply to Question No. 2,530, May 22, 1975.

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE OF EMBASSIES

Question No. 4,767—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the government aware of reports of a form of electronic surveillance of the United States Embassy in Moscow involving a form of radiation and, if so, has it any official information on the matter?

2. Is the government in possession of any information to indicate whether or not any similar radiation situation has existed or does exist in regard to the Canadian Embassy in Moscow and, if so, what are the details including (a) on what date such information came to the attention of the government, (b) all actions taken by the government since learning of such information?

3. If the government is not aware whether there has been any such radiation problem in regard to the Canadian Embassy in Moscow, has it recently taken any steps in an effort to determine the existence or non-existence of such a situation and, if so, what are the details?

4. Has the Department of External Affairs made any check of health records of persons who have served at any time in the Canadian Embassy in Moscow, and (a) if not, does it plan to make such a check, (b) if so, what do such records show in regard to any evidence of disease that could be directly or indirectly connected with radiation?

5. Are the incidents of cancer or cancer type diseases more prevalent among personnel who have served at the Canadian Embassy in Moscow than other Canadian personnel who have served elsewhere abroad?

6. Other than the Canadian Embassy in Moscow, has the Department of External Affairs investigated, or is it investigating, possible radiation surveillance of any other Canadian diplomatic establishments abroad and, if so, what are the names of all the countries involved?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. The government is aware of reports of a form of electronic surveillance of the United States Embassy in Moscow. It has no official information on the matter.

2. The government has no information in its possession to indicate that a similar situation has existed or exists in regard to the Canadian Embassy in Moscow.

3. The government is not aware of any radiation problem or hazard affecting the health of its employees at the Canadian Embassy in Moscow and has received no information that would warrant an investigation of such a situation.

4. All employees of the Government of Canada are subjected to medical examinations prior to and on return from postings abroad. Postings to Moscow are usually for a period of approximately two years and medical examinations of those concerned have not indicated any need for special investigation of diseases attributable to radiation.

5. There is no evidence to suggest that cancer or cancer type diseases are more prevalent among personnel who have served at the Canadian Embassy in Moscow than among other Canadian personnel who have served elsewhere abroad.

6. No, the Department of External Affairs knows of no reason to undertake such investigations.

OIL IMPORT COMPENSATION—NEWFOUNDLAND REFINING COMPANY

Question No. 4,924—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. In the past five years, has the Newfoundland Refining Company, at Come-By-Chance received any subsidies as part of the compensation programme for oil imports to Eastern Canada and, if so (a) in what amount, (b) what were the repayment clauses?

2. Has there been any delay by the Company in repaying (a) monies owed, (b) subsidies received and, if so (i) what is the amount in arrears (ii) for what reason?

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Energy Supplies Allocation Board reports as follows: 1. Yes. Paid as compensation to oil importers in Eastern Canada under Section 76 of the Petroleum Administration Act. (a) $108,523,-841. (b) Section 76 of the Petroleum Administration Act.

2. (a) No. (b) Yes (i) $15,913,148. As at February 13, 1976, company records showed approximately three million barrels of petroleum or petroleum products in inventory. If this material is consumed in Canada, the Board's position is that their claim for a refund of $15,913,148 would be reduced by approximately $12 million. (ii) Newfoundland Refining Company Limited and Provincial Refining Company Limited are each subject of a petition in bankruptcy dated February 13, 1976.

NUMBER OF PUBLIC SERVANTS ENROLLED IN FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

Question No. 4,941—**Mr. Reynolds:**

For the year (a) 1973, (b) 1974, (c) 1975, what was the total number of public servants who enrolled in (i) French (ii) English language training?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows:

Year	French training	English training	Total
1973	5,655	948	6,603
1974	7,466	1,271	8,737
1975	8,921	1,043	9,964

NOTES:

(1) Figures are for calendar years, and include both cyclical and continuous/intensive courses.

(2) Many public servants take training in consecutive years, carrying over from one year to the next, and are counted in each year's total.

LES ÉQUIPEMENTS LAPORTE INC., GRANBY, QUEBEC

Question No. 4,959—**Mr. Kempling:**

Was a grant, loan or other assistance given to *Les équipements Laporte Inc.*, Granby, P.Q., by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the fiscal year (a) 1974-75, (b) 1975-76 and, if so (i) in what amount (ii) for what purpose?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: (a) 1974-75, no. (b) 1975-76, yes. (i) An offer of $65,502 was accepted under the terms and conditions of the Regional Development Incentives Act. (ii) For the establishment of a new factory for the manufacture of clay pigeons.

DIXON REDIMARK PERMANENT FELT TIP MARKER

Question No. 4,988—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. Did the Department of National Health and Welfare examine the Dixon Redimark Permanent felt tip marker for possible harmful effects by inhalation of chemicals and, if so, was it (a) approved, (b) disapproved?

2. What chemicals are contained in the marker and are they harmful to the user by virtue of inhalation?

3. Has the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs examined the marker and, if so, did they direct that such harmful effects be noted on the marker?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Health and Welfare and Consumer and Corporate Affairs as follows: 1. No, this specific brand has not been examined.

2 and 3. Dixon Redimark Permanent felt tip markers contain xylene solvent which does not presently come within the purview of the Hazardous Products Act. The subject has been discussed with the manufacturer who stated that no user complaints have been received. Cautionary labelling will be the suject of further investigation by the department.

CBC EXPENSES SINCE 1973

Question No. 5,004—**Mr. Matte:**

What were the annual expenses of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation since 1973?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1972-73, $193,634,000; 1973-74, $228,395,000; 1974-75, $241,712,000. These amounts represent the net cost of operations, less depreciation and amortization for which funds are not provided. They include the operations of the following networks and services: English AM radio, English FM radio, English television, French AM radio, French FM radio, French television, the Northern Service, Armed Forces Service, regional networks where applicable, and Radio Canada International.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO ANTICOSTI ISLAND, AUGUST 14-17, 1974

Question No. 5,121—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by Department of Transport aircraft at public expense from Ottawa to Anticosti Island from August 14 to 17, 1974 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 69 answered February 3, 1976. Cost of aircraft, $778 per hour.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO ST-SAUVEUR, QUEBEC, NOVEMBER 10, 1973

Question No. 5,122—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by car at public expense from Ottawa to St-Sauveur, Quebec on November 10, 1973 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,121. In addition to gasoline, the chauffeur's expenses, $8.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO FRENCH RIVER, JUNE 15-17, 1973

Question No. 5,123—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by Department of Transport aircraft at public expense from Ottawa to French River on June 15, 16 and 17, 1973 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,121. Cost of aircraft, $586 per hour.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO ST-SAUVEUR, QUEBEC, JULY 7, 1973

Question No. 5,124—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by helicopter at public expense from Ottawa to St-Sauveur, Quebec on July 7, 1973 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,121. Department of Transport all inclusive cost, $154 per hour.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO ST-SAUVEUR, QUEBEC, JULY 12-15, 1974

Question No. 5,125—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by helicopter at public expense from Ottawa to St-Sauveur, Quebec on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 1974 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,121. Department of Transport all inclusive cost, $170 per hour.

Order Paper Questions

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO CAMPOBELLO ISLAND, AUGUST 14-20, 1973

Question No. 5,126—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by Department of Transport aircraft from Ottawa to Campobello Island from August 14 to 20, 1973 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,123.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO ST-SAUVEUR, QUEBEC, SEPTEMBER 25-26, 1973

Question No. 5,127—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by Department of Transport helicopter to St. Sauveur, Quebec on September 25 and 26, 1973 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,124.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO MONT-TREMBLANT, QUEBEC, MARCH 21-24, 1974

Question No. 5,139—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by car at public expense from Ottawa to Mont-Tremblant, Quebec from March 21 to 24, 1974 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,121. Cost of gasoline only.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO NEW YORK, AUGUST 24, 1974

Question No. 5,140—**Mr. Cossitt:**

What is a detailed description of the purpose of the trip when the Prime Minister travelled by Department of Transport aircraft at public expense from Ottawa to New York on August 24, 1974 and (a) what was the total cost to the taxpayer, (b) what are the reasons justifying the expenditure?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See reply to question 5,121.

DONATIONS FOR SWIMMING POOL AT 24 SUSSEX DRIVE

Question No. 5,184—**Mr. Cossitt:**

Have any Members of the Senate been involved directly or indirectly with soliciting donations of money or materials, or in making donations themselves, to the swimming pool at the Prime Minister's official residence, 24 Sussex Drive and, if so, what are their names?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See third paragraph of reply to question 1,233 answered October 28, 1975.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

MAN-HOURS OF TEMPORARY LABOUR

Question No. 5,198—**Mr. Rodriguez:**

1. For the fiscal years 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76, by month and by department and agency, how many man-hours of temporary labour were provided by private employment agencies?

2. For each department and agency (a) what were the names of the private employment agencies, (b) what was the percentage of man-hours provided by each?

3. For the same period, by department and agency, what (a) was the total amount paid to private employment agencies, (b) percentage of the money went to actual temporary employees, (c) percentage of the money went to the company in the form of commissions or other payment?

4. For the same period, by month and by department and agency, what was the number of persons working on a contract basis?

5. For the fiscal years 1974-75 and 1975-76, by month and by department and agency, what was the total number of (a) man-hours worked by permanent employees excluded from collective bargaining, (b) hours worked by permanent full-time or casual employees?

6. For the fiscal years 1974-75 and 1975-76, by month and by department and agency, what was the (a) total number of man-hours worked by all permanent full-time or casual employees who were considered clerical or secretarial, (b) percentage of the total number of man-hours worked?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): The information requested is not readily available. To provide an accurate reply in its entirety, would entail a lengthy and costly examination of the accounts of every department, which would be exorbitant or prohibitive.

RENOVATIONS TO EAST BLOCK

Question No. 5,209—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the estimates for 1976-77 which show a sum of $8 million as the estimated requirement for alterations, repairs, renovations, etc. to the East Block of the Parliament Buildings (a) how much will be spent on the part of the building now occupied or to be occupied by the Prime Minister and members of his staff, (b) what is a detailed list of the proposed items for the area occupied or to be occupied by the Prime Minister and his staff together with the estimated cost in each case?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): See Report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates for April 5, 1976.

[*English*]

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*English*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EASTER RECESS

Hon. Ron Basford (for the President of the Privy Council) moved:

That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 14, 1976, it shall stand adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1976, provided that at any time prior to that date, if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the Government, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time; and

That, in the event of Mr. Speaker's being unable to act owing to illness or other cause, the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman of Committees shall act in his stead for all purposes of this Order.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House agree to adopt the motion?

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised that the acting government House leader has not seen fit to get up on this motion and defend the record of the government.

An hon. Member: How could he?

Mr. Paproski: That's why he didn't get up.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Perhaps the reason he did not get up and defend it is that he is basically an honest man, and when he looked at the record he really had nothing to defend.

What really does surprise me is the courage of the government in deciding to adjourn the House today. This motion, unless hon. members opposite hive themselves off in their hotel rooms and in their offices, will set them out in the streets, highways and byways of their constituencies to meet the people of Canada.

Mr. Goodale: They are anxious to see us.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am sure hon. members opposite are anxious to see the people, and I am sure the people of Canada are anxious to see them, to ask them what has gone wrong with the ship of state here in Ottawa and why the government is shambling and moving seemingly without rudders or leadership with respect to all kinds of matters.

While it has always been the usual attitude of the opposition to fight adjournment and to make the government stay and tackle the problems for which governments are basically responsible because of their own neglect and dereliction, our attitude today will be a little different because we feel it is a good thing for this complex of dispensables, this shambling group which masquerades as a government, to go out and meet those for whom they say they speak. They pound their desks and say aye when the time comes to say aye, and nay when the time comes to say nay. I think that group which masquerades as a government should go out and meet the people of this country and find out just what the people really think of their performance.

An hon. Member: It would ruin their holiday.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I should like us to consider for a moment the members of the government. Let us think about the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). This morning in the *Globe and Mail* someone called him a "dyed in the bull" politician. Let us think about what he did. He carried off a masterpiece today and yesterday with respect to the dairy policy he introduced. He managed to do what no other minister of agriculture has ever been able to do, and that is shaft both producers and consumers at the same time. That takes some doing.

Mr. Broadbent: That is known as the Whelan principle.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Perhaps it is known as the Whelan principle. It is not the principle of relativity, in any event.

Then there is the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), who has no energy and who is prepared to let the Atlantic provinces heat and light themselves "at twice the price."

The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is the minister who has forgotten that when you build jails and penitentiaries you are supposed to put locks on the doors to keep the inmates in. He has forgotten the problems which are faced by his own staff. He has been condemned by the leadership of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. When I think of the morale of the RCMP, the morale of the people who work in our prisons and the dreadful conditions in them—if we believe half of what we are told, and I suggest we can believe at least that—I wonder why the minister should be in that portfolio at all. I wonder why he should be supported. If hon. members of the government are going to speak today, they should tell us why the Solicitor General should be supported, except that he happens to be one of their own.

If there is any situation in Canada which needs a clear investigation by someone who is prepared to look at all sides of the issue, it is the situation in our penitentiaries and the situation with regard to the RCMP, to which the government is prepared to give lip service, but in terms of the rumblings of discontent within that latter service there is an indication that something is wrong, and I suggest something is wrong with the government, not just with the Solicitor General. Surely the shoulders of the Solicitor General are not broad enough to bear all the results of the acts of omission and commission of the government.

If this is the season of tranquility and peace, I think we should leave this House and hope that in the spirit of Easter we might see a government returned refreshed. But I do not think there is very much left to refresh in terms of this government. With such a ministry is it any wonder that this country is in such difficulty?

● (1610)

Can any good Liberal be proud of the government's legislative accomplishments? What have hon. members opposite contributed to debates in this House? What has been the contribution of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale), apart from the occasional reply? For most part it has consisted of "Oh, oh!" or "Hear, hear!" Is it any wonder our people question the wisdom of the government? We are going through an economic crisis, a crisis

involving the Solicitor General's department, and a crisis relating to the government's moral and ethical standards.

Mr. Broadbent: What standards?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Apparently, in matters of ministerial ethics, the government considers the Criminal Code as the basic guide, not the guidelines set down by Lester B. Pearson. As the ship of state plows ahead, bumping a shoal here and a shoal there, with nobody at the helm, is it any wonder people think the government is a drifting mess.

In his year-end oration the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said parliament is irrelevant. The people of this country now think the Prime Minister himself is irrelevant. I ask hon. members to cast their minds back. When, in modern parliamentary history, have two ministers submitted their resignations in such circumstances as we witnessed? When has it ever happened that one resignation was accepted, and one not accepted on such specious grounds? When has a ministry been involved with matters like Sky Shops, the dial-a-judge affair and other, similar matters which have come before the House?

If government supporters are dismayed by opposition charges, I merely say that the opposition cannot make bricks without straw. The actions of the government, or its lack of action and—I use the word in its parliamentary sense—the wrongful acts of the government and those beholden to it have created the straw. We merely brought these matters to the attention of the House. When did you ever see such evasion? Certainly not in my time here. Perhaps others, who have been here longer, remember similar instances, but I do not.

When did you ever see such posturing as went on in the last year and a half, such empty posturing? Why, it has become necessary for the government to invent reasons for avoiding the public inquiries which we asked. Only when those involved in the matter were not in the government or closely connected with it was an inquiry granted. Otherwise, when we have asked for people unbiased politically to inquire into important public matters, we have been refused and stonewalled. Other times the government asked us to lay charges; but the government would not provide information which would allow us to make a judgment. Government members have tried to intimidate opposition members in a question period, and failed. This government has much to account for to the people of this country.

Why is the government afraid to face the people of Canada? The Prime Minister spurned the invitation to face the public in St. John's West, until he could spurn it no longer. We shall know the people's answer to the government when the people of St. John's West speak. Yes, the Prime Minister will have his birthday present in October, 1976. And what is to happen in Ottawa-Carleton? How can the Prime Minister justify leaving over 100,000 people in Ottawa-Carleton without representation in this House? Why has he refused, despite the pressure put on him by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and other opposition members, to say when an ordinary process in a democratic society is to take place, namely, a by-election?

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

The Ottawa *Journal*, a newspaper known for its unbiased approach to public matters—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —said, in an editorial printed on April 12, 1976—

Mr. Broadbent: It's about as unbiased as the *Daily Worker*.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —as follows:

> Of course no justification is possible. Mr. Trudeau is willingly sacrificing the interests of parliamentary democracy for the perceived self-interest of the Liberal party. His political advisers are worried about an Ottawa-Carleton by-election, as well they should be. The delay in even announcing its date is entirely for partisan reasons.
>
> Before Mr. Trudeau next talks about the irrelevancy of parliament, he might contemplate his own contribution to that sad fact.

With every passing day the government exposes its weakness. Although ministers demonstrate their technical knowledge and managerial ability, their credibility inexorably is lessened. The government is becoming less and less realistic in its assessment of the problems we all face. A government like that should go out to the people of Canada—

Mr. Stanfield: It should go out, period.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) says, it should go out. And I do not want anyone to think that the government neglects only the big issues. It neglects the small ones as well. In all aspects of its activities it has demonstrated the same inability, incompetence, and disregard for matters small as well as large.

I allude particularly to a matter I raised the other day as a point of order. Mr. Speaker decided that it was not a point of order, but I suggest that it concerned the smirking hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) and others, as it has to do with the position of parliamentary secretary. A section of the Parliamentary Secretaries Act provides that:

> There shall not be at any one time more parliamentary secretaries than the number of ministers who hold offices for which salaries are provided in section 4 of the Salaries Act.

This subsection refers to the ministers in office and not to the total number of eligible portfolios. We have, by virtue of the Government Reorganization Act, provision for a total of 28 full ministers and, therefore, a possible 28 parliamentary secretaryships. This government has not appointed an associate minister of national defence. It only takes one minister of national defence to foul up the defence posture of the country. We do not need an associate minister. Prior to March 16 there were 27 full ministers and 27 parliamentary secretaries. The three ministers of state do not enter into these calculations because they do not fall within the definition.

When the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) resigned as minister of consumer and corporate affairs, there remained 26 ministers drawing salaries pursuant to section 4 of the Salaries Act. As a consequence there is one parliamentary secretary too many in terms of salary. There are some in this country who would say there are 20 odd

parliamentary secretaries too many in terms of the work they do. However, I am not going to raise that matter in this debate.

● (1620)

On Thursday, April 8, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) was given the additional portfolio of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. He has proved that he cannot run the Post Office. He is now going to prove that he cannot run that department. Consequently there is a minister for each of the 27 portfolios. However, there are still only 26 ministers holding an office for which a salary is provided for a parliamentary secretary. Since the number of ministers is operative in determining the number of parliamentary secretaries, there is still one parliamentary secretary too many as of this time. It appears that one parliamentary secretary is drawing his salary illegally.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): None of them earn the salary, but one is drawing it illegally. I raise this with the government and I was thanked by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) for doing so. I want to know which one of the parliamentary secretaries is going to volunteer not only to give up the salary but to send back what he has taken from the Crown improperly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As I said, Mr. Speaker, the government provides an equal amount of neglect to each problem facing it. The parliamentary secretaries must be delighted to know that they are among the small problems. However, their neglect in this problem is very important in terms of proper administration under the statute. But the government ignores the problem.

We do not resist too strenuously adjournment at this time. In order for the government members to have more than a short exposure to the people on the streets of Canada we might increase the number of days. However, there will at least be time for them to understand fully that outside this lovely precinct of parliament, insulated as it is from time to time from what people on the street are saying, there are a great number of Canadians who look upon the government with the same disdain and disgust as many members of this House of Commons.

There are problems in Canada. There are great challenges facing the country. Frankly I do not believe that this shambling, dried-up bureaucratic, technocratic government, which once classed its members as great managers, is capable of managing its own affairs, let alone the affairs of a country that requires a unique kind of attention.

It would be very well if this House were dissolved and we went to the country. If this were the case today, there would be no doubt about the outcome. I would be immodest if I suggested that we might have an opportunity to go across the floor of the House, so I will not suggest it. I would rather say that members opposite will have an opportunity to test the other side of the House. With the situation in this country, this could not happen too soon. I do not know how long any country can withstand the neglect and lack of policy and direction. This government has ably demonstrated its incapability.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, if Canadians picked at random a group of people to run the government and sit in the cabinet, they would come up with a group that in the normal course of time would make a number of decisions which would include some good results and some errors. However, it is a marvellous accomplishment of this collection of Liberals to turn virtually every aspect of policy that they have had to deal with since the Christmas break into an unmitigated disaster. No other group of Canadians could have been so successful at spoiling virtually everything they touched in terms of policy in the past few months.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford), on behalf of the government, moved a motion of adjournment. We all noticed that he did not say anything. I do not mean that in the normal Liberal sense where they speak at length without any substance, but in the literal sense in that he simply moved the motion and resumed his seat. The reason is obvious. He would have had to speak in terms of pure hypocrisy about the record of the government, or tell the truth. If he chose the latter he would not have anything to say of a positive nature about the performance of the government.

In the past three months we have had the worst consecutive period of government for a three month period in the living memory of any member in this chamber.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Even Stanley!

Mr. Broadbent: We had the judges' affair and the Sky Shops' affair. The over-riding conclusion that has to be drawn from these two episodes is that, apart from the Criminal Code, the government has absolutely no standards. If it is not illegal, for a Liberal it is permitted, unless he is caught. If caught, the principle is that they do their damndest to cover it up. If they are caught trying to cover it up, they get some minister to resign for a completely phony reason and hope that no one will notice. That is the standard this cabinet has set in the last three months. I have no doubt that it has contributed to its very significant nosedive in the Gallup poll figures recently announced.

There has been a total abandonment of the serious parliamentary tradition, both in this country and abroad, that ministers have moral responsibilities that are well above those provided in the Criminal Code. Long after the temporary illustrations of the so-called judges' affair and the Sky Shops' issue are forgotten, neither of which is completedly resolved by a long shot, the permanent effect upon the government and the Liberal party will be that the people of Canada will judge them as a party that looks upon this nation in a completely cynical fashion, a fashion which states that, as long as it is not illegal, it is to be permitted. That is a standard that all parties on the opposition side made clear in the past few weeks that they categorically reject.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: As for the Defence Department, I do not know if one could get lower in any provincial or federal department, in this country or anywhere else. The $1 billion misunderstanding with regard to the Orion is almost beyond description in terms of the incompetency of the government. It is an incredible mishandling of public responsibility and public funds. All opposition parties have played a role in showing that this profound mishandling is taking place in the Defence Department by the current minister.

● (1630)

We are spending $1 billion on Lockheed Orions, which I suggest are not going to serve the first priority of our defence, as stated by the government itself in its 1971 defence white paper, namely, the protection and enhancement of Canadian sovereignty. We are spending millions of dollars on needlessly complex, technical equipment for the Orion, which the minister acknowledged in committee and acknowledged implicitly in the House has no other purpose but to provide the technical capacity to detect submarines in the course of supplying protective coverage for convoys carrying goods back and forth across the Atlantic in the event of a prolonged land war in continental Europe.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, could anyone other than the present Minister of Defence (Mr. Richardson) come up with such a hypothetical possibility in the year 1976 which has such absurd implications? As I said on another occasion, in the Orion deal the minister has prepared magnificently for refighting the second world war. This can be facetiously or jokingly dismissed, but we are not approaching it in that way, Mr. Speaker. Defence spending is a serious matter.

However, there is yet hope. The deal is not settled. We have suggested that the government extricate itself completely from the Lockheed deal and proceed to purchase and build planes in Canada. The Dash 7-R can be built in Canada, and given the right kind of equipment can undertake the surveillance task which, I repeat, was the number one task assigned to the defence department in the government's white paper. This can be supplemented by re-equipping the Argus aircraft, which can provide surveillance for submarines along our coast where this is appropriate. This would leave some $500 million which could be used for sensible, long-range purposes. For example, it could be used to develop inter-urban rapid transit facilities, which also can be produced in Canada and would meet Canada's urban needs.

As for inflation and unemployment, I will not go back over the origin of the anti-inflation program that was presented to the House shortly after last Thanksgiving. If one looks at what has transpired since we returned to the House following the Christmas recess, the weakness of the program in terms of its legal structure, complemented by regulations and administrative decisions, have more than confirmed our original conclusion about the program, namely, that it was primarily a wage and salary control program and not at all a price control program.

Perhaps the symbolic appointment that best characterizes the fact that the government was not serious about prices was the appointment of a man named Lasby as head of the profit control section of the Anti-Inflation Board administrative apparatus concerned with food prices. Did the government appoint a social worker, a trade unionist, a fisherman, or an ordinary worker to this position, Mr. Speaker? No, it wanted someone very dear to the hearts of the Liberal party and hired Mr. Lasby, who was formerly vice-president of Canada Packers. Mr. Lasby would know very well about price fixing and how the system works, but he would not be the kind of person in terms of disposition to look for profiteering and price gouging, which surely should have been the sort of person the government was seeking for this particular role in its anti-inflation program.

Perhaps it is just a mere coincidence that the board has rolled back in more than five months of existence only one price increase in Canada, and that was the price of a particular brand of beer manufactured in the province of Quebec. Some record indeed! In the meantime the board has rolled back some 100 trade union contracts and wage and salary settlements. The board has before it some 6,000 contracts, and since the program began has reached a decision on 2,000 of them. Some 4,000 remain. But overwhelmingly the emphasis of the board has been on rolling back contracts that have been negotiated and settled by the participants, not in any circumstance on improving those settlements.

The legislation that we have passed dealing with inflation was anti-working Canadian at its inception and has remained anti-working Canadian in its application. The recent cost of living figures illustrate this. There was a slight decline in the cost of living, but contrary to what certain government members have said this reduction was not at all the result of the anti-inflation program. This reduction occurred in sectors that the program does not control, namely, imported goods and food prices. The fact of the matter is that the most important price increases for Canadians are not covered by the program. I will not go into them at length but simply mention them: energy prices, mortgage costs, and food prices. These are virtually exempt in the most important respects from the anti-inflation program, yet they are most relevant to the budget of a typical family.

Another area that the government has fouled up—and I think that is the appropriate term—has been federal-provincial relations. In the last few months the government has reneged on a whole range of programs originally negotiated between the Government of Canada and the provinces during the last few years. This is the case particularly in regard to those programs involving the transfer of financial resources from the federal government to some of the provinces, which inescapably has normally meant the transfer of wealth from the wealthier provinces to the poorer. As I say, the federal government has reneged on the agreements it entered into with the provinces ostensibly in good faith. Now the financial burden has got a little tough, the federal government has turned its back.

This is particularly so in the case of health care financing, and it has had a very bad effect on the poorer provinces. The same is true of the revenue guarantee agreements entered into with the provinces some five years ago. The federal government's unilateral and arbitrary action in these areas not only jeopardizes the good relationships that are essential between the federal government and the

provinces, but it has had a negative effect in terms of the income benefits of our citizens. In all these instances it means that the poorer provinces of Canada are going to suffer and become even poorer.

Again the government's lack of action and failure to take specific steps is seen in its treatment of the native peoples of this country. Tomorrow is the first anniversary of a special submission on the aboriginal rights of Metis and non-status Indians made to the cabinet, and specifically to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), by the Native Council of Canada. At that time the Native Council of Canada was promised a response by the government within three months. That is a year ago tomorrow. I say with all seriousness that if the Government of Canada does not act, and act soon in terms of the needs and the aboriginal rights of the native people of Canada, we will experience a very significant, and I will not put it more strongly than that, level of civil disobedience in this country. It may well go beyond that, the issue is that serious.

● (1640)

A government that promises a year ago that it will act within three months and has yet done nothing is not a government that deserves the support either of the native people of Canada or of the rest of us. Our party believes it is time the rights of the native people of Canada were guaranteed. We believe their linguistic and cultural rights should be guaranteed in precisely the same way as the linguistic and cultural rights of French and English-speaking people are guaranteed. By that we mean they should be firmly embedded in our constitution. That is what they want, and it is time the Government of Canada gave recognition to the desire and implemented it.

Another area in respect of which the government can be criticized with complete justification is that of its neglect of women's rights. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) put on one fancy and expensive fanfare after another, along with a little bit of showbiz here at the National Arts Centre and its equivalent in Winnipeg, where there was a great production with buttons and everything, all during International Women's Year. Once the great and symbolic year was over we got no action at all.

There was a possibility within the anti-inflation program of making it clear that the women of Canada who still experience wage and salary discrimination ought not, in terms of the law, be subject to a continuation of that discrimination. The normal cop-out of the federal government was the suggestion that these people are employed within the framework of provincial law. That was the government's excuse up to its new anti-inflation law. Now that this has been brought in under the guise and within the framework of exceptional constitutional powers given to the federal government in emergency situations, the peace, order and good government clause, the government no longer has that excuse. While this legislation is on the books it provides the government with a perfect opportunity to practise this year what it preached last year when it was fashionable to talk about women's rights. It could have made it mandatory that women in Canada in the market place be paid on a full equality basis.

Another area the government has been treating with blasé indifference is that area of the automotive industry in Canada. This is a serious part of our industry, and in the province of Ontario alone one out of six jobs is directly or indirectly related to it. The government has been sitting waiting month after month, indeed, year after year in recent years, while our relative position compared to the United States automotive industry has gone down.

Last year we had a $2 billion deficit in automotive trade with the United States. That's a lot of dollars, and this affects our trade position seriously. It is also translatable into jobs. That means a lot of men and women in this country have been unemployed who might otherwise have been employed. If the trend which I understand has taken place during the first two months of this year persists, I predict that the deficit for 1976 will likely reach $3 billion. I understand we have a deficit not only in the automotive parts sector, which has been traditional over the years, but also unfortunately we have a deficit in the assembly sector in trade with the United States. I predict this with care, and with some knowledge about this industry.

It is time the Government of Canada recognized the importance of what is taking place within the framework of the Canada-U.S. automotive agreement and took steps to change it so Canadians would get, not more than their share, but at least their share in terms of jobs that were supposed to be guaranteed by that pact. In addition, the Canadian consumers would get the benefits they were supposed to get when the tax came into being ten years ago, namely, price parity in automotive production. They do not get this and, in fact, this is just as bad today as it was in 1965 when the pact came into being.

The final matter I wish to mention that is of concern to us is the decision that is likely to be reached in cabinet tomorrow concerning drilling in the Beaufort Sea. This is another example of the government plunging ahead without any thought about the consequences when it gave approval in principle to Dome Petroleum in 1973 starting some preliminary drilling there. In spite of requests from the United States government to delay, in spite of the expressed concern by the federal Department of the Environment, which has pointed out that if a blow-out occurs in the Beaufort Sea it could run wild for up to two years, and particularly in spite of the opposition by the United States government to proceeding so quickly, the government gives every indication that it will decide to proceed with that operation.

We in the NDP assert that this is a wrong decision. The technology being used, to our knowledge, is not sufficient to guarantee the kind of environmental safety that is essential. We say the decision should be delayed and that this action should not go ahead. I repeat that all the indicators seem to be that the government will proceed, as soon as it gets the opposition parties out of Ottawa, with that very important and potentially very harmful decision.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As they always do.

Mr. Broadbent: As the government always does, as the hon. member suggests.

I have touched on a number of areas: the judges and Sky Shops affair, the billion-dollar misunderstanding about the Orion, the disastrous levels of persistent high unemploy-

ment, the betrayal of the provinces in respect of cost-sharing agreements, the ignoring of our native people's rights, and the continuing ignoring of the important principles of sexual equality.

I conclude with the point I made at the outset, that no other group of people in Canada, had it been randomly selected, could have done so badly about so many issues of such great importance as this government has in the last two months.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself very briefly to one question that has been raised repeatedly during this session, and certainly during the 1976 portion, and this relates to search and rescue.

Since January we have lost six fishermen off the coast of Newfoundland and four fishermen off the coast of British Columbia. In March the fisheries patrol vessel *Cape Friels* went down leaving 23 men in the water for 15 hours. It was just by a very happy coincidence that at that particular time there happened to be a tracker aircraft from Halifax on the ground in St. John's. That tracker aircraft was able to get in the air and succeeded in locating these men. We are told they were within one hour of being lost because of a developing weather system in the area. I am further told that the pilot of that tracker aircraft was severely reprimanded by his superiors for refusing to obey orders and insisting on staying over the area until the rescue vessel was in sight. As I say, that would have been a very serious disaster indeed.

● (1650)

It came as no surprise when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) issued a statement on April 7 under the heading "Marine Search and Rescue (SAR) Activities". This was an eight-page resume of the inventory of the Canadian coast guard. The minister really did not address himself to the total search and rescue effort. What really surprised me and most people was the very dramatic admission on page eight of that statement. This is what the Minister of Transport said:

> It has become evident that, in spite of the provision of additional resources, facilities and coordination capabilities over the years, the marine SAR organization is no longer entirely adequate.

That is precious little consolation to the families of those fishermen who have been lost this year. Then the minister went on to state:

> A Canadian Coast Guard Task Force has reviewed the national search and rescue policy and the revised policy is expected to be ready for submission to Cabinet by mid-1976.

The Minister of Transport accused me of misreading his statement. He said his statement referred to the report being ready before mid-summer 1976. That is what *Hansard* will show. I hope the parliamentary secretary will note that the statement of April 7 said that the submission would not be ready until mid-summer 1976.

This is a most crucial fact. It raises the whole question that, once the Minister of Transport arrives at the point in time where he is ready to admit what we have been saying all along, which is that the present search and rescue facilities are not adequate, it then becomes incumbent upon the minister and his colleagues in cabinet to assure the House and the Canadian people that an interim measure is being put into effect which would cover, on an interim basis, the inadequacies referred to by the minister in his statement, at least until the task force makes its report by mid-summer.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is a most grievous thing because we are about to embark upon another fishing season on the east coast of Canada. I believe the minister has put himself in the position by that admission that, if there is another accident at sea involving Canadian fishermen, which by the very nature of the occupation there probably will be, God forbid, the government will be condemned by its own words. This government by its own admission places itself in the position of being accused of what to my mind is tantamount to criminal negligence.

I do not know what the legal position will be if there should be another accident at sea either on the east coast or on the west coast, but certainly we have a right to expect from the minister some assurance that the inadequacies which obviously have been identified will be corrected, at least on an interim basis, to ensure maximum efficiency during the crucial time when the task force is preparing its report, which report will not be ready for submission to cabinet until mid-summer, or perhaps even later.

The last tragedy at sea in my province was the foundering of the fishing vessel the *San Juan* with the loss of two lives. My question today to the minister was whether or not he is now prepared, in light of the submission of the report by his department into the sinking of the *San Juan*, to have a full scale judicial inquiry. I submit such an inquiry is warranted by the tabling in this House by the minister of the in-house inquiry report of his department.

Such an inquiry is warranted because, according to this report, only the captain of the CGS *Bartlett* and only the first officer of the vessel and the quartermaster were interviewed. Why were the members of the RCMP not interviewed since they were instrumental in notifying the air-sea search and rescue in Halifax that the *San Juan* was lost? Second, why were not the personnel of the air-sea search and rescue in Halifax not interviewed to determine what procedure was taken immediately following the receipt of this news?

What seems to be perhaps even more difficult to understand is why were not the members of the crew of the *Bartlett* who were on deck at the time not interviewed by this inquiry or investigation? I say, Sir, that unfortunately, because I am sure this was the conclusion of well meaning people, this investigation raises more questions than it answers. I find one part of the report particularly objectionable. On page three of the report there is a reference to the fact that the two fishermen, Mr. Coady and Mr. Ryan were on some kind of pleasure cruise. The suggestion was made that they were out sports fishing, that they were shooting birds for sport.

The Newfoundland fishermen do not venture out into the North Atlantic in the middle of February for sport. They do so because that is a crucial part of their existence. They do so for the very important reason that they have to supplement their inadequate incomes. They supplement their income by catching a few fish for their table or by shooting some seabirds to provide some fresh meat. That

has been the traditional pattern of Newfoundland fishermen. It is unworthy of the people who prepared that report, and of the Minister of Transport who presented it, to suggest that these two fishermen who were lost were out on some kind of sporting venture.

I wonder whether the Minister of Transport would have the courage to go to the widow of one of these fishermen and adviser her and her nine children that the husband and father was lost while on a sporting cruise on that ill-fated day. How many more fishermen will have to be lost before this government gets the message that it has an on-going responsibility to protect Canadians at sea and in the air?

I venture to say that if some kook were to take it upon himself to cross the Atlantic in a balloon, as has happened on a number of occasions, and if by the very nature of that foolhardy exercise was to come down somewhere in the northwest Atlantic, the full capability of Canada's search and rescue and of the United States search and rescue facilities would be brought to bear to save the skin of that nut. Yet, Sir, we seem to be suggesting that if fishermen engage in some kind of sporting pastime with their equipment while waiting for the fishing season to commence, or if fishermen on the west coast of Canada venture out without adequate equipment, then somehow they are not entitled to the same protection as they would were they engaged in legitimate fishing activity.

I submit that all Canadians involved in fishing, be it sport or otherwise, are entitled to the protection that is their right as Canadian citizens. That is why I believe, with the admission of the Minister of Transport that the present procedures are inadequate, with the further admission that the task force report will not be ready until mid-summer, that we must have some assurance that steps will be taken in the interim to correct the inadequacies.

● (1700)

The minister in the report on the *San Juan* incident made no reference to the air-sea rescue Centre in Halifax or the responsibilities they have. The report carried with it the implication that there is a division of responsibility here which all too often has resulted in a very serious loss of time in getting the search and rescue in operation.

On the one hand we are told that the Department of Transport is responsible for the marine capability in search and rescue, and on the other the Department of National Defence is responsible for the air capability. That is not my understanding of it. My understanding of it is that the Department of National Defence, which operates the four search and rescue centres in Canada, is responsible for the over-all supervision of search and rescue in Canada. It is its responsibility to take the initiative. Indeed the initiative cannot be taken unless the air-sea rescue centres have been notified, and indeed air-sea rescue centres have the ongoing co-ordinating responsibility once a search gets under way.

Yet we have all these contradictions creeping in from time to time. For example, General Dextrase when he was before the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence on March 23, in his statement, which can be found in the report of the committee of that day, said:

> But I do believe the responsibility is not ours. I do not want to sound callous; somebody has to do the job. But if we are forever coming back when we are discussing estimates and having the Department of National Defence picking up whatever is alleged or considered as not being done by anyone else, then the budget will certainly have to include it.

Obviously the Commanding General of the Canadian Armed Forces does not have the same understanding of the division of responsibility that the Minister of Transport and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) have. I would say that we deserve, the people of Canada deserve, and certainly our fishermen deserve, to know exactly what interim measures the government will take to correct the inadequacies identified by the minister in his statement last week. We deserve that because, after all, if a municipality is about to acquire a new fire engine, it does not close down the fire hall because the existing equipment is inadequate. It takes whatever steps are necessary to bring the present equipment up to maximum efficiency on an interim basis until the new equipment is ready, and certainly that applies with a great deal of force and legitimacy to the whole question of air-sea rescue.

I will not take too much of the time of the House, but in conclusion I want to make reference to the report of Judge Soper who headed a judicial inquiry into the loss of the fishing vessel *Enterprise*, and the foundering of the Canadian National ship *Patrick Morris* which was engaged in the search of the *Enterprise* in 1970. Judge Soper released his report in 1971 and identified the problem. For example, he said:

> There is one factor which should be examined by the appropriate authorities of the Government of Canada and that is the "reaction time", which is the time lag between the order to go on a mission and the take-off of aircraft.

I did some checking today with the Canadian Armed Forces and I am told that the tracker aircraft, a prop aircraft which is the kind of equipment we now have, takes approximately three and a half hours flying time to get from Halifax to eastern Newfoundland. That is a critical time factor. As I mentioned earlier, it is only by the grace of God that there was a tracker at St. John's at the time the *Cape Freels* was lost because, if that tracker had not been there, we would probably have been faced with a tragedy of huge proportions in that 23 men would have been lost. Yet we had to depend on the east coast of Newfoundland on an air element that is operational from Halifax or Summerside, Prince Edward Island.

What did Judge Soper have to say about that in his report? He made some important recommendations which, to the best of my knowledge, have never been acted upon. That report was handed down in 1971. In addition to addressing himself to the critical time lag he recommended that there should be greater dispersal, greater deployment of air-sea rescue aircraft to cover the Atlantic region, pointing out rightly that the area covered by air-sea rescue was far too vast to have to depend on aircraft stationed in Summerside or in Halifax. Yet to this date that recommendation has not been acted upon.

The judge also recommended that additional personnel be employed in the air-sea rescue centres to ensure maximum 24 hour efficiency. To the best of my knowledge that recommendation was not acted upon either. I think we deserve an explanation. People who depend upon the sea

for a livelihood deserve an explanation. What is more important, we deserve from this government and from the Minister of Transport, who should have all the responsibility because he has under his command the Canadian coastguard, an assurance, while he is waiting for the report of this task force, that immediate steps will be taken to correct the inadequacies identified by the minister himself, and that they will put together some kind of interim organization to ensure maximum efficiency and capability and a reduction in reaction time until the report of the task force is received.

This would mean a few simple steps which I will suggest to the government right now. First of all, tracker aircraft should be stationed in Gander on a full time 24 hour basis. Second, lifeboats which were purchased by the government at considerable expense should be redesigned to make them efficient to the maximum, because at present they can only operate under ideal conditions. For example, when two fishermen were lost in Morton's Harbour in February there was a lifeboat standing by in Twillingate a short distance away and that lifeboat was not operational because it could not operate in more than two inches of ice.

An hon. Member: One inch.

Mr. McGrath: I am corrected by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Baker (Gander-Twillingate)), and I appreciate that correction.

● (1710)

Second, I am told that when the *San Juan* went down there was a lifeboat in St. John's at that time and that that lifeboat was not operational because it could not operate in high seas. These accidents do not take place under ideal conditions. They usually take place when there are high winds, adverse weather conditions or serious ice conditions, so for God's sake let us not play around with cosmetics. Let us bring these lifeboats back, redesign them, and have the necessary additions made to them which will make them truly operational.

Third, I suggest that some kind of plan be put into effect which would maximize the use of whatever aircraft and whatever vessels happen to be in the area. For example, at any given time at St. John's or Gander there are water bombers, which are converted Cansos, which are ideal for this type of operation and which could and should be brought into force whenever there is a rescue operation under way. This could be done by a simple arrangement with the government of Newfoundland. Surely that is a simple suggestion.

Finally, whatever the task force recommends—and obviously it will have to pay some heed to the recommendations of Judge Soper with respect to deployment—let us hope the government acts on its recommendations and acts with the dispatch this situation deserves.

In this regard I hope that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries will let his voice be heard because I know he shares my concern. I know he is convinced, as I am, that the logical location for deployment of whatever facilities we have from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island to cover the Newfoundland situation would be the airport at Gander, which has the National Defence establishment already there. There is a fully operational aerodrome, and this could be done with very little additional expense to Canadian taxpayers. Whatever is to be done, for God's sake let it be done quickly, before someone else is lost.

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), not in an effort to monopolize the debate on the adjournment motion, but simply to point out the truth which he speaks. This is a very important matter.

As the over-all arrangement for search and rescue is set up throughout this country we have four co-ordinating zones. In the case of the province the hon. member represents, which is my province, operations are co-ordinated from another province. All the aircraft which are used in search and rescue operations have to be sent from another province, and from a specific area of another province, which is perhaps quite distant.

The co-ordination presently in effect is not adequate at all. As the hon. member pointed out, division of authority between two specific departments is not acceptable. The triggering device for search and rescue is not acceptable, and I think that is the major reason why there are discussions under way regarding the whole situation.

What is it that the hon. member for St. John's East and I are basically requesting? We deserve at least an aircraft in our own province, which we do not have at present. We do not have one aircraft. They have to come from another area of Canada. The hon. member pointed out that with regard to the major disasters which have occurred that they have occurred mostly at a certain time of the year, and around the coast of Newfoundland. The hon. member pointed out the reasons for that.

We have fishermen who are licensed seal hunters and who have to go out at a time of year when the ice is in and not too far off shore. There is a regular hunting season, not for sports hunting, but to provide a food supplement to the people who live along our coast. They have to go out at a time of year when one normally would not be doing sports fishing. A sports fisherman would not want to be out among ice pans at a time of the year when any change in the weather within a 24-hour period would result in the sports fisherman being heavily iced in. Because of our geography, weather conditions, and the occupations of Newfoundlanders, I believe we deserve to have an air-sea rescue co-ordinating centre in Newfoundland.

I would not mind if the centre were placed in the riding of the hon. member, or in some other part of Newfoundland. However, Gander is a central location, and I think the government should reach that decision.

This question is important to Newfoundlanders, not just to those people working in the fishery who have to go out on these waters during the spring and winter months, but to everyone in Newfoundland. I predict that before long—I would say this summer—we will see some petitions about this matter presented in the House of Commons. I agree wholeheartedly with what the hon. member for St. John's East said with regard to the need for an air-sea rescue centre in Newfoundland and also with his general com-

ment about the need for co-ordination, better aircraft, and better equipment on that aircraft.

We could learn a lot if we examined some of the air-sea rescue services which are operated throughout the world. Perhaps if we were to look at what is now available, and deployed our resources properly, the problem would be solved. In any case, the problem has to be solved, and I join with the hon. member in making that point.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that after 17 months of a session, the longest in the history of this country, the adjournment motion should be put without any statement whatsoever from the government.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Nineteen months.

Mr. Coates: Well, I made a mistake in a conservative way. After that period of time the acting government House leader comes into the House and puts this motion for adjournment without any mention of any achievements the government could lay before the people of Canada as reasons for taking a recess instead of proroguing the House and starting a new session of parliament.

It is one of the very sad commentaries on this parliament that it has been going continuously since the last general election. That is an indication of just how unco-ordinated the government has been in everything it has tried to achieve, in the name of sanity, for the people of Canada. The crown the government wears is not a crown of diamonds and rubies. It is a crown of thorns, and the people of Canada feel the effects.

● (1720)

I am pleased to see the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard) has been present in the House all the time this motion has been debated. He is new to the department. He is a dedicated man but must clean up a terrible mess in Atlantic Canada. Eight years ago the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talked about the just society, about the need to eradicate regional economic disparity. Is it not sad that the head of the Economic Council of Canada, appearing before the Regional Development Committee, said that the department set up seven years ago to eliminate regional economic disparity has not achieved its aims? It has hardly lessened regional economic disparity which has existed since Confederation.

The economic outlook for people in my province becomes worse with each passing day. They face the future with fear and trepidation. Why, Mr. Speaker? The reason is our escalating energy costs. The blame is not to be laid so much at the feet of the federal government as at the feet of the government of Nova Scotia, which did virtually nothing by way of planning to lower the costs of energy. Our energy costs have escalated because the Nova Scotia government put its faith in offshore oil. Offshore oil is used mostly for the province's energy production. The situation is similar in Prince Edward Island but could have been avoided in Nova Scotia, as the province has available other resources which it could have brought on stream in anticipation of present difficulties.

Ordinary Nova Scotians owning ordinary homes pay more for their electric bills than for their mortgages. Mortgage payments are lower than payments for electric power bills. And this happened almost overnight. The government of Nova Scotia, through an advertising campaign, convinced people to change to electric heating. Many people converted, and now they cannot afford to heat their homes electrically. They cannot pay their electric bills and cannot sell their homes, because no one wants to buy homes so expensive to heat. This is a terrible mess and a terrible disaster for the people.

The federal government convinced many industries to locate in Nova Scotia. The idea was to provide employment for our people. Assisted by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, some industries established themselves in Nova Scotia. They face mounting energy costs which they could not have anticipated when they first moved to Nova Scotia. I do not doubt that if something is not done soon, bankruptcies in the province will increase. This will be bad news for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the people of this country, because we shall lose the tremendous investment we made when we helped those industries locate in Nova Scotia.

I say to the minister that the Nova Soctia government's lack of planning and lack of concern for the people are reprehensible. I criticize the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for not protecting the investment the people of Canada made when they helped industries to locate in the province. My criticism is not directed at the minister personally; it is directed at departmental officials. They should have anticipated that energy costs would increase, and should have encouraged the government of Nova Scotia to provide forms of energy alternative to and cheaper than offshore oil.

Nova Scotia possesses tremendous coal resources and Devco, the federal entity, is doing its best to bring provincial coal on stream. It wants to open coal mines; we need coal both for the steel industry and thermal power production. When Devco was first established the government of Nova Scotia entered into a special arrangement with the federal government whereby Devco was to assume responsibility for the coal mines in Cape Breton and the Nova Scotia government for the coal mines in the rest of Nova Scotia. The provincial government was to pay the subventions connected with thermal power plants in the province, not the federal government. The Nova Scotia government thought it was a good deal. The federal government behaved generously in the deal which led to the establishment of the Crown corporation on Cape Breton Island. But what happened?

After the deal was signed and the Regan administration took over, the province began closing coal mines. It thought, shortsightedly, that it would save money because it would not need to pay subventions on coal if mines were closed. Now that administration would dearly love to have those coal mines in operation and dearly love to pay those subventions. In my constituency, at Springhill, a viable coal mine could be in operation. There is lots of coal. At one time the Nova Scotia government decided to open a

new coal mine there, then, suddenly, at the whim of the premier, decided not to. In Pictou county it was the same.

The provincial government closed the mines. Because coal had no sex appeal for the premier, coal mining was phased out. He put all his eggs in the one basket. He put his faith in oil on Sable Island, until he discovered there wasn't much oil on Sable Island. There wasn't enough to make that oil commercially viable.

An hon. Member: He showed everybody a bottle of oil.

Mr. Coates: Yes, he showed Nova Scotia a bottle of oil. Oil was to be the wave of the future in that part of Canada. But even that bottle of oil has become pretty expensive.

An hon. Member: It has turned out to be castor oil.

Mr. Coates: As the hon. member from Kingston says, for Nova Scotia it has turned out to be castor oil.

Then the premier decided that, although we did not have offshore oil, perhaps we could develop Fundy tidal power. One minute he is in favour of Fundy tidal power, and the next he is not. Nobody knows where he stands. Despite the willingness of the federal government to involve itself in tidal power studies and bring closer the day when we can decide if we can harness the tides, the premier could not make up his mind. He could not come up with appointments to the Fundy tidal power review committee for almost a year. He messed around with the additional study and we lost months when the committee could have been working and coming up with conclusions. At this moment in time we in Nova Scotia find ourselves almost totally committed to offshore oil, and the premier now cries, asking the federal government to bail them out.

● (1730)

As much as I hate to see us having to pay for the mistakes of Mr. Regan in Nova Scotia, at the same time I say we have to give very serious consideration to meeting the request he is making. If not, we will only worsen the degree of regional economic disparity that exists there. We will increase unemployment in that area and there will be a further migration of our people because there will not be the possibilities to entice them to remain there. Therefore I say to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, please urge upon your colleagues to put into effect at least a short term program to help both Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island out of the terrible dilemma they are in with regard to escalating energy costs.

Let me give an example of how serious this is from a personal point of view, and I am much better able to pay my power bills than most people in my constituency. Prior to a few months ago my power bill was $24 for two months, in effect $12 a month. I have the same basic facilities now. I do not have an electric stove. I heat with oil, not with electricity. My water is oil heated. My power bill went from $24 to $83.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Did you talk to the provincial government?

Mr. Coates: The hon. member says I should talk to the provincial government. I agree with him from the point of view that it was the provincial government that created the problem. However, the federal government has so much money invested in Nova Scotia through the infrastructure of DREE to try to overcome regional economic disparity that we cannot sacrifice what we have done, as well as the hundreds of millions of dollars of investment, because of the stupidity and incompetency of the Regan administration.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is the same in every province.

Mr. Coates: I hope it is not the same in every province. I suggest to the hon. member that everyone in this country does not have the same kind of power bill as the people in Nova Scotia. That is the sad fact. I therefore plead with the government to put forward some kind of interim plan to help the people of Nova Scotia get over the hump. The government should have some forward planning to open some coal mines, get on with the Fundy tidal power project, and get oil from wherever it can be found, but get away from the dependence on expensive offshore oil.

Even if we have to pay the equivalent for coal mined in Nova Scotia as we pay for offshore oil, it will accomplish two things. Nova Scotians will be put to work in the coal mines and pay cheques will be provided for them. Second, the money that we get for the coal that goes to the thermal power plants will stay in this country. Therefore, we must come up with some plan to try to overcome this tremendous economic burden that has quickly fallen on the shoulders of the people of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. We must try to keep the industries there viable. We must keep the people working in those industries and, hopefully, take some of the burden off the people of Nova Scotia who now are paying horrendous power rates. Many of the ordinary working people just cannot pay those rates as well as their mortgage payments. They will lose their homes.

This is a sad commentary on the shortsighted planning of the Regan administration in Nova Scotia that has now run crying to the federal government. At the same time, if we are going to protect our investment, we are forced to come up with some kind of interim plan that not only helps the people of Nova Scotia by eliminating regional economic disparity to a degree, but protects the investment the taxpayers of this country have made through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to overcome some of the unemployment that we face, and will continue to face in the days ahead.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to take only a few minutes of the time of the House to associate myself with the speeches which have been made by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) and the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) with regard to the need for immediate action in providing an effective search and rescue service on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. I support completely the statements made by these two members with respect to conditions as they exist for fishermen on the Atlantic coast. I rise solely for the purpose of pointing out to the House that a similar situation exists on the Pacific coast and that the conditions there are equally deplorable and equally demand prompt and efficient action by the government.

On the Pacific coast last year, in a two week period during the herring fishing season, we lost 14 men and ten ships. Already this year, in the first two weeks of the season, we lost four men and six ships. When I raised the matter in the question period in the House some weeks ago, to our consternation the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) admitted that, while we have an aerial search capacity, we do not have an aerial rescue capacity after dark, and that for service during the night hours we are dependent upon the assistance of our good friends and neighbours in the United States.

● (1740)

During the storm which took the lives of those four men and was responsible for the sinking of those six ships, the United States Air Force was, of course, pre-occupied with events on its own coastline and we were unable to get the kind of service which might have saved the lives of the fishermen.

It becomes increasingly apparent that there are two great difficulties as far as the search and rescue arrangements on the Pacific Coast are concerned. The first is the lack of co-ordination. The Department of National Defence is involved, the Department of Transport is involved, the Department of Fisheries is involved and, in the case of night rescue operations, the U.S. Air Force is involved. It is no wonder the fishermen find the service unsatisfactory with a divided jurisdiction like that. They have complained to the government year after year, but no satisfactory action has followed.

Like the hon. member for St. John's East I was interested in the eight-page press release issued by the Department of Transport. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) seems to put the major blame for this loss of lives and ships upon the fishermen, not upon his department, not upon the government's inefficiency and incompetence, not on the fact that the operation is characterized by divided jurisdiction. I will read what the report says under the heading "Herring Roe Season":

> Fishermen, in some cases, are not taking every precaution for their own safety. It is becoming evident, particularly during the herring roe season on the West Coast, that because of the cost involved fishermen are not willing to spend money to equip their boats with such safety equipment as emergency transmitter locators, flares and life jackets.
>
> In 1975, 14 men died and 10 boats were lost in one two-week period. This year already, six boats have sunk and four men have lost their lives. However, there is nothing to prevent a novice crew from setting out under an incompetent captain on one of the many small, fragile gillnetters and running into trouble somewhere in the vast area served by the Victoria Rescue Co-ordinating Centre.

So the department is blaming the fishermen because they do not have proper equipment, because they have not taken precautions such as putting in bulkheads to prevent the fish moving and capsizing the boats. I would point out that the Department of Transport and the Department of Fisheries have been asked repeatedly by the unionized fishermen on the West Coast to make such provisions mandatory.

The fishermen have been asking the department for years to declare fish to be cargo under the fishing regulations; they have been asking the government to require that these fishermen shall instal on their boats necessary equipment such as transmitter locators, flares and life jackets. They have been asking that it be made mandatory for bulkheads to be put in and for the stern to be protected. Yet none of these requests have been complied with as yet.

Now, the minister, in the press release he issued, tells the country and the House that an inquiry has been undertaken. These are his words:

> In July of last year, the report of the West Coast fishing vessel casualties inquiry was tabled in the House of Commons. It was initiated because of the unprecedented loss of life. The report made eight major recommendations on crew certification and training, weather forecasting, vessel regulations and inspection, fishing research, naval architecture and safety information to improve springtime operations.

I have this report in my hand. It is the West Coast Fishing Vessels Casualty Inquiry, March, 1975. It is a good report. But there is not a recommendation in it which has not been made to the government again and again over the years. The report of Mr. Justice Soper, to which the hon. member for St. John's East has referred, and the petitions and representations which have been made by the fishermen's union on the West Coast, have dealt again and again with these matters. Now the minister says he has received a report. And what does he propose to do with it? He says:

> A joint Transport Canada-Fisheries working group has been studying the recommendations and how they should be implemented. The work of this group will result in meetings between senior Transport-Fisheries officials and all concerned parties, including the B.C. government, to discuss further the implementation of the recommendations. It has become evident that in spite of the provision of additional resources, facilities and co-ordination capabilities over the years, the marine SAR organisation is no longer entirely adequate.
>
> A Canadian coastguard task force has reviewed the national search and rescue policy and the revised policy is expected to be ready for submission to cabinet by mid-1976.

They got the Soper Report in 1971. Briefs have repeatedly been presented to them by the fishermen's union. They have the report of the West Coast Fishing Vessels Casualty Inquiry in hand. And now the government says it hopes some recommendations will be ready for cabinet by midsummer of 1976. Then, of course, the House is perfectly aware that a decision made in Cabinet will not in itself do the fishermen any good because of the length of time it takes, after the time the cabinet has decided to do something, before the word trickles down through the bureaucracy and is translated into action. That interval, Mr. Speaker, is liable to be a lengthy one.

On Tuesday, April 8, I moved a motion in the House under Standing Order 43. It asked:

> That the House urges the Prime Minister to order a restructuring of the search and rescue organization under a single agency responsible to one minister, and that immediate steps be taken to procure adequate facilities and equipment for air and marine search and rescue operations on a 24-hour basis.

Because it was put forward under Standing Order 43, requiring unanimous consent, the motion could not be dealt with—some Liberal members said no. I do not wish to delay the House but I do want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members of the government, that this is not a partisan matter; this is not some economic debate. It is a matter which affects the lives of the men who make a living by going out onto the ocean to catch fish. It is a matter which concerns the welfare of human beings, and the delay which the government has shown in coming to grips with this problem is deplorable.

On almost every subject, but on this one in particular, members on the treasury benches opposite have shown themselves to be masters of procrastination. Their slogan seems to be: never do today what you can put off until tomorrow. The fishermen on the West Coast, like the fishermen on the East Coast, are sick and tired of this dilly-dallying. The government ought to take notice that members on both sides have stood up to register their righteous indignation and their protest.

We expect some action soon. By the time we come back after the recess we ought to hear from the Minister of Transport, if he is capable of coming down to earth, some information about what he and his colleagues propose to do to stop this deplorable loss of life due to the government's incompetence and to its failure to organize the search and rescue capability of our country under a single agency, and under one minister, so as to bring an end to this divided jurisdiction which has produced an intolerable situation.

● (1750)

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5)(a) I move:

That the sitting of the House be continued beyond the ordinary hour of daily sitting until this motion is adopted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has moved a motion under Standing Order 6(5)(a) which reads as follows:

When Mr. Speaker is in the Chair, a Member may propose a motion without notice, to continue a sitting through a lunch or dinner hour or beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of considering a specified item of business or a stage or stages thereof subject to the following conditions:

(i) The motion must relate to the business then being considered—

—which is met.

(ii) The motion must be proposed in the hour preceding the time at which the business under consideration should be interrupted—

—which is met also.

(iii) The motion shall not be subject to debate or amendment.

(b) When Mr. Speaker puts the question—

This has to be very clear to hon. members.

—on such motion, he shall ask those members who object to rise in their places. If ten or more members then rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn, otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted.

It is therefore my duty at this time to put the motion. It has been moved by the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Elzinga), seconded by the hon. member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. McKinley):

That the sitting of the House be continued beyond the ordinary hour of daily sitting until this motion is adopted.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There is no debate. Are any members opposing the motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is carried.

Motion (Mr. Elzinga) agreed to.

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

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I said yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I did explain the Standing Order. If hon. members had intended to oppose the motion, we would have called it six o'clock in five minutes' time. We will now sit until the motion is adopted.

Mr. Elzinga: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate in this adjournment debate to review some of the actions of the Liberal administration. My main concern is the implementation of its anti-inflation program. For programs such as this to work, I believe it is essential that the public—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interfere with my hon. friend's right to speak. In fact I would join in unanimous consent that he be permitted to do so. But did he not exhaust his right to speak in this debate when he rose to present the motion? Can he do both things, make a motion and then speak?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Surely, Mr. Speaker, he rose immediately without any debate whatever and put the motion. He sat down, the motion was put and was adopted under the rules of the House. He then rose to make his speech having been recognized by the Chair. I submit that is an end to the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must say that the Standing Order is not really clear on this point. I think by consent the hon. member should be allowed to speak. Though his proposal might have been misunderstood, if it meets the wish of the hon. member I hope he can speak by consent. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Basford: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I agree with what Your Honour has just said. I hope the hon. member will be recognized and will make a speech, and that other members who wish to make a speech will also do so. If the motion had not been agreed to we would have adjourned at six o'clock and sat tomorrow. As House leader I would only entreat members to make their points undoubtedly, but to endeavour to make them briefly.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether there is any broad agreement during this extended period, which I have no objection to, for the House to adopt a procedure whereby we will waive the quorum requirements during that period.

Mr. Elzinga: Before I get to the crux of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain why I put this motion. So often in this House individuals like myself who are on the backbenches do not have a proper opportunity to express the views and complaints of their constituents. We saw a prime example of this when the Liberal administration

brought in closure on the second reading debate of the gun control legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Elzinga: If the hon. whip on the other side wishes to speak, he now has an opportunity. As I was saying, for the government's anti-inflation program to work it must have the faith of the public. This government, our Liberal administration, has lost the faith of the public because it speaks so often out of both sides of its mouth.

During the election of 1974 hon. members opposite said that our control program would not work. Now they themselves have introduced a program of selective controls for a period of three and a quarter years. This is a program with almost dictatorial powers that could lead to a state or government controlled economy. We advocated during the 1974 election campaign a 90 day freeze on everything, with a period of 18 months of flexible controls to follow.

What we wanted to do was to break the inflationary psychology that is prevalent in Canada, but we were also aware that controls were only a temporary stopgap program. However, the main plank in our program of controls was government restraint and the controlling of our money supply. This is not in the Liberal government's program.

The majority of economists today agree that the government itself bears the major responsibility for inflation because it has not controlled these two areas. What has the Liberal administration done in these two areas? It has asked the public to abide by an increase of 8 per cent while government expenditures rise to something in the vicinity of 18 per cent. I would ask our colleagues opposite, where is the fairness in that? Is it any wonder that the government has lost the faith of the Canadian public?

As I have said, in 1974 the Liberals campaigned against a controls policy. Then a year later they implement a program of controls which is full of injustices. I might also note that exactly the same thing happened in the 1972 election.

In 1972 the Conservative party proposed the indexing of personal income taxes and a modest increase for pensioners. We were criticized strongly by our opponents, but when they were elected as a minority government they accepted the guidelines upon which we campaigned. Now hon. members opposite wish to take credit for that. The other day in the House a Liberal backbencher was speaking and attempted to take credit for the conception and implementation of indexing of personal income tax, a positive platform of this party during the 1972 election campaign. We introduced that idea, and I commend the government for instituting programs we have introduced, but I think it could be a little more honest in presenting them to the people.

● (1800)

It is my feeling that the government cannot be trusted by the Canadian people, as illustrated by the examples I have given. In the last two elections the government has campaigned on one thing, and shortly after the election has reversed its position entirely.

There are other prime examples that leave a good many questions in the public's mind. All we have to do is look at the judges' affair, and there are many questions to be answered in that area, the SIU implications, the Hamilton Harbour scandal, the Sky Shops affair, the Mirabel airport inquiries, the Olympic Village and the travel agency irregularities. For any government to function properly it must have the faith of the public, but this Liberal administration does not have that faith, and understandably so.

Despite what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and other members of his government have said in the past about the danger of believing in "doom and gloom" forecasts, our economy remains in poor shape, and we believe it is due to the contradictory economic policies of the present administration—

An. hon. Member: Why don't you read?

Mr. Elzinga: I will do that, and what you should do is learn how to read. We believe this is due to the contradictory economic policies of the present administration which has failed to enhance the growth and stability of Canadian employment and industrial production. This has not encouraged investment in industry and has permitted a serious decline in our competitive position in international markets.

This Liberal administration, as a means of fighting inflation, has imposed upon all Canadians a program of prices and incomes controls, the major component of which is restraint. In implementing the program and demanding restraint of everyone else, the government itself is failing to observe its own rules. The federal government this year will increase its spending in the order of 18 per cent, according to a comparison of the 1975-76 and 1976-77 main estimates. The federal government from January, 1975, to January, 1976, increased the money supply by some 16.5 per cent. By January, 1977, according to the finance minister's own estimate, our money supply will have grown another 13 per cent, yet everyone else in the country, according to the regulations set down by the government's anti-inflation program, is being held to wage and price increases of not more than 8 per cent.

This is counterproductive and contradictory in two ways. First, the government's fiscal and monetary policies are working against the goals it is attempting to achieve with its anti-inflation program; and, secondly, the government's lack of restraint in fiscal and monetary policy sets a poor example for the ordinary worker and the businessman. Such lack of restraint on the part of the government only creates cynicism about the program and works against the program's intended success.

There are many more examples of our current poor economic performance. We must find solutions, but again the federal government's answers are non-answers. As was expressed by our party's finance critic, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), in debate on March 24:

> With no real growth in the economy, a per capita income now eighth in the world compared with second six years ago, and with the highest combined inflation and unemployment levels since Confederation, those in power would like to talk of other things. The new approach is: if you cannot reach your goals, then change your goals.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe suggested there is too much government control of the economy. He went on to state:

We have the potential to be the wealthiest people on earth if we allow our resources to be harnessed through individual initiative.

He also said that:

—left to government, our oil fields, our gas reserves and our potash industry would never have been developed to their present levels. Yet governments, in the name of progress, now stifle further advances through heavy taxation and regulation.

He told the House of Commons:

The nation has now reached a crossroads where we must decide between a more competitive more open society or accept, perhaps irrevocably, a society in which the large decisions about our economic and personal welfare are made by a central government.

This same government would like to run all our lives, but it should be remembered just how it runs its own departments such as the Post Office. The hon. member for York-Simcoe went on to state:

The past demonstrates that a system of free enterprise, despite its many flaws, is the most compatible with the protection of rights and liberties as well as the most productive of material goods.

There are two other areas I wish to deal with, and one is in respect of Bill C-83. I should like to express my deep concern and disappointment with the Liberal administration that has seen fit to muzzle members on all sides of this House on the second reading debate of Bill C-83. All this does is exemplify the attitude of the government. It does not care about what the people want. It is going to do exactly what it wants, and it does not give the members of this House the opportunity to express the wishes and the desires of the constituents they are sent here to serve.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Elzinga: In closing I should like to give a prime example of what is happening in my own constituency of Pembina. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) said to me several months back that in the event our constituents and the people in the municipal district of Sturgeon did not wish to have a federal penitentiary located in the area, the government would not go ahead with it. What do we see happening now? The Solicitor General is pushing this down the throats of the individuals in this area, in spite of the fact there is a petition on his desk with the signatures of 248 people requesting that the government not build this penitentiary on this piece of prime agricultural land.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Elzinga: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this not being less than honest with the Canadian people regarding this issue?

In concluding, I should like to leave you on a lighter note, Mr. Speaker. I wish you, the members of the House, and the staff, all a restful and happy Easter.

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the desire of many members to leave the Chamber and I will not impose upon you for very long.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Leggatt: That may be the only response I get.

It probably is appropriate that one of the last speakers this afternoon intends to talk about the environment, because the environment is the last thing on the priority list not only of the government, not only in terms of the opposition, but in terms of the public itself.

An hon. Member: What about the NDP?

Mr. Leggatt: Yes, and the NDP. I am not trying to be partisan. What I am trying to do is bring the question back to the attention of the public.

As soon as the gross national product in this country drops a little bit, interest in the environment drops as well. We are all guilty in this regard. The environment was something we talked about several years ago and something the government talked about in the Speech from the Throne in 1974. This is what the government said in that famous speech about its intentions:

—stemming the despoilation of our planet and returning our water, air and land to a more natural state.

That is a very acceptable objective, but nothing has been done about it. Not only is the government not attempting to redress this process of the environment, it is participating in the escalation of the destruction of this country's environment at a rate that is disgraceful.

Let us have a look at what the government has been doing. The last thing it did was to replace the minister we had before. She was not particularly successful at her job but she could have learned, with a little time and patience. She made some very attractive speeches. Her rhetoric was very good, as were her intentions. What did the government do? It moved her out as soon as it looked like she might really start to do something in respect of the environment.

● (1810)

The government replaced that minister with the most moveable minister in the whole Liberal cabinet. He began his career without a portfolio. Then he went to DREE. We remember when that minister was looking after DREE. I would say that we in the New Democratic Party were thankful that he was responsible for DREE in 1972, because he was probably as responsible as any other minister for the election of many members of our party due to the way he managed that portfolio. Then he went to the Department of Transport. We remember that. After he looked around that department he said it was in a mess and that he could not do anything about it. Then the government tried to find another slot for him. I forgot for a moment that he was once in the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Finally he went to the Department of the Environment. That minister has a reverse Midas touch. Everything he touches becomes crap.

I should like to say something about the important decision the government will make tomorrow in respect of the Beaufort Sea. My prediction is that this drilling permit will be issued. The reason is that the same mistake has been made that was made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) in respect of the Lockheed Orion. Two years ago an agreement was entered into in principle with Dome Petroleum Company involving an investment of $100 million. The government locked itself into that project. Then the government received the environment studies which predict the probable disaster and high risk in terms of the use of the Beaufort Sea area. Now it is faced with either a $100 million lawsuit, or risk to the

environment. I predict the government will let the environment take the risk again despite the protest by the United States. There again the government has locked itself into a position out of sheer negligence.

Then there is the Syncrude project in which there is a conflict of interest. The environmental studies refer to 40 tons, and the emission permit is for 287 long tons. In this country we rely for our standard of living on the industrialization of the belt immediately north of us. When our standard of living results in the death of Indians from mercury poisoning the government should take another look at the environment in terms of things we should be examining in this House. Last but not least in respect of the environment is the insatiable desire we have for money. We export nuclear death around the world. The government is contributing to the greatest possible disaster the world has yet seen.

An hon. Member: Hogwash.

Mr. Leggatt: It is not hogwash. We were once known around the world as a country on which one could count to go abroad and cool the fires of international tension. Now we are flooding the world with CANDU reactors. It is interesting that the United States, in terms of their sales of the Westinghouse reactor, say there is no point in bothering with unstable countries because Canada has them all locked up.

The United States takes the position that there is no point in considering sales to North Korea or Argentina because the Canadians are selling their reactors to these countries at an indecent rate. Then there is the question of our reliance on domestic nuclear sales. There is required in this country a very open inquiry so that the public will have an important input. We may be creating a nuclear industry which will be completely unnecessary if we look to alternate sources of power. If we continue to do what we are doing we will rue the day.

I must say that for the first time I am ashamed of Canada's position in the world in terms of the export of nuclear reactors. I might say that the government is a very poor inheritor of the mantle of Lester B. Pearson who went down in history as a peace maker. This country may go down in history as a war maker and a contributor to international disaster.

Easter Adjournment

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the position of being acting House Leader because Cupid has stolen my colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). Because of pressing events I did not reply to all the matters raised in the previous debate. We are adjourning for purposes of the season and the Resurrection, and I am sure the President of the Privy Council will return on April 26 resurrected and ready to answer all the questions that have been raised. May I move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This is hardly necessary because we have sat beyond the ordinary time of sitting. There is no need for such a motion.

Perhaps I might take this opportunity in the name of Mr. Speaker, who is unavoidably absent from this House, to invite on his behalf members and the staff of the press gallery to room 16. When the House rises it will await the Easter opportunity to rise again, when there may be another opportunity to have a good understanding of Standing Order 6(5)(a) in anticipation of a good and restful adjournment.

● (1820)

[*Translation*]

I am happy, on behalf of the Speaker and at his express request, to invite all hon. members as well as staff members, and members of the press, to come and fraternize in Room 16, and perhaps discuss all the topics mentioned in the last few minutes, in the spirit of Easter and the Resurrection.

It being past six o'clock, pursuant to Special Order made earlier this day, this House stands adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1976, at 2 o'clock p.m.

At 6.20 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, April 26, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF FARRIS REPORT AND ESTABLISHMENT OF INDEPENDENT INQUIRY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond Delta): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Since we have now witnessed the sixth hostage drama at British Columbia Penitentiary in just over 14 months and again the establishment of a meaningless in-house inquiry into the incident, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That this House instruct the Solicitor General to immediately table the report of the Farris Inquiry and to establish an independent investigation into what is obviously an explosive situation at the B.C. Penitentiary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

SOCIAL SERVICES

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE COSTS OF DAYCARE CENTRES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Last December, I questioned the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) on the government's intentions with respect to the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women dealing with daycare. Since that recommendation has still not been implemented, and since the lack of adequate daycare facilities continues to be a serious concern all across Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That this House instructs the government to implement within 12 months the recommendation that the federal government contribute on a cost-sharing basis with the provinces in the capital costs for the establishment of daycare facilities and not simply contribute to maintenance costs once they are established.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIRPORTS

SUGGESTED JUDICIAL INQUIRY INTO TENDERING PROCEDURES FOR LEASES, CONCESSIONS AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the numerous questions about public propriety that affect trust in government and reflect, indeed, on all of us in public life, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle):

That the Prime Minister take all necessary steps to arrange to appoint a judicial inquiry into tendering procedures at Dorval and Mirabel airports, with reference to contracts involving leases, concessions and construction projects, excluding therefrom, however, those matters involving Sky Shops during such time as they remain sub judice of our criminal courts.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF PENSION RIGHTS FOR HOMEMAKER SPOUSES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in asking the House to agree to this motion under Standing Order 43, I make the point that it does not call for action overnight. However, it does stress the urgency of a commitment being made now with regard to an important matter. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House urges the government to bring in legislation that will establish pension rights for homemaker spouses equivalent to the rights of those employed outside the home, and that the government commit

itself to the taking of this action during the life of the present parliament.

Mr. Speaker: The provisions of Standing Order 43 require the unanimous consent of the House before the presentation of such a motion. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ELIMINATION OF SEX DISCRIMINATION IN PAY PRACTICES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. On December 17, 1975 and again on February 5, 1976, the leader of the New Democratic Party raised in this House the question of the widening gap between women's and men's incomes and urged that the provision in the anti-inflation program for an exemption from the general guidelines to ensure the achievement of equality of the sexes with regard to income be made mandatory instead of optional.

Since the government has failed to take such action and since women in the Canadian labour force continue to be discriminated against in terms of their incomes, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instruct the government to take steps to implement on a mandatory basis the permissive clause in the anti-inflation program relating to the elimination of sex discrimination in pay practices.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF ACTIONS OF KHMER ROUGE IN CAMBODIA TO UNITED NATIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

For some months now in the New York *Times*, as well as New York Review of Books, and recently in *Time* magazine, April 19, 1976 edition, it has been estimated that since the Communist victory in Cambodia last year, one half million Cambodians, or one tenth of the population, have died from political reprisals, disease or starvation under the Khmer Rouge.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt):

That Canada's External Affairs Department bring this matter before the United Nations for open discussion.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

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

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

EXPERIMENTAL BILINGUAL EDITION OF "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS"

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members will notice that a bilingual edition of *Votes and Proceedings* has been placed on their desks in addition to the regular English and French editions. This arrangement will continue for the balance of the session to enable hon. members to make their comments to the Chair as to the suitability and usefulness of the combined version.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—TENDERING PROCEDURES FOR FOOD AND BEVERAGE CONCESSIONS

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Can the minister assure the House there were no unusual circumstances and excessive lobbying involved in the tendering process, the evaluation of bids and the eventual awarding to Les Entreprises Cara (Quebec) Limitée of a lease to operate the food and beverage concession at Mirabel Airport? In other words, can he assure us that standard procedures according to established government policy were followed throughout?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe there is nothing at all to indicate that anything but the standard procedure was followed. If the hon. member has any information to the contrary I would be delighted to receive it.

Mr. MacKay: That being the case, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister if he is aware of the circumstances surrounding a telephone conversation made a couple of hours prior to the time scheduled for the opening of tenders for this concession wherein Mr. Boyd Matchett, the president of Cara, called Mr. Gerry Stoner, the then Deputy Minister of Transport, to inform him about departures from normal tender-opening procedures which Mr. Matchett discovered upon his early arrival for the opening of bids and which Mr. Stoner had to over-rule very precipitously?

Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such call.

Mr. MacKay: Would the minister, after he has looked into these things and acquainted himself with the circum-

stances, explain to the House how it was that because of alleged great pressure which was then exerted on the then minister of transport, Mr. Stoner, the Deputy Minister, suggested to Mr. Matchett some time after the tenders were opened that he should explore a merger with Kebec Restaurants Limited and how it was that when Mr. Matchett did this, Mr. Bellehumeur of Kebec Restaurants suggested that Cara withdraw its higher tender and that these companies work together on the basis of the lower bid submitted by Kebec Restaurants, a proposal which Mr. Matchett very properly refused to consider?

Mr. Lang: The hon. member knows full well that I do investigate any matters which are brought to my attention and I would have appreciated it had he brought these matters to my notice.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSITION OF MR. MARCHAND IN RECOMMENDING CONTRACTS IN QUEBEC

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

As weekend newspapers reported that the Minister of the Environment had admitted making, at the time when he was the Prime Minister's Quebec lieutenant, thousands of recommendations with regard to the adjudication of contracts, can he tell the House whether, among those countless recommendations he made, he might not have made specific ones with regard to "Les Entreprises Cara Québec Ltée" and "Québec Restaurant A.F.C. Ltée"?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, in all cases, I followed standard procedures observed by the department concerned. In the case of public tenders, I did not intervene. In cases where there are no tenders, I received recommendations, I made some in turn, and I even received some from my hon. friend from Joliette.

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

Since the minister confirms that he made recommendations for public information would he be willing to table a list of his recommendations and say what were the results?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to draw up the list and mention the recommendations made by the members of all parties in this House. I must say that I got some from every party. Moreover, I find this perfectly right. When the member for Joliette asked me if it would be possible to obtain grants for his constituency, I found his representations fair and I do not blame him for doing so.

Mr. La Salle: One last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When I said recommendations I hope the minister understood that I was referring to companies and contracts.

I would like to put a supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Considering that the Minister of the Environment was at one time the lieutenant of the present Prime Minister and that he had to make hundreds of recommendations concerning the granting of contracts, are we to understand that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), in his quality of Quebec lieutenant, is now responsible for these recommendations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when there are several members of parliament or several ministers in one province, it has happened and it still often happens that I ask some ministers to come together with a recommendation. This is so in the province of Quebec, this is so in the other provinces, and it was so when the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was Prime Minister.

[*English*]

LETTER FROM CARMEL CARRIÈRE CONCERNING SKY SHOPS LEASE—MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Could the Prime Minister tell the House whether he has asked the Minister of the Environment if he had knowledge of a letter written in October, 1971 by his then executive assistant, Carmel Carrière, to the then executive assistant to the Minister of Transport concerning the removal of competitive bidding for the Sky Shops lease and, if so, would the Prime Minister tell the House what the minister's answer was and was he, the Prime Minister, satisfied with it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall that any such letter had to do with the removal of competitive bidding, but it has been alleged publicly that such a letter was written by Miss Carmel Carrière. I knew of it and I discussed it with the minister, but I do not believe that the subject of removal of competitive bidding was in the letter I am speaking of.

Mr. Broadbent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The last part of my question was not answered by the Prime Minister and I should like him to do so now, if he would. Was he satisfied in every way with the answer he received from the minister concerning that letter? Secondly, would he tell the House whether he has asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the then Minister of Transport, if he was aware of the letter that had been sent by Carmel Carrière, did he discuss that matter with this minister as well, and was he satisfied with the answer that he received from that minister?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes in both cases and on both subjects. The present Minister of the Environment made it quite clear, and I stated in the House, that he became aware of that letter after it had been discussed publicly, but he did not know of the existence of that letter at the time.

POSSIBILITY TREASURY BOARD CONSULTED ON RENEWAL OF SKY SHOPS LEASE

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister advise the House whether or not Treasury Board was

advised or consulted regarding the decision to renew the Sky Shops lease; and if advised, did Treasury Board itself make a recommendation in this matter?

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the extent to which the Treasury Board was or was not involved. I had in mind an answer given by the present Minister of Transport some weeks ago when he explained the Sky Shops affair and the lease which had originally been granted by the Conservative government back in 1962 and renewed in the normal way. I have asked for further details on this, and whether or not it had gone to the Treasury Board. I have not had that answer. I expect it later today. I did have in mind the rather complete answer given by the Minister of Transport some weeks ago. I cannot remember whether he did mention Treasury Board involvement.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON GUARANTEES REQUESTED BY MR. BOURASSA PRIOR TO PATRIATION

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister.

During the weekend a Liberal party convention took place in Quebec City where Premier Bourassa dealt with three specific points, namely the patriation of the constitution, the Olympic Games and the common front in the province of Quebec.

As far as the constitution is concerned, Mr. Bourassa stated that he represented one fortieth of the total population in America and that he required guarantees by the Prime Minister of Canada before he agrees with the idea of partriating the constitution. Is the right hon. Prime Minister in a position to tell the House whether the guarantees required by Mr. Bourassa have been given to him?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the idea of such guarantees was accepted not only by myself but also by the nine other provincial premiers at the meeting of first ministers in the month of April last when we got together to discuss this among other things. This was explained quite clearly in a letter tabled in the House before the Easter recess.

In brief, everyone is prepared to give guarantees so the French fact, so the French language may continue to exist on an equal basis in this country. That is the policy of the federal government, and of all parties in the House. There is no question about that. It is on the wording itself of a guarantee that there has been no agreement thus far. The hon. member no doubt learned from the papers tabled in the House that the federal government made an effort together with the province of Quebec to draft such a guarantee. Now, if the premier of the province of Quebec wants other formulas, or other clauses, I think it would be up to him to come up with proposals, otherwise he is asking in theory for something that was already given in theory.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

OLYMPIC GAMES

FEDERAL AID IN FINANCING

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

About the constitution, as far as I was able to see last night, the premier of Quebec has not yet understood, but nevertheless he suggested that yesterday the President of the Treasury Board was meeting provincial Finance Minister Garneau about the Olympics and that an agreement was about to be passed whereby Ottawa would come to the help of the Montreal Olympic Organizing Committee which forecasts a very great deficit. Did the government suggest or propose to the federal government any assistance to fill that deficit that will occur in Montreal?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the position of the government on that has not changed for the last two years, and has still not changed in the past month. We supported the systems of self-financing from the start. I said on several occasions in the past two years that we would look at any reasonable system of self-financing. I said in answer to the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont recently that that was still the position of the federal government.

I strongly refused and still refuse that money be taken out of the federal treasury to cover a deficit incurred by the Olympic Games Organization Committee, the city of Montreal or the province of Quebec, as regards the Olympic Games. This position remains unchanged. I think that the province of Quebec now understands such view and, if I am well informed, it is considering self-financing propositions, and that will be the end of those stories to the effect that the federal treasury will help make up the deficit incurred.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

POSSIBILITY MR. BOURASSA REQUESTED ASSISTANCE OF ARMED FORCES IN VIEW OF COMMON FRONT DEMONSTRATION

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a final supplementary question.

A moment ago, I pointed out three facts. However, there are rumours about the rather delicate situation existing in the province of Quebec between the common front and the government, that is to say against the Quebec government's authority. Is it true that Mr. Bourassa asked for federal government assistance in case the army is required if ever the situation worsens between the common front and the Quebec government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, such a request was certainly not submitted, at least not to my office because I would be aware of it.

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL INQUIRY INTO TENDERING PROCEDURE OF DEPARTMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In light of the information raised today by the hon. member for Central Nova and the indication by the Minister of the Environment in *Macleans* Magazine that his duties as Quebec leader involved the making of thousands of recommendations for contracts and so forth, is the Prime Minister now prepared to establish a judicial inquiry into the tendering procedures of the Ministry of Transport, specifically excluding those aspects of the so-called Sky Shops affair now before the courts, but including the role of ministers' offices within the general tendering procedure.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister made it quite clear that when there is a tendering procedure he does not intervene to make any recommendation. That was quite clear from the answer he gave a moment ago. When there is no tendering procedure and there has to be a choice made between a group of architects, lawyers or engineers, the minister follows the same procedure which has been followed by the previous government, and by governments before that, of rather than letting the civil service make the choice the ministers themselves make the choice and recommend one officer or one series of operators.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the Prime Minister's answer is that he will not now call a judicial inquiry into this question concerning the participation by ministers or ministers' offices in the tendering procedures of the Ministry of Transport or generally. To be clear on this, is the Prime Minister telling the House that after the inquiry he has made privately, he is satisfied there is no irregularity in the tendering procedure of the Ministry of Transport, and particularly that there has been no involvement by representatives of offices of the ministers of the Crown in the tendering procedure? I make the point, offices as well as ministers themselves. Is he satisfied as to that effect and is that the reason he declines to establish a judicial inquiry?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the answer is that, generally, I am satisfied that is the situation. If there are particular cases which come to light in the case of the government or the opposition, they of course should be pointed out to the police who in this particular case have made an investigation. There is obviously a possibility of human fallacy. When such a thing is discovered in every case to my knowledge it is handled by the RCMP and investigation follows. I think this is the proper procedure.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, so that I might be clear, the Prime Minister has ruled out the possibility of a judicial inquiry into the tendering practices or procedures in the Ministry of Transport or the involvement of ministers or offices of the ministers. Is that the case?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have ruled it out on the basis that so far as we know or so far as the opposition seems to know there has been no system of irregularities. There has been one case which has been doubtful, which is being investigated and indeed is before the courts. Of course, if it came to light that there was a system or a pattern of irregularities, I think the answer might be completely different.

Mr. Horner: Are you prepared to look for the facts?

Mr. Trudeau: If the opposition has knowledge of such a thing existing under my government or under any previous government we would gladly look into it.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBILITY OF FORCE BECOMING INVOLVED IN JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister. In light of the absence of the Solicitor General and the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice. Would the Prime Minister tell the House and the country what steps his government has taken or will be taking to ensure that the RCMP, for which the Solicitor General is responsible to Parliament, does not become embroiled or involved in jurisdictional conflict which could reflect upon its credibility or apparent effectiveness as a national force. He often refers to them and says that the police are looking into this or that. If they are going to be an effective force, they should be above that kind of dispute.

● (1430)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I agree that they should be above that kind of dispute. It appears that in the course of the past week there has been a dispute which did arise between the authorities in the province of Quebec and the RCMP. I have asked the Solicitor General to look into it and to report to me. It is not a dispute with the government but, I repeat, a dispute about the RCMP having laid charges in one province rather than in another. It is of course within their right to do so and I am naturally interested, as is the hon. member, in finding out the process through which this dispute arose.

Mr. Woolliams: In light of the fact that, as the Prime Minister said, there does seem to be some dispute as to the jurisdiction of the police force, has the government given thought, in light of the recent developments in the Sky Shop matter, to the appropriateness of proceeding under the Senate and House of Commons Act rather than under the Criminal Code, as a result of which there could be no conflict?

Mr. Trudeau: I am sure the suggestion will be conveyed to the RCMP, but I must confess that I do not see the relevance of it in this particular proposal. Charges have been laid under the Criminal Code in the way the RCMP decided, and I do not see that the hon. member really complains about their decision. If he does, I will convey his feelings to them.

Oral Questions

CRIMINAL CODE

SUGGESTED ELIMINATION OF PRE-ENQUÊTE PROVISION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Will the right hon. Prime Minister consider an amendment to the Criminal Code to repeal what seems to many of us to be an unjust provision, that of pre-enquête or pre-inquiry which is obviously an outmoded method of dealing with this. Will the government abolish this system?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I take note of the suggestion and will discuss it with the Minister of Justice. I think this tradition or this practice has existed for a long while and is still practised in various provinces in exceptional circumstances. I cannot see at first blush why it should be discontinued in special circumstances, but I would be glad to hear the arguments of the hon. member.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ACTION OF DEPUTY MINISTER OF TRANSPORT IN SUGGESTING JOINT VENTURE ON TENDER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Arising out of the information disclosed by the hon. member for Central Nova, does the Prime Minister accept it as a principle in the guidelines that govern the conduct of deputy ministers that such a deputy minister should suggest to a bidder that he enter into a joint venture with a competitor in order to secure a concession or a lease upon which both have bid, and that this shall be done according to terms that are more favourable to one of the bidders?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member is referring to a case of which I know nothing and of which apparently the Minister of Transport knows nothing either. If the facts are as stated by the hon. member, there may have been good reasons to do it. We will find out and report to the House.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSITION OF UNITED STATES ON DRILLING IN BEAUFORT SEA

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On March 19 it was reported that the United States delivered a note of concern to the Canadian authorities over the drilling program proposed at that time for the Beaufort Sea. Can the minister advise the House whether that note of concern has now been withdrawn, and can he also advise the House whether the U.S. authorities are now in agreement with the decision to drill in the Beaufort Sea?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer affirmatively to either of these questions. I know that there have been consultations with the government of the United States and they expressed concern about the environmental effects of such drilling. I believe that a series of technical meetings have been held at which time it was suggested to us that their views be taken into account. Indeed, they were in the decision of the cabinet, but I have not received any additional comment from the government of the U.S. since that decision was announced.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

POSSIBLE ABANDONMENT OF REASON FOR ADVOCATING 200 MILE ZONE IN VIEW OF DRILLING IN BEAUFORT SEA

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): In view of the position that Canada has taken at the Law of the Sea Conference which was to justify the 200 mile economic zone on the ground that we would require that zone to protect the coastal state ecology, and in view of the risk that the government is now undertaking in the Beaufort sea, have our delegates to the United Nations now been instructed to abandon that as a ground for supporting our 200 mile zone in view of the risk that this country now seems to be willing to take in the 200 mile zone?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): It was never the view of the Canadian government either at the Law of the Sea conference or elsewhere that economic activities should be prohibited in any such zone and in particular in the Arctic. What we did say, and what we continue to say, is that the highest possible environmental protection should be put in place when such events do take place, and that is certainly the effort that was made by cabinet in making its decision.

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary question. Would the minister advise the House whether it was his recommendation to proceed with the drilling in the Beaufort sea and, secondly, in view of his answer that the highest technology should be available to justify our position, is it his position now that the highest technology is available to clean up a blow-out in that sea?

Mr. MacEachen: I regret that I cannot oblige the hon. member and tell him what transpired in the cabinet, and therefore his supplementary questions are not applicable.

* * *

TRANSPORT

DEPARTMENTAL RULES ON OPENING OF TENDERS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transport. I assume from the answer which the minister gave to the questions posed by the hon. member for Central Nova that an investigation will be carried out into the matters which have been advanced by the hon. member. While the minister is checking into the circumstances of this tendering procedure and subsequent events, would he also report on the rules relating to the opening of tender bids publicly as opposed to private bids as well as find out who authorized that course of action which Mr. Stoner found it necessary to over-rule, and also would he report on what steps Mr. Stoner took and whom he contacted to rectify that which Mr. Matchett found unacceptable?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, certainly the hon. member can be assured that the ordinary procedures are followed carefully with regard to the opening of public tenders. I have given his colleague the indication that I will look into these matters. I do not think there is much point in further speculating on what did happen as the result of a phone call which cancelled another phone call. But I will look into the matter.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSSIBILITY OF REVIEW BY TREASURY BOARD OF PROCEDURES CONNECTED WITH LEASES AND RENTALS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): My question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Since the Treasury Board, under the provisions of the Financial Administration Act, has over-all authority in the management of Canada's financial affairs which includes among other things the matter of leases, the provision and use of facilities and rentals, etc., is the minister satisfied with the current practices and procedures, and can he indicate to the House whether he is considering undertaking a comprehensive review of current practices so that we might hopefully restore public confidence in this part of the government's activities?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, whenever a problem such as this one is brought to the attention of the Treasury Board, we consider it and try to give the best possible ruling. However, we are always on the lookout for better procedures. This is not always easy but I shall heed the hon. member's suggestion.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: Could the President of the Treasury Board assure the House that he and his colleagues will undertake a comprehensive investigation and review of current procedures in light of the Sky Shop affair and in light of the affair which has been brought to light by my colleague, the hon. member for Central Nova today?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, there are times when it is absolutely impossible to call for tenders. We try to proceed through tenders as much as possible but there are situations, Mr. Speaker, where we must take our responsibilities, and this cannot be helped. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, when we have decisions to make we assume our responsibilities. One cannot deny that we are politicians. We were elected by the people and in some circumstances we must assume our responsibilities as administrators and politicians at the same time. We cannot separate the two.

• (1440)

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. With regard to the special responsibilities he has inherited from the Minister of the Environment as the leader of the federal Quebec party, I should like to ask the minister if he takes direct responsibility for this extra ministerial task or whether to any extent this clearing house is run by his staff.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the hon. member realizes that he is not directing a question to the minister in his capacity as Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order at the present time? If the minister or members of the cabinet have on different occasions indicated that they in fact are vetting various contracts within various provinces,—and the answers of the Prime Minister confirmed that contention—and if there is an acknowledged leader of the party in a particular province, seized with that responsibility, it seems to me to be quite legitimate for us to ask that minister questions with respect to those responsibilities, and I ask the indulgence of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: It may be an interesting question to ask, but it is not a legitimate question to ask during the question period.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSSIBILITY OF IMPROPRIETIES BY MINISTERIAL AIDES IN SKY SHOPS AFFAIR—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Prime Minister. On April 13, as recorded at page 12761 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister said it was confirmed by the RCMP that they are not recommending that any charges be laid against any minister. Since the questions of propriety and the Pearson code are the responsibility of the Prime Minister and not the RCMP, would the Prime Minister tell the House what kind of investigation, if any, he has undertaken into questions of impropriety by ministers, but perhaps more important, by ministerial aides, which have been raised by the Sky Shops affair, and would he advise the House the full results of these inquiries which have been made by him, if he has made them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the results of the inquiries I made, particularly with regard to the Sky Shops affair, I have reported to the House on previous occasions.

As regards the conduct of ministerial aides in general, I always make it a point, when I am appointing a new minister, to remind him of the responsibility he has to choose the best aides possible, to make sure that they stay

within the limits of their authority, that they do not use the minister's name in vain and that if he has any cause to suspect misconduct, he should get rid of the aide involved. I am not sure if I did in every case, but I have circulated copies of Mr. Pearson's guidelines of 1963 or 1964 regarding aides to the ministers.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It is obvious that the Prime Minister is saying that in his judgment the Pearson code does apply to ministerial aides. Given that state of affairs, would the Prime Minister answer the question and tell us whether he will advise the House fully and completely with respect to the conduct of ministerial aides pursuant to the Pearson guidelines in connection with these issues? That is the question which was asked on April 13. We are asking that question again today because we think this is a matter of extreme public importance and that the Prime Minister and his ministers have a duty to this House to answer it fully.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I have answered the question with regard to the possible involvement in the Sky Shops affair of any ministerial aides.

With regard to other aspects I repeat that there are general guidelines or enjoinders which exist. Ministers are always cautioned, and they know well enough to caution themselves, against aides who might use their authority unwisely, but by and large, I think it is fair to say that this government and, presumably, previous governments have been well served by the young men and women who come to work for the government for a period of time to do their share for the common weal.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF SLAUGHTERING CATTLE AFFECTED BY BLUE TONGUE

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister consider abandoning the procedure of slaughtering cattle herds in the south Okanagan with the disease blue tongue, in view of the fact that many more herds with the disease have been found and that slaughtering may not be the best way of proceeding at this time?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this disease has been brought into Canada by imported cattle. We were free of this disease. We want our herds to remain so. Some of these cattle have been shipped from that area as far east as Ontario, and we are checking those herds at the present time. The only nations which are free of this disease follow the procedure of eradication. I have a complete report from the acting director of health of animals, and recently he met the people in this area and outlined our policy to them. We will continue the eradication program until we rid the nation of the disease.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

BLUE TONGUE—SUGGESTED INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR SLAUGHTERED CATTLE

Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture with regard to blue tongue in herds in the southern Okanagan.

Mr. Broadbent: Tory cows.

Mr. Whittaker: In view of the fact that eradication of herds is going ahead—even though blue tongue does not affect the animals—to help some other industries in Canada, would the minister look at the compensation he is giving to ranchers for these animals? The compensation which is being given is market value, and to me this means that it is not costing the government anything. Would the minister consider giving the ranchers proper compensation for these animals?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says this disease does not affect the animals. It certainly does. It causes weak calves to be born, and as far as we are concerned, all the consequences of this disease after it has been in a herd for some time are very questionable. We are considering the compensation. We want to be as fair as possible to these people.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

POSSIBLE CONTINUATION OF BENEFITS FOR PERSONS 65 YEARS OF AGE

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that a recent ruling from the appeal board has established a case of statute law to the effect that a person over 65 years of age who was entitled to unemployment insurance benefits before January 1, 1976 will be able, notwithstanding the new Unemployment Insurance Act, to retain all his rights pursuant to the former legislation, would the minister indicate to the House whether or not people aged 65 or over, whose benefits have been withheld pursuant to the new law on December 31, 1975, will be able henceforth to receive their benefits until they have run out?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is asking me for a legal opinion or a legal interpretation. I am aware of the case to which he refers, and it is being considered. I believe there is an appeal from that decision to a higher authority, and until that appeal is heard I do not think I should made a legal comment.

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION ORDER AGAINST ROSIE DOUGLAS—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DOUGLAS AND QUANG

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I understand that it is the intention of the department to carry out tomorrow a deportation order against one Rosie Douglas—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: How did he get here?

Mr. Brewin: —notwithstanding the fact that, as I understand it, there are proceedings pending, or there may be, before the Supreme Court of Canada, and notwithstanding the fact that if he is deported to the Dominican Republic, his future will be at least as hazardous as that of one Quang, who has been ordered to be deported to Viet Nam but who has not been required to leave the country.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that deportation proceedings relating to Mr. Douglas have been under way for some time. He has appealed to the Immigration Appeal Board, to the federal court, to the Supreme Court, back to the Immigration Appeal Board and the federal court, and he may now again be considering some further appeal to the Supreme Court. I am not sure on what grounds, but our instructions are to proceed with the deportation order. As to the second part of the question, I suggest that the premise of the hon. member's comment, about how he would or would not be treated in the country to which he would be returned, is doubtful.

● (1450)

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister explain the difference between a case like this, involving a man who has been accused and convicted of expounding radical opinions, and that of a man like Quang, who has obviously been involved in large scale criminal activities in his own country?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that a deportation order has been brought against Mr. Quang and that inquiries are under way with the government of South Viet Nam to ascertain if they would accept him on return, and under what conditions. When I have that information, I will decide what is to happen about his deportation.

DEPORTATION ORDER AGAINST ROSIE DOUGLAS—INQUIRY IF CONVICTED OF CRIME IN CANADA

Hon. Martin O'Connell (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration if Mr. Douglas was convicted of a crime committed in Canada?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. The conviction was upheld on appeal to the Superior Court.

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTION INCREASED FERRY RATES NOT BE PASSED ON TO SHIPPERS

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. As the minister's department has granted ferry rate increases of up to 38 per cent and 52 per cent with regard to goods shipped by rail and ferry to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, will he assure the country that the increase will not be passed on to shippers in Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the increases would be on the rates in the ordinary way, and would be borne accordingly.

INCREASED FERRY RATES—CONSULTATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the two provinces to be affected by the proposed ferry rate increase already suffer from high unemployment and extraordinarily high inflation rates, and as the rate increase will exacerbate their situation, is the minister prepared to meet with his counterparts in Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, before this decision is implemented by CN?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we are conscious of the impact of rate increases, especially in this area, and are slow to move on them if they are to take place in areas over which we have jurisdiction. But it is worth observing that the increases are small compared to increases in costs—

Mr. Horner: Is 52 per cent small?

Mr. Lang: —which are constantly growing at a rapid rate, and represent a significant investment by the people of Canada in the development of these areas.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

REASON FOR FAILURE TO TABLE FARRIS REPORT

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Acting Solicitor General. In view of the latest hostage taking at B.C. penitentiary this past week end, the sixth in 14 months, why has the government still not produced the Farris inquiry report which was completed several months ago?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, charges are pending against persons involved in the hostage taking, although the murder charge has been stayed. The Farris report will not be released, as the Solicitor General earlier advised the House, until those other charges have been disposed of.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REASON FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE NUMBER OF GUARDS

Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At a March 10 meeting with the Commissioner of Penitentiaries, Dragon Cernetic, director of British Columbia penitentiary, stated that he requires 205 security positions to maintain adequate supervision over prisoners. Will the Acting Solicitor General explain why Millhaven has 182 security guards for 280 inmates, whereas B.C. penitentiary has only 168 security guards for over 430 inmates?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to look into the particulars of the facts and provide the hon. member with the information.

* * *

POST OFFICE

CLOSING OF CANTEEN AT CALGARY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. Is the Postmaster General aware that another attempt is being made to close the canteen at the Calgary post office on weekends and the midnight "graveyard" shift, notwithstanding the fact that operations at the plant are on a seven-day, 24-hour schedule and the order issued by the Postmaster General on two previous attempts to deny canteen service to some of the postal workers, to the effect that in the interest of good human relations canteen service will be available to all employees at all times? Will he now reaffirm his earlier decision?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I will investigate to determine if the restaurant is closed and canteen services available. I would be surprised if no food is availabe to employees on the graveyard shift or any other shift.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think, if the Postmaster General will investigate, he will see that the situation is precisely as it was a few months ago. May I ask this supplementary question: does he not agree that the way to heal the malaise in the Post Office Department is by ensuring good industrial relations?

Mr. Mackasey: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, well fed postmen on the midnight shift will do a lot to increase morale. But morale in the post office has never been higher. If it is related to food, they must eat very well these days.

* * *

INDUSTRY

LISTS OF COMPANIES BENEFITING FROM LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR TABLING

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The minister has been somewhat reluctant to reveal the names of the 25 Canadian companies which would get sizeable production benefits from the Lockheed deal. I have before me two lists, one naming the 25 principal companies which will benefit and a second, much longer list, which was made available to me, naming companies which might receive benefits. Some of the names on the latter list include companies like B.C. Aviation Research Council, which makes a marine borer prevention system. These appear as unlikely candidates for work on the LRPA. I would therefore ask the minister to table both lists of companies which are supposed to do work on the LRPA, together with a brief description of the work they will be doing and the approximate cost.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member does not expect me to table something, when I do not know exactly what I am supposed to table. I have not seen the list. I must apologize to certain hon. members, to whom I said earlier that I thought I could make the list available. I am looking into that today, to see if it is possible. I was told that the only reason it is not is that these are speculative lists. They depend on whether companies are successful in the tendering process. If the hon. member would be good enough to let me see the lists, I will be glad to make them as open as we possible can, without jeopardizing the interests of the companies concerned once arrangements for the tendering process are completed.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF LOAN

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I will gladly co-operate with the minister.

My second question is for the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister tell the House three things about the LRPA Lockheed deal now being negotiated? Exactly how much money is being borrowed; how long is the period of the loan; and what kind of security will Canadian banks get for their loan, inasmuch as the government has said categorically that it will not guarantee the loan?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we are now in the final stages of important negotiations between the Lockheed company and Canadian banks and I expect to be able to make an announcement about those discussions fairly soon.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

SUGGESTION REAPPOINTMENT OF CARMEL CARRIÈRE TO APPEAL BOARD BE DELAYED

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In his absence on April 13 I asked the Prime Minister if Miss Carmel Carrière, whose appointment to the Immigration Appeal Board is to end on May 10, 1976, is to be reappoint-

ed. I ask the minister to indicate whether his cabinet colleagues have recommended that Miss Carmel Carrière be reappointed? Further, will the minister consider not reappointing Miss Carrière to the Immigration Appeal Board until the Sky Shops affair has been concluded in court?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will look into the recommendation. On the second point, as I recall, the appointment was to a temporary position. It was to last for a two year term and was for the purpose of cleaning up the appeal backlog. We do not intend to renew these appointments when they terminate.

* * *

POST OFFICE

SALE OF STAMPS TO FOREIGN DISTRIBUTORS AT DISCOUNT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. Is it the practice of the Post Office Department to sell Canadian stamps to foreign distributors for one third less than the face value of the stamps?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I know exactly to what the hon. member alludes. It is a practice engaged in by at least 15 other countries. Rather than opening permanent offices in Europe, we have appointed distributors to sell to the philatelic field. They get a discount, which is below the regular retail value, and then sell the stamps retail. Since they sell to the philatelic world, we take all precautions to make sure these stamps do not find their way back to Canada.

Mr. Ellis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister confirm that the department is selling to United States philatelic dealers who are within 200 or 300 miles of the Canadian border, sometimes at prices much below face value?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member implies that the stamps come back to Canada at a discount. But the discount is not sufficiently large to warrant anybody doing it. We also know what quantities distributors in virtually every country, including the United States, purchase and this can identify those who might attempt to ship stamps back into Canada.

● (1500)

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of momentous privilege to the women of my province. Sixty years ago today, the women of Alberta received the right to vote. I wish to report, Mr. Speaker, that in the most recent elections thay have been exercising that franchise in a manner entirely commendable, completely logical and in accordance with the welfare of my province, a situation which I hope will soon spread to the rest of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ministerial Responsibility

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, during the question period I very briefly raised a point of order. I raise it again now in a little more detail and depth in order to get an answer, guideline, or possibly a ruling from Your Honour with regard to the whole question of ministerial responsibility and, indeed, the right of members of the opposition to question members on the treasury benches with respect to matters within their jurisdiction or, indeed, competence.

There has been a fair amount of circumlocution during the past few days and weeks with regard to the question whether there has been any vetting of contracts or dealings by a particular minister with regard to a particular province or region of Canada. In statements made today by the Prime Minister it came out that there has been input by a minister or group of ministers with regard to matters arising in various provinces. In other words, there has been an admission on the part of the government that at this point in time there is some responsibility attributable to certain ministers for matters arising within their areas. If, in fact, the government has given some responsibility with regard to granting of contracts or leases, and indeed the matter on which we are now questioning the government, the ministers involved in particular areas should be responsible for answering certain questions with regard to that.

If Your Honour in fact finds there is no requirement on the part of ministers to answer questions regarding matters arising within their general areas, or in fact it is not a matter of responsibility or places the legal interpretation that ministers have no right to have input with respect to contracts within a particular province or area, that is one thing. However, there has been no admission on the part of the government or the Prime Minister that this in fact goes against the Financial Administration Act: they say that the practices and procedures are quite within the law.

After admitting that they are vetting contracts and leases within a particular province, ministers should be obliged to answer questions with regard to their involvement and participation in them. If they have this responsibility, they should be required to answer in the House of Commons with regard to all aspects of their activities relating to the granting of contracts. They should not be allowed to hide behind the technical appellation they have with respect to a particular department, but should in fact answer questions regarding any input into the granting of contracts. I give as an example the fact that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce did answer questions with respect to the involvement of his staff relating to matters over which he does not now have jurisdiction.

I submit to Your Honour, with the greatest deference, that it should not only be a ruling of the Chair but a right of opposition members to have every opportunity to investigate these matters, whether they be technically within the responsibility of a particular department, if—as it is now acknowledged—there is some method within cabinet for input by ministers for particular areas. I ask Your Honour to take this matter under consideration and in future question periods to allow us to direct questions to leaders within a particular province, as there is apparently an admission that they do in fact vet all contracts that come within their province.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fairly obvious that there is a long-standing tradition in this place—and there are very good reasons for it—that a responsible minister answers in relation to matters having to do with his department and matters coming within his purview when matters cross several departments; and, of course, questions are from time to time put to the Prime Minister. It is perfectly obvious that members opposite may have questions of interest having to do with political matters or matters outside the purview of a minister's department or the government's operations as a government, but this House is not the place for those questions to be put. In fact, the rules of this House prohibit it.

There is, in each case to which the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar refers, where any matter of government business takes place, a minister responsible for that business, and—certainly in this government—he stands in his place ready to take responsibility for what is done within his department, to answer for it and to answer for the procedures in relation to it.

There are, of course, many submissions from members of parliament inside the House and citizens outside the House in relation to matters of government business. Indeed, conscientious members of the opposition from time to time write to ministers asking that careful consideration be given to a particular case or cause of a constituent, district or city. Clearly, that does not shift any responsibility from the member of the opposition but, rather, leaves responsibility on the government and the minister in relation to his department for the thing that is done, if it is done, and the way in which it is done. That supports the long-standing rule with regard to questions to ministers relating to their departments and the exception to it made in relation to the Prime Minister because of his broad, over-all government responsibility.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the acting government House leader referred to the opposition and our request for answers to certain questions. Indeed, the acting government House leader, the Minister of Transport, put the classic case within the rules of this House with regard to questions about ministerial responsibility as established by the government.

The questions that we are now asking have been responsibly and fully dealth by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. They relate to a direct assignment of responsibility by the Prime Minister, the leader of the government, to particular ministers. One concerns the Minister of the Environment, at the time the minister of regional economic expansion, whose mandate from the leader of his party and the government went far beyond the operations of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. By the admission of the Prime Minister today—and it will be seen in public print tomorrow—the minister was involved in vetting things that had absolutely nothing to do with regional economic expansion. That was not by accident, but by design, because he was an acknowledged leader in a particular province. Surely it would be improper, and would indeed fetter the ordinary operations of the opposition, if the Chair allowed the government to hide behind the classic definition that was just put by the Minister of Transport, as it has no application to this particular type of case. That is the point of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar.

I go one step further. If there is to be any order with respect to leasing, rentals or anything else involving government expenditure, something must govern—and surely that is the Financial Administration Act. If there is to be a case made for ministerial propriety, surely questions can be directed to the President of the Treasury Board with regard to financial administration. In fact, we should not be left there; we should not be stepped from asking questions of a minister whom we feel is carrying out responsibilities, as admitted by the Prime Minister, beyond the power of the ministry under the Financial Administration Act. Surely we cannot be fettered in that respect. That is the point made by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, one which is important from the point of view of the opposition and its rights to ask questions and the responsibility, at least politically, of the government to answer them.

● (1510)

It is such an important question that I ask you, Mr. Speaker, not to make a judgment today but to consider the matter in light of what has been said on both sides and decide later whether it would be proper to fetter the opposition in this way.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I want to support the position taken by the Minister of Transport, the acting House leader, and to indicate, by using one or two examples, that his view is perfectly correct. The minister responsible for a department or for a particular appointment must, in the end, answer for it. I am answerable for appointments, for instance, when I name a particular person to the Senate from a province which is not my own province. I would, however, ask the advice of the senior member from that province.

When I appointed the former Conservative leader from Nova Scotia to the Senate a few months ago, I did discuss the matter with the Secretary of State for External Affairs who knows that province well and was in a position to confirm the respectability and qualifications of that particular person. When I named the former Conservative member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin), to the Senate, I discussed the matter with the present Minister of the Environment because that is a province which he, also, knows well. But the responsibility of appointments to the Senate is mine, just as the opposition has been making it clear that I was responsible for appointing Senator Giguère. If they have questions to ask, they can direct them to me. But the convenience of consulting a minister who represents a particular province, whether the matter concerns the appointment of a senator or of a lieutenant-governor, of finding a qualified lawyer or an engineer able to do a job, cannot be underestimated since these are things a prime minister does not know because he cannot know the whole country.

It frequently happens that a minister responsible for a particular department is not acquainted with the firms which operate in another part of the country. I repeat, by way of example, that the responsibility is taken by the responsible minister and he is answerable to the House with respect to his political judgment. As the President of

the Treasury Board said, we are politicians; we have to make political judgments; we are answerable to the people for those judgments, and we are answerable to this House. If the opposition were to ask us, as they did ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, about Carmel Carrière, we would accept responsibility—and if the people do not like our answers, they know what to do at the next election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad I have at least the theoretical support of the opposition, because by their applause they are indicating that this is the correct procedure; that we should be responsible, and not someone else.

Mr. Speaker: Since it does not appear that other hon. members wish to contribute to the discussion of this interesting point of order, let me say I am prepared to take it under consideration, but I must exercise some caution. I am sure members of the opposition who have indicated their desire that I extend the parameters of the question period to permit the kind of question asked by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar earlier today are not seriously suggesting that reconsideration should be given in terms of the full range of political responsibility which is generally accepted as falling upon members in the geographical sense.

I think the political responsibility involved there is well known. It has never been extended to the ambit of the question period, and that is not what is being requested from me. Nevertheless, I am prepared to look at this particular matter, in view of the circumstances, and give a definitive answer tomorrow.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. During the question period, when the Minister of the Environment was answering questions put to him by the hon. member for Joliette concerning recommendations with respect to a contract, or certain contracts, inside the province of Quebec, the Minister of the Environment said he had received recommendations regarding this matter from all members in all parties: at least, that is what I heard him say. I suggest this casts a rather wide net. The inference was that there were recommendations which went beyond the rules of propriety from all members of all parties. If that is what he said, I think the Minister of the Environment should table those recommendations or at least table a list of those who made them to him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I would like to make very clear if I did not do so in the interview that I gave. I want the House to understand that there is no interference in the granting of contracts for which there is a call for tenders. The decision is based on the merits of the tenders. Even in the case of CARA which was the low bidder, this company got the Mirabel franchise instead of someone else.

When it is a matter of a recommendation where the government has some discretion, then representations come from everywhere. For instance, they can come from the New Democratic Party, from the Senate or from a judge, and there is nothing shocking about this. Everyone is aware of it, including the provincial governments and the opposition. Moreover, it is useless to create an atmosphere of scandal when we are simply following regular procedure.

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister—as is not infrequently the case—has added further confusion to the confusion which arose from his earlier statement. I believe he has an obligation to make a distinction between the kind of requests that he gets. In answer to questions on the orders of the day, he said, or implied, that members of the House of Commons made requests on behalf of their constituents or on behalf of other groups or persons in Canada. Such requests are, within one category, entirely appropriate; they form part of what we were elected to do.

What the minister failed to do when he spoke in a general way about requests was to distinguish those requests from requests which violate government guidelines or the laws of Canada. Such a distinction is important. If the minister has had requests made to him by any member of any party asking that a course of action be taken which violates treasury procedures or the laws of Canada, he has a duty to make available a list of such requests.

● (1520)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). We should establish a distinction. For my part, I am not at all shocked when I receive requests from any source. Of course, the problem is as follows; when the request is for something illegal and unethical, I agree that it must be turned down; if undue influence is used, it should be criticized publicly. If the official opposition wants to blame us for such action, let them come right out and say so instead of making only general suggestions and creating an atmosphere of corruption where there is none.

If there has been, let them say where. As concerns the Sky Shops affair, I have cooperated entirely with the RCMP. I have given them all the information that they asked. I have given them everything that they wanted and they know this, including very personal documents. I have cooperated with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police because I knew that everything that I did was legal. I did nothing wrong in the Sky Shops affair.

The other matters are before the courts, and this is where they should be. If there are some irregularities, the judge will say so, and then we shall know where we stand.

Order Paper Questions

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

TWENTY-EIGHTH REPORT OF CLERK OF PETITIONS RESPECTING PETITION PRESENTED BY MR. EPP

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the table the twenty-eighth report of the Clerk of Petitions stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) and finds it meets the requirements of the Standing Order as to form.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[*Translation*]

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,912, 3,969, 4,112, 4,120, 4,304 to 4,308 incl., 4,589, 4,593, 4,618, 4,774, 4,928, 4,930, 4,944, 4,953, 4,962, 4,964, 4,996, 5,019, 5,027, 5,055 to 5,064 incl., 5,100 and 5,136.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMME

Question No. 3,912—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What are the 18 projects which were provided with financial assistance under the Community Legal Services Programme?

2. Have all provincial governments been notified of the broadening of the programme to permit funding of research projects, etc.?

3. What are the names of all persons who have applied for new funding?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): 1. The projects receiving contributions under the 1975-76 Community Legal Services Programme are identified on the following list. (Marked "A")

2. Details relating to the broadened mandate of the Community Legal Services Programme were included in the programme press release and application forms. Copies of these forms were forwarded to the offices of the Provincial Attorneys General as well as to other provincial government agencies.

3. As of January 30, 1976, the organizations that have applied for funding under this programme for the fiscal year 1976-77 are shown on the following list. (Marked "B")

"A"—Matsqui Sumas, Abbotsford Community Legal Services, Abbotsford, British Columbia; British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, Vancouver, British Columbia; Vancouver Community Legal Assistance Society, Vancouver, British Columbia; Saskatoon Legal Assistance Clinic Society, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Manitoba Law Students' Legal Aid, Faculty of Law, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Correctional Law and Legal Assistance Project, Faculty of Law, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario; Queen's Law Students' Legal Aid Society, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario; Legal Assistance of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario; People and Law, Toronto, Ontario; University of Toronto Students' Legal Aid Society, Toronto, Ontario; Injured Workmen's Consultants, Toronto, Ontario; Problem Central, Toronto, Ontario; Neighbourhood Legal Services, Toronto, Ontario; Association Coopérative d'Économie Familiale, Hull, Quebec; L'Association pour la défense des droits sociaux du Québec métropolitain, Québec, Quebec; Centre Communautaire Juridique de Montréal, (Immigration Legal Services Project), Montreal, Quebec; Les Services Juridiques Populaires de Sherbrooke, Inc., Sherbrooke, Quebec; Penitentiary Legal Services Association, Sackville, New Brunswick; Dalhousie Legal Aid Service, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Maliiganik Tukisiiniakvik, Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.

"B"—The University of B.C. Legal Clinic, Vancouver, British Columbia; Lower Mainland Unemployed Citizen's Welfare Improvement, Vancouver, British Columbia; Vancouver Community Legal Assistance Society, Vancouver, British Columbia; Matsqui, Abbotsford Community Services, Vancouver, British Columbia; The University Legal Aid Centre, University of Manitoba, Faculty of Law, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation, Toronto, Ontario; Les Services Juridiques Populaires de Sherbrooke, Inc., Sherbrooke, Quebec; Association Coopérative d'Économie Familiale, Hull, Quebec; La Clinique Juridique Populaire de Hull Inc., Hull, Quebec; Centre de Communication & d'Information Mobile, Bathurst, New Brunswick; Penitentiary Legal Services, Sackville, New Brunswick.

REPAYMENT FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY FLOODING IN QUEBEC

Question No. 3,969—**Mr. Lefebvre:**

1. Since the 1974 spring flooding, what was the total amount claimed as compensation in (a) the Province of Quebec, (b) the Constituency of Pontiac, (c) each municipality in the Constituency of Pontiac?

2. Of the total amount claimed in the Constituency of Pontiac, what was the amount of money and how many claims were accepted for compensation purposes under the federal-provincial agreement for (a) individuals, (b) provincial government, (c) provincial government agencies, (d) municipal governments, (e) school boards, (f) business and manufacturing establishments, (g) any other group?

3. Of the total amount accepted for payment (a) in the Province of Quebec, (b) in the Constituency of Pontiac, what amount will be provided by the (i) government, (ii) provincial government?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): 1. The federal government has offered to share the cost of assistance provided by the Province of Quebec to victims of the 1974 flood. The offer of assistance was in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Federal Disaster Assistance Program, under which the province is reimbursed for a certain portion of the costs incurred as prescribed by formula. Following completion of its flood damage assistance program the province requested that a sample audit be conducted pending submission of its claim for final settlement of account. The sample audit which was conducted by the federal auditors identified several problems and the province has chosen to have these clarified before rendering its final account. As soon as these problems are resolved and the claim from the province has

been received, the audit will be completed and the payment made.

2. See above.

3. See above.

MINT CANADIAN POSTAGE STAMPS

Question No. 4,112—**Mr. Gillies:**

Does the Post Office Department sell mint Canadian postage stamps to philatelic distributors in the United States at a price less than the face value of the stamps and, if so, what is the annual value of sales?

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): No. Sales of mint Canadian postage stamps by the Canada Post Office of its agents, to philatelic distributors or other purchasers, are not made at a price less than face value.

BARRIER NURSING TECHNIQUES

Question No. 4,120—**Mr. Robinson:**

Are there nurses in Canada trained in "barrier nursing" techniques and, if so, how many?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The training received by all graduate nurses includes understanding of isolation techniques in providing care for patients with communicable diseases. There exists a stand-by pool of approximately 80 nurses who have undergone specialized training in barrier nursing techniques related to medical flight evacuation operations.

CORRECTIONAL CONSULTATION CENTRE ACTIVITIES—PRAIRIE REGION

Question No. 4,304—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Are activities being carried out by the Solicitor General Correctional Consultation Centre in the Prairie region and, if so (a) what are they, (b) on what specific projects, (c) who are the individuals involved, (d) what is the cost of each project?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Yes. See following statement for details.

Prairie Region

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Rehabilitation Services for Natives	A project to continue the development of services to assist in the rehabilitation of Native ex-inmates, in particular, those in rural communities and reserves	Native Clan Organization of Manitoba	$ 75,000
Indian Community Corrections Workers Project	A project to establish a core of Indian Probation Officers, as recommended following a study of correctional services in Saskatchewan	Department of Social Services, Province of Saskatchewan	$368,179
Human Justice Services Program	To assist the University's School of Social Work develop, with the Saskatchewan Criminology and Corrections Association, a program of university studies in the area of human justice services, known in other areas as "applied criminology"	University of Regina, Province of Saskatchewan	$132,566
Pilot Alberta Restitution Centre	The establishment of a restitution centre to determine the efficacy of the diversion process in comparison to current practice for non-violent, personal property offenders under $500	Department of the Solicitor General, Province of Alberta	$ 35,376

CORRECTIONAL CONSULTATION CENTRE ACTIVITIES—ATLANTIC REGION

Question No. 4,305—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Are activities being carried out by the Solicitor General Correctional Consultation Centre in the Maritime region and, if so (a) what are they, (b) on what specific projects, (c) who are the individuals involved, (d) what is the cost of each project?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Yes. See following statement for details.

Atlantic Region

(1)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Alternative to Charging Young Persons	Project to assess the value of providing alternative services, rather than court action, to young persons charged under the Juvenile Delinquents Act	Department of Social Services, Province of Nova Scotia	$ 42,000
Manpower Training and Development Study	Study to evaluate the present and future needs of correctional agencies in Atlantic Canada for para-professional correctional workers; to evaluate the need for improving existing skills; and design appropriate training program with a model for its evaluation	College of Cape Breton, Sydney, Nova Scotia	$ 10,000
Rehabilitation and Prevention Services for Juveniles	A community-developed demonstration project involving a specially-trained constable, released from regular duties, to work with juveniles	Town of Glace Bay, Nova Scotia	$ 39,100
Atlantic Region Staff Training and Development Program	To contribute to the development of a staff training and development program for corrections in Atlantic Canada over a three-year period	Department of Justice, Province of New Brunswick	$240,720
Information Communication Project in Criminal Justice	A project to assess and determine the attitudes of the public, and those persons working in corrections, towards criminal justice services in the Province of Nova Scotia	Department of the Attorney General, Nova Scotia	$306,300

Order Paper Questions

CORRECTIONAL CONSULTATION CENTRE ACTIVITIES—QUEBEC REGION

Question No. 4,306—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

Are activities being carried out by the Solicitor General Correctional Consultation Centre in the Quebec region and, if so (a) what are they, (b) on what specific projects, (c) who are the individuals involved, (d) what is the cost of each project?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Yes. See following statement for details.

Quebec Region

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
West Island Juvenile Diversion Project	A diversionary project involving delinquent youths centered around training in riding, mechanics and safety of mini-bikes which had been contributed by Honda Corporation	Montreal West-Island Y.M.C.A.	$19,709
Casework Program	A Casework Program aimed at the prevention of juvenile delinquency and rehabilitation of youthful offenders	Sun Youth Organization, Inc., Montreal, Quebec	$74,237
Project 80	A crime prevention project, in Montreal Centre-Sud, aimed at children aged 3 to 15	Recreation Project 80 Inc., Montreal, Quebec	$10,000

CORRECTIONAL CONSULTATION CENTRE ACTIVITIES—ONTARIO REGION

Question No. 4,307—Mr. Hnatyshyn:

Are activities being carried out by the Solicitor General Correctional Consultation Centre in the Ontario region and, if so (a) what are they, (b) on what specific projects, (c) who are the individuals involved, (d) what is the cost of each project?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Yes. See following statement for details.

Ontario Region

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Information Centre on Volunteers in Corrections	To gather complete information on all volunteer programs in the Province of Ontario for the purpose of being an information resource centre on volunteers in corrections for Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governements and providing advice to new volunteer groups establishing programs	John Augustus Society, Toronto, Ontario	$ 6,000
Rehabilitation & Training Program for Group-Home Children & Parents	A project to provide a model rehabilitation program for group-home children and parents; provide resources to develop social and academic achievements; and provide resources to train group-home parents in techniques of modifying behaviour	Dr. C. H. Pierce (In trust)	$ 9,000
Volunteer Adult Probation Services	The development and operation of a demonstration project of volunteers in adult probation services in Ottawa	J. J. Kiessling (In trust)	$ 22,100
Policing a Peaceful Community: A Model for Human Resource Development in the Burlington Police Department	Pilot project in police development involving the Burlington Police Department to examine policing entire system	Foundation for Human Development	$ 19,800
Attendance Centre Program	The development of an "Attendance Centre" for the purpose of providing a Juvenile and Family Court Judge with an alternative to sentencing a person to a training school or treatment home while, at the same time, keeping the young offender in the community	John Howard Society, Hamilton, Ontario	$ 55,500
Family Crisis Intervention Project	To conduct a research study into the needs of the London Police Department in meeting the problems of family crisis intervention, and developing an operation training model once the needs are identified	Research Office of the University of Western Ontario, in co-operation with the London Police Department	$140,000
The Frontenac Diversion Program	A three-year demonstration project to divert juvenile from the Criminal Justice system by way of: (a) a "Juvenile Court Committee" which is a body of community representatives which acts as a screening mechanism by which many juvenile offenders are handled outside Juvenile Court, and (b) a "Restitution Project" which involves the informal negotiation of restitution agreements between juvenile offenders and their victims and thus provides a dispositional alternative at the police intake, and court stages of the juvenile justice system	Judge G. M. Thomson, Provincial Court (Family Division), Kingston, Ontario	$ 37,500
A Youth Crime Prevention Program	A five-year crime prevention and diversion program involving volunteers in the Downsview Weston Action Community of Metropolitan Toronto	Downsview Weston Action Youth Committee, Toronto, Ontario	$103,102

[Mr. Allmand.]

CORRECTIONAL CONSULTATION CENTRE ACTIVITIES—PACIFIC REGION

Question No. 4,308—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

Are activities being carried out by the Solicitor General Correctional Consultation Centre in the Pacific region and, if so (a) what are they, (b) on what specific projects, (c) who are the individuals involved, (d) what is the cost of each project?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Yes. See following statement for details.

Pacific Region

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Community Diversion Centre, Victoria	To contribute to the developmental costs of a Community Diversion Centre, Vicotria, through which persons can be diverted from the Prison system by way of their being referred to community agencies for rehabilitation	Community Diversion Centre	$60,090

CFDC FILMS SHOWN ON CBC NETWORKS

Question No. 4,589—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Have any feature length films produced with financial assistance from the Canadian Film Development Corporation been shown on (a) CBC network, (b) local CBC stations and, if so, what was the number and percentage of such feature films shown on (i) CBC network (ii) CBLT (iii) CBUT (iv) CBCT?

2. For each year 1972 to date, what percentage of all feature length films shown on (a) CBC network, (b) CBLT, (c) CBUT, (d) CBCT were (i) produced with financial assistance from CFDC (ii) Canadian films?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. (a) Yes. (b) No. (i) French television network: 37 showings of 26 films from 1972 to date. English television network: 8 films have been shown, two of them more than once, from 1972 to date. (ii), (iii), (iv) So far, Canadian-produced feature films have only been scheduled for network release.

2. (a) Records are not maintained in such a way as to permit a calculation of the percentage of CFDC-supported feature films of all feature length films shown on CBC networks. (b), (c) and (d) See answer to 1 (ii) above.

CBC—ADVERTISEMENT IN WINNIPEG "FREE PRESS"

Question No. 4,593—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. With reference to CBC advertisement in the Winnipeg *Free Press*, February 24, 1976, was this placed in the paper in the French language only and, if so, for what reason?

2. What are the language criteria used when placing advertisements in Canadian newspapers?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes. The advertisement was placed in French only through an unintentional mistake.

2. Normal practice in the CBC's Prairie Region is to place advertisements in French in the French-language press and in English in the English-language press.

CBC—HOCKEY GAMES TELEVISED

Question No. 4,618—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. Are Montreal Canadians' away-games televised by CBC in the Province of Quebec and, if so, for what reason?

2. Are Vancouver Canucks' away-games televised by CBC in the Province of British Columbia and, if not, for what reason?

3. Did CBC televise the Buffalo-Montreal Canadians game on March 6, 1976 for British Columbia viewers but not televise the Vancouver-Kansas City game played in Kansas on the same date and, if so, for what reason?

4. Does CBC promote games in the World Hockey Association which has more Canadian teams than the National Hockey League and, if not, for what reason?

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Not on a regular basis by the English network, although playoff games are carried. Montreal Canadien's away-games are sometimes carried in Quebec by the CBC's French network, which now has two evenings a week of hockey instead of the English network's one. However, next season, when the French network's coverage of hockey on Wednesday evenings is expected to end, Canadiens' away-games will not be carried by the French network, unless they are played against another Canadian team.

2. Not in regular season when the away-games in the United States, but playoff games are carried. The English network carries hockey on Saturday evenings only, when there is at least one Canadian team playing at home. The home game is the one carried on the national network.

3. Yes. As stated in part 2, games invloving one or more Canadian teams playing at home are carried rather than games outside the country. The Buffalo-Montreal game was played in Montreal.

4. No. CBC does not have a contract to carry World Hockey Association games, rights to some of which are

held by Global TV (for the Toronto Toros) and TVA (for the Quebec Nordiques). The CBC carries National Hockey League games and, as noted in parts 2 and 3, the Saturday evening schedule emphasizes at-home games of Canadian teams. The CBC does not feel it can add a second evening of hockey to the English network in view of its other national, regional and local programming responsibilities.

RCMP—DISMISSALS

Question No. 4,774—**Mr. MacKay:**

How many (a) NCOs, (b) officers have been dismissed from the RCMP during the past ten years and, in each case, under which section or regulation of the RCMP Act?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): (a) 38, Regulation 173; 19, Regulation 177. (b) 1, Regulation 173; Nil, Regulation 177.

FISHING OPERATION LOAN PROGRAMME—LOANS GRANTED TO QUEBEC FISHERMEN AND FIRMS

Question No. 4,928—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since the inception of the Fishing Operation Loan Programme, what has been the total amount of loans granted to Quebec fishermen and fishing firms?

2. In each case, what was the (a) purpose of the loan, (b) region concerned, (c) average annual interest rate, (d) number of loans granted, (e) name of the lending institutions?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As of December 31, 1975. 1. $162,796.

2. (a) and (e) This information is not available. (b) Regional statistics within provinces are not maintained. (c) 1955, 30/06/68, 5.00 per cent; 1/07/68, 31/03/69, 7.50 per cent; 1/04/69, 30/09/69, 7.75 per cent; 1/10/69, 31/03/70, 8.50 per cent; 1/04/70, 30/09/70, 8.50 per cent; 1/10/70, 31/03/71, 8.00 per cent; 1/04/71, 30/09/71, 7.00 per cent; 1/10/71, 31/03/72, 6.75 per cent; 1/04/72, 30/06/73, 6.25 per cent; 1/07/73, 31/03/74, 8.25 per cent; 1/04/74, 30/09/74, 9.75 per cent; 1/10/74, 31/03/75, 10.00 per cent; 1/04/75, 30/09/75, 8.00 per cent; 1/10/75, 31/03/76, 8.75 per cent. (d) 129.

NEW HORIZONS PROGRAMME—CONSTITUENCY OF TÉMISCAMINGUE

Question No. 4,930—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since the inception of the New Horizons Programme, were any subsidies granted in the Constituency of Témiscamingue and, if so, in what amount?

2. In each case, what was the (a) name of the subsidy, (b) amount, (c) year of approval, (d) number of jobs generated, (e) municipality involved?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Since 1972, grants totalling $128,688 were made to senior citizens groups in the Constituency of Témiscamingue under the New Horizons Programme. (a), (b), (c), (e) 1972-1973, Club de l'Âge d'Or, Ville Marie, $4,165; Total: $4,165. 1973-1974, Un groupe de citoyens de Beaudry, Beaudry, $8,431; Centre des loisirs de l'Âge d'Or Inc., Rouyn, $16,388; Club de l'Âge d'Or, Latulipe, $7,330; Club de l'Âge d'Or, St-Eugène-de-Guigues, $5,388; Âge d'Or, Notre-Dame-du-Nord, $1,025; Total: $38,562. 1974-1975, Le Club de Rémy d'Or, Rémigny, $4,915; Le Club de l'Âge d'Or, Fugèreville, $5,375; Les Amis de l'Âge d'Or de Béarn Enrg., Béarn, $7,293; Les pensionnaires et locataires de la Maison Pie XII, Rouyn, $1,503; Âge d'Or «Club de la Gaieté», Fabre, $4,800; Club de l'Âge d'Or de Noranda, Noranda, $4,387; Club de l'Amitié de l'Âge d'Or de Laforce, Laforce, $6,260; Club d'Âge d'Or, Moffet, $2,600; Club l'Âge d'Or, Angliers, $2,200; Club d'Âge d'Or St-Isidore, Laverlochère, $4,800; Club d'Âge d'Or de Ville-Marie, Ville-Marie, $3,265; Club de l'Âge d'Or de Lorrainville, Lorrainville, $4,400; Foyer St-Raphaël de Rouyn, Rouyn, $1,080; Club de l'Âge d'Or de Nédelec, Nédelec. $5,330; Total: $58,208. 1975-76, Golden Age Club, Témiscamingue, $1,720; Club de l'Âge d'Or de Guigues, Guigues, $3,000; Club de l'Espérance de l'Âge d'Or, Rouyn, $2,925; Les Anciens Défricheurs, Noranda, $3,360; Villa Mon Repos, Belleterre, $2,520; Le Club de l'Âge d'Or, Latulipe, $3,800; Club de l'Âge d'Or de Notre-Dame du Nord, Notre-Dame du Nord, $9,428; Total: $26,753. (d) The New Horizons Program was established to enable retired Canadians to participate in activities beneficial to themselves and the community and all participants are volunteers. Furthermore, New Horizons is an activity oriented program and not a job creating program.

DRUG CASES IN COURTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 4,944—**Mr. Reynolds:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,161, regarding drug cases in court in which the Minister of Justice stated that he was "determining the necessary measures required to rectify the problem", has the Minister taken any action since October 16, 1975 and, if so, in what manner?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): A close review of drug cases in the Courts of British Columbia was done prior to the end of 1975. As a result of this study, various steps have been taken in order to improve the prosecution of such cases. Legal supervision of the agents acting for the Attorney General of Canada in British Columbia has been decentralized and is now primarily the responsibility of the Regional Director of the Department of Justice in Vancouver. There exists in British Columbia a substantial back-log of cases of every nature. Discussions have taken place with representatives of the Attorney General of the Province in order to determine the possibility of improving court facilities in Vancouver for a better handling of drug cases. It is clear, however, that the back-log of drug cases in British Columbia is only part of a much larger problem of a back-log of criminal cases, not only in British Columbia but in other provinces as well. In February, the Minister of Justice asked the Law Reform Commission to accelerate its work in relation to pre-trial procedures with a view to reducing the delay in getting criminal cases on to trial. The Commission has agreed to do this and has established a task force consisting of judges, prosecutors and defence counsel to deal with this problem. The provincial attorneys general have all responded favourably and enthusiastically to this initiative and the Commission's proposals will be presented at a meeting of the eleven attorneys general in Vancouver in June. The Minister of Justice has stated that if general agreements can be reached about the changes which should be made, he would be prepared to move quickly with amendments to the Criminal Code.

GRANT TO LAVAL UNDER WINTER CAPITAL FUND PROGRAMME

Question No. 4,953—**Mr. Roy (Laval):**

Has the Department of Finance made a grant to the City of Laval in the Constituencies of Duvernay and Laval under the Winter Capital Fund Programme and, if so, in each case, what was the (a) amount granted, (b) nature of the project?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As of March 24, 1976 the following loans had been made under the Winter Capital Projects Fund for construction projects in the City of Laval.

Nature of Project	Amount Granted
Construction of access roads, bridges, autoroutes, lights on highway 440	$8,294,256
Construction of an overpass at highway 440 and 15	$1,905,848

LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND INDUSTRIAL PLANTS

Question No. 4,962—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. For each of the past five years, what was the total of loans issued by the Canadian banking system for the construction of non-residential buildings and industrial plants in Canada?

2. What was the average term of the loans?

3. What is the average estimated period for accounting the depreciation of the buildings and plants involved?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I have been informed by the Bank of Canada as follows: 1, 2 and 3. Banks are not required to provide information on their lending classifed by the object of the expenditure.

PARTICIPATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN COURSES OFFERED BY THE IMF INSTITUTE

Question No. 4,964—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since 1964, have government officials participated in courses offered by the IMF Institute and, if so, (a) how many, (b) what are their names and positions?

2. Are they presently employed by the government and, if so, in what capacities?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Since 1964, the date the IMF institute was inaugurated, six Canadian government officials have participated in courses offered by the Institute. A seventh is scheduled to start a course this spring. The six former participants, their positions, and the courses they took are (1) Dubuc, André, who was with the Bank of Canada, is now with Hydro Quebec in Montreal. Course: Financial Analysis and Policy. (2) Dunn, Robert A., Operations Officer, Treasurer's Department, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C. 20431. Course: Financial Analysis and Policy. (3) Houle, René, Analyst, Département des relations internationales, Banque du Canada, Ottawa, K1A 0G9. Course: Balance of Payments Methodology. (4) Malouin, Jacques, Financial Officer, French Productions, National Film board, P.O. Box 6100, Station A, Montreal, Québec, H3L 3H5. Course: Financial Analysis and Policy. (5) Robillard, Richard H., Economist, Economic Development Division, Department of Finance, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0G5. Course: Balance of Payments Methodology. (6) Vachon, J. Serge, Conseiller en recherches, Département des études bancaires et financières, Banque du Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0G9. Course: Financial Analysis and Policy. This coming spring, John Motala of Statistics Canada is to participate in the course on Balance of Payments Methodology.

MANPOWER—GENERAL MACHINE AND STEEL WORKS LTD. AND CITY-CENTRE DEVELOPMENT LTD.

Question No. 4,996—**Mr. Howie:**

1. On March 11, 1976, were job openings in the Atlantic Region reported to the local Canada Manpower Centre by (a) General Machine and Steel Works Ltd., Fredericton, N.B., (b) City Centre Development Ltd., Campbellton, N.B. and, if so, how many?

2. Were such positions filled by persons referred to the firm by the local Canada Manpower Centre and, if so, how many?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. (a) and (b) No.

2. Not applicable.

RCMP SUPERANNUATION ACCOUNT

Question No. 5,019—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What was the total amount at credit in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account as at (a) March 31, 1973, (b) March 31, 1974, (c) March 31, 1975?

2. What rate of interest has the government paid for the use of this money during the fiscal years ending on the dates noted above?

3. What amount of interest was credited to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1973, (b) March 31, 1974, (c) March 31, 1975?

4. What was the total amount paid out of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1973, (b) March 31, 1974, (c) March 31, 1975?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. (a) 31-3-73, $269,053,974.73; (b) 31-3-74, $315,731,881.96; (c) 31-3-75, $393,645,391.52.

2. 31-3-73, 5.8969 per cent; 31-3-74, 6.1148 per cent; 31-3-75, 6.4164 per cent.

3. (a) 31-3-73, $9,498,815.49; (b) 31-3-74, $11,649,384.89; (c) 31-3-75, $14,281,057.27.

4. (a) 31-3-73, $2,329,355.53; (b) 31-3-74, $3,107,861.30; (c) 31-3-75, $4,096,312.44.

ARTIFICIALLY CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT FACILITIES FOR GROWING OF VEGETABLES, PLANTS AND FLOWERS

Question No. 5,027—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Has the government participated financially or indicated an interest in any artificially controlled environment facilities for the growing of vegetables, plants or flowers?

2. Are any studies underway or being considered to encourage the development of systems to overcome the economic effects of Canadian winters to facilitate increased Canadian production and to reduce the demand for imports?

Order Paper Questions

3. Have studies been made of the Danish method of plant culture using continuous growth techniques?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No.

2. No.

3. Plant growth systems are monitored on an international basis and no specific Danish method is known.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—QUEBEC

Question No. 5,055—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Quebec by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $27,601 thousands.

2. (a) 53 permanent jobs; (b) $1,449 thousands, for 1975-76.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—ONTARIO

Question No. 5,056—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Ontario by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $1,640 thousands.

2. (a) 15 permanent jobs; (b) $316 thousands, for 1975-76.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 5,057—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Newfoundland by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $7,178 thousands.

2. (a) 18 permanent jobs; (b) $640 thousands, for 1975-76.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 5,058—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of New Brunswick by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $10,388 Thousands.

2. (a) 17 permanent jobs, (b) $599 thousands, for 1975-76.

[Mr. Herbert.]

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 5,059—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Nova Scotia by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $5,682 thousands.

2. (a) 24 permanent jobs; (b) $608 thousands, for 1975-76.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—P.E.I.

Question No. 5,060—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Prince Edward Island by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Nil.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—MANITOBA

Question No. 5,061—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Manitoba by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Nil.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—ALBERTA

Question No. 5,062—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Alberta by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Nil.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 5,063—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of Saskatchewan by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Nil.

CREATION OF NATIONAL PARKS—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 5,064—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. From 1965 to date, how much has been invested in the Province of British Columbia by the government for the creation of national parks?

2. (a) How many permanent jobs have been created for the management and maintenance of such parks, (b) what is the annual cost of such services?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. $8,034 thousand.

2. (a) 20 permanent jobs; (b) $694 thousand, for 1975-76.

BILINGUAL POSITION IN RECENT PSC COMPETITION

Question No. 5,100—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Were there nine applicants for a bilingual position in a recent Public Service Commission competition?

2. Is at least 90 per cent of the work of this position presently in the French language?

3. Was the winner of the competition unilingual English and, if so, was that person sent or will that person be sent on a language training course?

4. Could the language training of the successful candidate last more than six months?

5. (a) Have five persons been placed on an eligibility list for a maximum of six months, (b) are the first and second persons on the list bilingual?

6. Do the Public Service Commission's regulations require the opening and publication of another competition should the winner of the original competition be unable to fill the position after a six month period has passed?

7. What means are employed to ensure that the work to be undertaken by the new employee is satisfactorily executed during the period of the language course?

8. What are the language capabilities of the employee to be used to fill the position for the interim period?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: The Commission is unable to reply to this question due to lack of information as to which competition is being referred to.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Question No. 5,136—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. What is the name and location of each veterans' hospital, either federally or provincially operated?

2. By province and territory, for each hospital, how many veterans (a) have been on the waiting list since March 31, 1975, (b) are presently on the waiting list?

3. What is the average waiting time for veterans to enter each veterans' hospital?

4. What steps are being taken to alleviate or eliminate the waiting time at the veterans' hospitals?

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Camp Hill Hospital, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Queen Mary Veterans Hospital, Montreal, Quebec, Ste. Anne's Hospital, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec, Westminster Hospital, London, Ontario, Deer Lodge Hospital, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Colonel Belcher Hospital, Calgary, Alberta.

2.

Nova Scotia	Camp Hill Hospital
Quebec	Queen Mary Veterans Hospital
Quebec	Ste. Anne's Hospital
Ontario	Westminster Hospital
Manitoba	Deer Lodge Hospital
Alberta	Colonel Belcher Hospital

3.

	Active Care (a) and (b)	Chronic and Domiciliary Care (a)	(b)
Camp Hill Hospital	None	21	30
Queen Mary Veterans Hospital	None	N/A	N/A
Ste. Anne's Hospital	None	76	186
Westminster Hospital	None	None	2
Deer Lodge Hospital	None	50	50
Colonel Belcher Hospital	None	None	None

4. For active treatment there is no difficulty. The other requirements are presently under review.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-88, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House contains, essentially, two matters of interest and importance to the Wheat Board designated area. They are the formal provision of procedures for the election of the Wheat Board advisory committee; secondly, the broadening of the scope of the Canadian Wheat Board to establish separate pools for selected types of grain within an identifiable grade. This will be known to most members as a malting barley pool amendment, though in its words and possibilities it is broader than that.

The first part of the bill having to do with the election of the advisory committee follows an experiment which was very well received by the grain producers. The experiment was to set up an election procedure which allowed the producers within the Wheat Board area to nominate, and then to vote upon and elect, the members who would serve on their behalf on the 11-member Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee. There was a great deal of interest in the election that took place, in terms of the number of candidates and the breadth of experience and interest that the candidates represented, which resulted in electing members who in this way directly represent the producers in particular and identifiable regions. Under the existing law, of course, the election was a forerunner to the appointment by order in council since the law requires the 11-member board to be appointed in this fashion.

We had, of course, indicated that the election would be followed up with such appointment, and that has taken place. Indeed, the new committee has been functioning for a good number of meetings now, and while admittedly having some interesting growing pains as it became established, I think hon. members will agree that it is showing its real value. The Canadian Wheat Board relies on the committee for comment and opinion on matters affecting producers, though not, of course, transferring to it any of the essential responsibility for providing the best marketing expertise that the Wheat Board must exercise on its own. The advisory committee will, I hope play an increasingly important role in advising the Canadian Wheat Board of the views of producers on a multitude of matters and will also increasingly be in a position to report back to producers on matters within the board's responsibility. In this way producers can become informed by their own representatives in addition to the more formal releases or methods of communication adopted by the Wheat Board.

I said that the procedure was generally very well welcomed, and I believe that is also true of its operation. I am sure members will be glad of an opportunity in committee to look at the specific nature of the advisory board and to comment further upon it for its own future development. Certainly for my own part I shall welcome expressions of view from hon. members concerning the direction in which the advisory committee should go and the extent to which the input of producers can be improved. I have always been very concerned to establish as many means of consultation as possible with producers, particularly in regard to matters such as the marketing of their own grain in which they have a prime interest, even though necessarily it falls under the broad umbrella of the legislation of this parliament.

The establishment of a separate pool for malting barley has been discussed by those who have grown barley for quite a number of years. However, for a long time the view was taken by a good number of producer representatives that a pool was undesirable in view of the fact that the selection of specific barley from among all the grades might be seen in itself as somewhat fortuitous and a rather special break for the individual producer who managed to have his grain selected.

As the selection of barley for a purpose such as malting became more important, and as more and more producers attempted to arrange their farm practices to raise a malting barley, putting increasing efforts into the production of barley for specific selection, the pendulum began to swing in the other direction. In the course of the years 1973 and 1974, therefore, we began to receive an increasing number of representations in favour of allowing for the separate pooling of the selected barley within a particular grade, and in due course the Wheat Board and its advisory committee joined in the representations that were made that this was a worth-while thing.

● (1530)

Accordingly, I indicated that I would be willing to put before the House a bill along these lines in the hope that the House would see fit to bring it into law in order for it to be effective in the present crop year. The indication of my willingness to do this came during the course of the last crop year when I indicated to the Canadian Wheat Board it would be desirable for it to keep accounts in such a way that if parliament did, indeed, make this law effective, the barley selected for malting this year could be pooled separately.

Hon. members from the Wheat Board region will be particularly aware of the fact that last year emphasis was placed on the desirability of separate pooling of selected grades of barley for malting purposes. In the last year period a good amount of what otherwise would be No. 1 feed barley was selected for malting purposes. Because the Wheat Board could not, under existing law, segregate the results of the pooling of that selected barley, it was merged with the broad pool for feed barley. While the difference between selected barley when it is selected from other higher grades is perhaps significant enough, it is even more significant in the case of selection from No. 1 feed barley. Quite obviously, as a result those farmers whose barley was selected felt they should have had the benefit of that selection. The argument could rage on, but certainly at this point in time many producer organizations—indeed, I do not know of an exception—have changed their former position in recommending against separate pooling and now endorse the separation of the selected grades.

As hon. members will know, I have been speaking about malting barley, and this is the key selection of grade that we have in mind; but the bill is broader, to give the Canadian Wheat Board and its advisory committee rather additional flexibility from time to time, when other types of grain within a broad grade are selected, to establish separate pools in those cases as well. I do not suggest the judgments will be easy in every case, as it was not over a period of years in this instance. However, it does seem to me it would be better to be in a position to respond quickly on the advice of producer groups, the advisory committee and of the Canadian Wheat Board itself, when a broad grade is being subdivided in practice by selection for a particular purpose, to allow pooling in that situation.

I therefore commend to hon. members this change in the legislation. I would be very glad to go into the reactions and views of the various representative groups throughout the prairie region with hon. members. I know their familiarity with these views will lead them to lending their support to this bill. I certainly welcome that as we see

it moving toward becoming law. In closing, I emphasize the importance of moving it forward since the crop year is moving along and it would be useful to add certainty to the proposition which I have put forward, that it would be desirable to have this law applied to the crop year now in progress, that is to say, the one which commenced last August 1 and which ends next July 31.

Notice of the intention to present the bill was given to the public well in advance of that time and I believe, therefore, that hon. members can move forward with happy hearts so that selected barley in this year can indeed be segregated in the pool, the Wheat Board having kept the appropriate accounts for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore take great pleasure in moving the second reading of this bill and its reference to the committee.

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, the minister quite rightly pointed out that the experiment of an elected Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee has worked out well. I wish that committee the best in years to come. Bill C-88, as the minister has said, proposes to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to provide for the establishment of separate pools for selected grains, such as malting barley, probably the selected oats going into the rolled oats trade, and we are hopeful it will also include payments for selected high protein grains.

I note that the Palliser Wheat Growers Association has written the minister suggesting that Bill C-88 presently before the House is the proper vehicle under which to sort out high protein grades. The association goes on to state that this would not require special binning at the country elevator level, but that the protein level could be determined as it is by our American friends. The association further states that the Canadian Wheat Board has received some 34 cents a bushel premium for 13.5 per cent protein wheat, compared with 11.5 per cent. It suggests it would seem only fair that farmers growing the higher protein should be compensated, thereby promoting this incentive. The association goes on to say that this would lead to better land utilization by producers in consistently low protein areas, improving their performance by growing higher yield varieties. The association ends its letter by stating:

> Due to the frustrations from delays, the producers are ready for some action.

I hope we can look forward to protein being included under this bill. The bill also provides a permanent basis for the election of prairie grain producers to the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee. Under the amendment, the board will exercise direction and supervision over the administrative process in all future elections to this advisory committee. The governor in council, however, will enact all rules and regulations, which means the minister will in fact have complete control. This will probably give producers some cause to ponder.

Mention could be made of the present snarl-up in the western grain stabilization plan whereby every producer now delivering must have the 2 per cent deduction applied, whether he wants to come into the plan or not, because the excluding stickers for their permit books are not yet available. This has caused the farmers in my area to become even more skeptical of this plan, especially now that they find the government's contribution to the plan will only be a bookkeeping entry and the money will probably be used elsewhere. This money could, of course, be used to promote the metrication of our grain industry. This is incomprehensible to producers in southern Saskatchewan. We have had no estimate of the cost of this metrication plan, but we note United States publications claiming an estimate ranging from $40 million to $100 million for the switch in that great country. If we take one-tenth of that, we end up with something between $4 million and $10 million.

It is all right for the government to be promoting this program. The bureaucrats may well say, "Let the costs fall where they may." They are not in the business, of course, and do not have to buy new scales, new tools and new labels. It is impossible to understand the claims by metric commission officials that the conversion will increase the export of our grain as our grain is presently sold on the basis of metric tons. The United States has used more common sense in its conversion, which is more gradual and selective. Each move must pass the test of benefit and existing cost. I suggest we could well take a look at this method in our country.

Because of this forced 2 per cent deduction under the grain plan, farmers are properly asking whether the government is trying to force a signing-up. Producers rightly suggest that it is probably much easier to have the amendments made to the plan now than getting the plan established and then trying to have it amended.

The minister indicated there was some skepticism in years gone by about obtaining additional premiums for malting barley because it might appear that this is special treatment for those who produce malting barley. This a very tricky question. The domestic and export malting industries require barley that is relatively plump and uniform in size, true to variety and type, which does not have excessive amounts of physical imperfections.

● (1540)

It is absolutely imperative that uniform germination takes place in the malting process. Barley must be low in moisture content. If it has to be stored for long periods, artificial drying will adversely affect germination. Producers, further, have to use sound methods of threshing and be careful not to peel or break the kernels. The protein content is very important. Low protein content is desirable. Most of these requirements are above and beyond requirements in respect of grade.

I hope this will give some appreciation of the care and technique required by producers to have their barley rated malting. It is interesting that sales in this crop year to date, of some 274,000 bushels of malting barley, have been selected from grain company stocks. I hope there will be some assurance from the minister that the grain companies will not reap the benefits from the malting premium.

In the last full crop year—that is, the 1974-75 crop year—over 18 million bushels of feed barley ended up in the malting houses. When a producer delivers grain to a western country elevator, normally no official grade is placed on the grain. The ticket is simply marked "Graded by agreement". This is the official basis for payment if accepted by the producer. This was the basis for any final

payment by the Canadian Wheat Board. So any barley graded No. 1 feed and eventually ending up in the malthouse generated a final payment to the farmer of about 18 cents a bushel last year, whereas it generated a premium of up to and over $1 a bushel for the Canadian Wheat Board.

The minister is always saying he is held up by some final legal interpretation when it comes to giving the producer the benefit of the doubt. However, there seems to be no such qualms when the shoe is on the other foot. I think of the sorry story of the Temporary Wheat reserves Act payments of several years ago when producers were required to initiate court action in order to get the money from the government that was legally owing to them.

I question the legality of the Canadian Wheat Board proposal to pay to the grain companies some $10 million of the farmers' money in order to encourage the companies to build additional storage at Vancouver. All we know about this is what is reported in the *Western Producer* of April 15 where it is stated that the Canadian Wheat Board proposes to establish three categories. The companies were to receive guaranteed storage payments on 95 per cent of their total licensed capacity, less whatever percentage they reserved for non-board grain.

Those companies which build or increase their terminal elevator facilities by more than 2.5 million bushels will be eligible to receive guaranteed storage payments on all their licensed capacity. As I have said, it appears to me that this will cost western farmers some $10 million. I think the government of Canada could well take a look at this because it has a responsibility to help increase the storage space at the Pacific seaboard.

On top of that, the farmers are now aware of the proposed non-funding by the government under the Western Grain Stabilization Act. This, to them, seems to be consistent with the minister's mode of operation. We had a plea from him this year for more seeded acreage, and at the same time we had an announcement of lower initial grain prices to the western farmer. Our western grain industry was built and developed on policies that were designed to bring the greatest good to the greatest number. We had standard handling tariffs. Now we have variable or flexible tariffs in country elevators.

We had no trucking from country elevators, but now we have it. We had standard grades across the prairies, and now we have protein standards at export and proposed protein granding at country elevators. We used to have the standard Crowsnest Pass freight rates for export grain. Now the minister is bringing forward proposals that the producers feel will make those rates variable. Where we formerly had complete Canadian Wheat Board control, we now have open market feed grains and a general freeing-up.

Grain from the northern and southern parts of the prairies used to be blended at export to give a uniform grade. Now the northern and southern grains are kept separate because of protein standards. Our whole grain transportation system, of course, is in a turmoil. The elevator companies do not know what the future holds. The railways do not know where they will go. Surely the government's transportation policy should be to develop a system to serve the needs of the grain industry, and not vice versa.

[Mr. Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek).]

The net result of the meddling by the minister has brought the western grain industry to the point where it would be impossible to export the volumes of wheat of some 14 years ago. It is interesting to note that up to the present our wheat and Durum exports amount to some 260 million bushels. There are three more months until the end of the crop year. This means we will probably end up, at best, with 400 million bushels of wheat. Government grain statistics show that in the peak year, 1963-64, wheat exports were 594 million bushels. We might compare that with the 400 million bushels we will probably export this year in spite of all the government money poured into our system.

The minister has done this by using the capital accumulated by the discipline of the past. The word I get from the producers is, "Get the government off our backs for a while". By "the government," they mean the minister. No other country has the control of licensed varieties that Canada has. This is certainly necessary if we are to keep promoting our malting barley. It seems to me that we are slipping badly now. Our research scientists are being neglected. Their work on new varieties is being curtailed. Canada is losing its leadership.

Surely it is time for the government to allow producers to set up a check-off system so they can promote their own research and marketing. This could be done, hopefully, under the amendments we are now discussing in Bill C-88. We might look at our competitors in other countries to see what they are doing. We see that in Brazil they are expanding the network of paved roads to 63,000 kilometres. They will be spending $3.5 billion on railways in the period 1974-79. By the end of the decade the Brazilian merchant fleet will reach over 9½ million tons dead weight, with most of the ships having been produced in Brazilian shipyards.

On the other hand, we in Canada have practically no merchant marine. The rural credit programs in Brazil totalled $12 billion, with an average 11.2 per cent nominal interest rate, which in an inflationary economy means a real transfer to the agricultural sector. In our country, the largest grain handling organization, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, states its concern about the limited funds available and the lack of encouragement for young people to become involved in agricultural research and plant breeding. I should like to quote a statement by Mr. Avery Sahl, pool director and Wheat Board advisory committee member. He said:

● (1550)

But during the course of this discussion—and I might say that we had a Dr. Jack Morrison from Research Ottawa in attendance and I've personally had some communication with Dr. Hurd at the research station in Swift Current and some pretty startling realities have come to light as a result of those discussions . . .

For instance, we've only got 30 cereal scientists or plant breeders left in Canada. They have about 29 or 30 back-up people such as chemists, you know, assist them in their efforts but I should also say that these same people, these same 30 plant breeders, really can't devote their total efforts to plant breeding because they're involved in teaching at universities and other administrative work.

He concluded by saying:

Well that's certainly true. During our discussion we learned that the people that are in the plant breeding program are in the general age

group of 50 years of age and we'll be losing these valuable people through normal retirement, you know, before very long.

The director says that the federal government has some responsibility in the area of basic research, as do agricultural producers through the Canadian Wheat Board, farmer-owned co-operatives and marketing agencies. So I say again that provision should be made in this bill for producer check-off as their contribution to the basic research that we need.

We are all aware of the fact that the Canadian National Railways' main line has been out of commission to the Pacific seaboard for some months. It is back in business now. The government has made no move to bypass this bottleneck in the Fraser canyon, which could be done with a simple 40-mile loop. We desperately need more facilities in the Pacific seaboard, and we see no reason why the government cannot act and why it cannot pay interest on the deferred settlements and extend those deferred settlements with interest for the present year or for two or three years.

We heard the minister say that we have to accept the "user pay" proposition and that the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls have to go up. It seems to me that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that the free market system under which the users pay is not working for the general good. We are told that the AT and east rates for export flour and winter grains for the maritimes will be removed. In this particular case there was no prior consultation with the industries. It was an arbitrary decision by the minister playing fast and loose with the industry, I suggest. From 1954 to 1974 world demand for flour increased by 50 per cent. Canada's share of the flour trade declined from 31 per cent to 11 per cent in 1974. The world flour market is fiercely competitive due to the implementation of subsidy programs by many foreign governments. Many markets for our winter exports can only be met by the export of flour to West Africa and the West Indies where there is no milling capacity. The Soviet Union has indicated that Canada is no longer competitive in world flour markets and that further increases in price will require them to look for alternate suppliers.

To return to the matter of the AT and east freight rates, the removal of which will be disastrous for our flour industry, Mr. Sneath, president of the Manitoba pool elevators, had this to say:

We have stated many times that the Seaway provides a service which is in the national interest and should not, therefore, be expected to generate a profit. Approximately one year ago, it was suggested by the Seaway authority to the Hon. Jean Marchand, then minister of transport, that rate increases should be considered. At the same time, a proposal to write off the long-term debt and interest charges, was also suggested. We encourage the latter, and suggest that such a move would increase traffic and, even at present rates, keep the Seaway down in the black.

The Manitoba pool president stated that decisions on this matter should not be made arbitrarily. He said:

As a member of the Great Lakes Waterways Development Association, and as users of the Seaway, we feel strongly that Canadian users should be consulted about the effects of any increase in rates on their operations.

It does not take much studying of the western Canadian grain industry to realize that the minister has handed to Mr. Justice Emmett Hall the impossible task of deciding the fate of our western rail system, primarily because none of the factors in our grain system at present are stable; everything seems to be in a state of flux. I will mention just one factor, namely, the inland terminal concept in western Canada which has everyone wondering.

The minister's treatment of our grain industry can be likened to a building catching fire. It is the combustion of one object which generates the heat required to ignite the next, and unless counter measures are taken the fire spreads farther and farther, becoming more difficult to control, until nothing is left.

When we look at the problems facing our industry, we remember that under the 1974 tariff structure for the country elevators it costs as much to lift the grain 50 feet into the air as it costs the railways to move it 1,000 miles. Other problems are the export grain rates to be changed, rail line abandonment, the metric conversion of the grain industry, the fact that our competitors have long-term deals with our best customers while we have none, more storage at the Pacific seaboard, etc. Perhaps we should consider storage of grain overseas where the customers are. Companies such as Imperial Oil, Standard Oil and Gulf would not keep their oil in the United States. They promote its sale by having it where the customers are. As I have mentioned, we need more research into new varieties of grain.

The minister's actions can be likened to baloney being sliced one thin slice after another. Pretty soon all we will have left is the string, and that is not much good to anyone. Right now grain farmers are about the only Canadian industry not priced out of world markets, and we would like to keep it that way.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my party generally supports this legislation in principle, but we have some comments to make on it. I hope the minister will consider some suggestions that we have to make both at this stage of the debate and in the committee for changes in the legislation. First I should like to comment on the bill in general, and then on two or three specific matters relating to it.

This bill defines the structure of the advisory committee, how its members will be elected, what their duties will be, how they will receive their pay and expenses, and so forth. The previous practice was that advisory committee members were appointed by the minister, usually on the recommendation of major farm organizations. As the minister explained earlier, and as we all know, the situation is now changed so that the producers themselves directly elect members of the advisory committee. The legislation also allows for the establishment of various constituencies for each of the 11 members of the committee and sets out the means for arriving at their pay, the meetings to be held—there will be six in number each year, and I will comment on that later—and who has authority to call a meeting.

One of the disturbing aspects of the situation is that no provision is made, either explicit or implied, for committee members to hold such meetings as may be necessary in order to report back to the permit holders who elected them. Previously there was a six-man advisory committee and the members were nominated by the western co-operatives and the farmers' union. It was not mandatory under

the act that they be selected in this manner but that was the practice followed, and it was possible under those circumstances for the members of the former committee to have a means of reporting back to the producers. All the members of the advisory committee were elected officers of farm organizations which were controlled by the producers. A method of reporting to farmers and bringing forward information respecting producers' opinions to the minister or the administrators of the Wheat Board was established.

● (1600)

The advisory committee members who will be elected under the new procedure may not be attached to farm organizations in an official capacity, and since they are nominated and elected we submit that provision should be made for them to be responsible directly to the producers in all respects. It seems to us that if the new committee is to function effectively, there must be provision for it to have the ability to report back to its constituents in the same way as a member of parliament. There must be provision for members of the committee to hold meetings and contact directly the individual producer or collectively contact producers in the regions they represent in the Wheat Board area.

It should also be possible for farmers in the constituency to initiate meetings if the need should arise and if they wish to meet with a member of the advisory committee. There should also be provision for the advisory committee to have a meeting called upon its own request. Provision should be made whereby the advisory committee, either unanimously or by a quorum of five or six members, could request the board to call a meeting of the committee. It should then be obligatory for the board to do so.

The legislation provides that the board shall call six meetings per year of the advisory committee. What would happen if some matter arose which members of the advisory committee thought was so urgent and important that an extra meeting was required? It seems to us that the advisory committee, through either a majority or a quorum, should be able to request a meeting, and that it should be obligatory on the chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board to call such a meeting. It should not be left just to the board or just to the limitation of the act providing for six meetings per year. If the members of the advisory committee feel there should be three or four meetings more than that during the course of a year, the legislation should allow it to happen. It should not be just at the whim of the minister or the Canadian Wheat Board.

If a majority of the advisory committee members feel that additional meetings are warranted, this bill should make provision for that and the members should be paid their pay and allowances. The committee should not be put in the position of being suspected of being nothing more than a puppet for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board or being at the beck and call of the Canadian Wheat Board. Some degree of autonomy and freedom of action of the advisory committee should be in the legislation. Unless something of this nature is provided for the committee, it will look too much like some sort of pussy cat for the board.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

The bill proposes to amend section 10 of the Canadian Wheat Board Act and it lays out in full detail how the advisory committee shall be elected, how it shall be constituted, and so forth. It is to be constituted by regions, or what I choose to call constituencies, which each advisory board member will represent. The legislation provides that this shall be arrived at by the governor in council. I wonder why this could not be done by the redistribution commissioner who works on the boundaries of federal constituencies for members of parliament. Why cannot this be done by the redistribution commissioner, or at least by the Canadian Wheat Board itself? I ask that because, frankly, I would feel nervous if the decision as to the areas which members of the advisory committee will represent were left in the hands of the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board and his cabinet colleagues. I think I have good reason for that nervousness. I do not see why the governor in council should be the body to have responsibility for determining the boundaries of the constituencies of the members of the advisory committee.

The expenses and allowances paid to members of the advisory committee should be sufficient to allow them to incur what could be considered reasonable costs for travelling about the constituencies they represent, holding meetings and reporting back to their constituents, the grain producers who are the permit holders they represent. It seems to us that this should be a two-way street of communication, not only from the bottom up but from the top down. The advisory committee should be able to report back to those permit holders who are grain producers and tell them how much of their advice is being taken by the Canadian Wheat Board, by the minister or by both of them, and how much of it is being ignored. I submit that the grain producers have a right to know just what effect the advice of the advisory committee will have on the minister and the Canadian Wheat Board.

Having an advisory committee democratically elected by grain producers will be of little use if the grain producers have no way of knowing whether that committee is of any benefit to them, or whether the minister or the Canadian Wheat Board is paying any attention to it. Is this just going to be window-dressing, something which makes it appear as if the Canadian Wheat Board is drawing upon the best possible advice from the grain producers' representatives and using it? This two-way communication should be built into the legislation, which means allowing each member of the advisory committee sufficient expenses in order to report back to the grain producers he represents.

The legislation also provides for the continuing of grain deliveries from an existing crop year into a new crop year. There is nothing new about this. The minister is just making it formally possible in the legislation, but in many previous crop years the Canadian Wheat Board, grain companies, railroads and everyone just turned a blind eye. We always had a saying that July 31 could be a very long day. Quota deliveries for the previous crop year were delivered on the fourth, fifth, tenth and twenty-fourth days of the new crop year, but the storage tickets, or the cash tickets which the elevator agent made out were all dated July 31. This was to allow producers who, through no fault of their own, had been unable to deliver their quotas before the expiration of the crop year, to deliver them so that all

would be fairly treated. I hope that is the intent of the minister in putting this provision into the legislation.

The third change is a proposal to amend the act by bringing in an addition after section 32. Under the provisions of the new legislation, the Board could select certain grades, a minimum of two, and form a separate pool in any crop year. The purpose of this is to permit the setting up of separate pools for malting barleys so that the premiums now paid can be passed directly to the producers. This proposal also provides for the setting up of separate pools for separate classes of wheat such as Durum and winter wheat. We generally support that idea. However, I want to caution the minister and the House that while we support the idea of separate pools in the case of malting barleys and in some instances two or more grades of wheat, I hope the minister and the board will not allow this separate pooling to be carried on to such an extent that one of the major reasons for the existence of the Canadian Wheat Board is rendered useless.

One of the reasons for having a Wheat Board was that returns from the sale of grains would be pooled so that all producers would benefit relatively equally. Another reason was that bad weather or poor export markets would not cause one group of producers in any part of the Wheat Board area to be treated less fairly than those in another part of the Wheat Board area. I wonder whether the allowing of separate pooling for not less than two grades should be made something like not less than three grades. I wonder if this would prevent any narrowing down or pooling just for special areas which, I submit, could then weaken one of the main principles behind having the Wheat Board. The idea of doing this with malting barley is good, although I am concerned about the two-grade limit. That ought to be the minimum limit, otherwise we could destroy the very purpose for the existence of the Canadian Wheat Board.

● (1610)

Something which has happened in connection with malting barley in the last two crop years, and possibly before then, concerns me greatly. I am thinking of producers who have special permits to deliver carload lots of malting barley. Sometimes the Canadian Wheat Board or a grain company will phone a producer with a special permit for a carload lot of malting barley and ask him to deliver, but that producer must haul to another shipping point on another railway line because the railway company has abandoned temporarily the railway line serving him.

That has been the experience of hundreds of producers in the past two crop years. It happened in my own constituency before Christmas. The railway had shut down one line for over a month and announced it would not open it for two more months. Several producers within the area had carload lots which had to be delivered by December 20. But there were no trains. Consequently, the farmers were told to haul the grain an extra 20 or 40 miles one way. The extra trucking cost gobbled up any premium they might have earned from their malting barley. There is not much point establishing a separate pool for malting barley if in hundreds of cases the premium the farmer would earn from delivering a carload lot of malting barley is used to meet extra trucking costs, costs incurred because the rail line is not functioning.

If this is allowed to continue there will not be much in the pool to divide among farmers. It has happened in dozens of instances all over the three prairie provinces. The railways have allowed their railway lines to deteriorate. The rail lines are in a disgraceful condition. Trains have not run over some of them for months on end. Then, when a grain producer receives an order or a special order of the kind I have mentioned, he cannot ship from his own shipping point. Consequently, many Canadian Wheat Board shipping orders are left unfilled and the efficiency of the Canadian Wheat Board, the pool system, the block system, unit trains, etc., is effectively harmed.

In my constituency there is a line which had not carried a train for over three months. The railway had allowed the condition of the line to deteriorate. Many producers served by that line could not fill outstanding Canadian Wheat Board shipping orders. There were a number of carload lots of malting barley and odd carload orders for commodities such as rapeseed which could not be shipped by rail. There were over 200 outstanding regular Wheat Board shipping orders. In other words, five or six trainloads of orders could not be filled because that line was not operating.

The railway company would not run a train over the line in the winter. When the matter was raised with the minister and his officials, they said that winter is not a good time to run trains because there is a lot of snow. I point out that last winter was not a hard winter and the line could have stayed open. Not enough snow fell to block a gopher hole, let alone the railway track. The government used snow as an excuse. That was the reason for not running a train on a line about 120 miles long.

It should be pointed out to the minister, since he was involved with this, that if the ground under the track is in bad condition and if your rails are weak because the ties and rails have been insufficiently maintained, the time to run trains on that track is in winter when the ground is frozen. But no, the CPR had to have its own way. The railway closed the line for three or four months because, allegedly, it was snow-covered. So no trains ran over it in the winter months. But the line was also closed in the spring because the ground was soft. You end up with trains not running on branch lines until May or even mid-June. Sometimes people served by branch lines do not see a train on the line for as long as six months.

The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Hamilton) suggested that an impossible task has been handed to Mr. Justice Hall. That is perfectly true. I do not know why the task was given to him in the first place. The railway companies should not have been allowed to abandon any rail lines. They should have been told that they will not be allowed to abandon any line until the facts are ascertained and Mr. Justice Hall advises or rules that a certain line can be closed. As I say, it should be the commission's task to decide whether, and which, rail lines should be abandoned. The commission will have an awkward task deciding if a rail line should be abandoned as the railway companies can argue that certain rail lines are already abandoned, so to speak, up to four months each year. The railways have allowed lines to deteriorate so much that they can argue, justifiably, that it is economic suicide to repair them, even if the commission decides to keep them open. The costs will seem horrendous to the

railways and to the minister, and the government could well choose to ignore the recommendations of the Hall commission.

We submit that the legislation ought to be broader. Let me repeat something my party has been saying since 1935. Of course we shall argue for improved provisions when the bill is considered in committee. The bill ought to contain provisions which will broaden and strengthen the responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board. All parties in this House support the existence in principle of the Canadian Wheat Board. It is like motherhood; nobody dares oppose the existence of the Canadian Wheat Board. But certain things done have tended to weaken the authority of the board and lessen its importance and strength.

We want the legislation to give the Canadian Wheat Board full jurisdiction over feed grains. The minister may argue that the farmer should be free to decide where to sell, that is, whether to sell on the open market or to the Canadian Wheat Board. To that I say that the farmers have over-whelmingly shown how they choose. Little feed grain is delivered and sold on the open market. That speaks well for the almost unanimous support western grain producers have shown for the Canadian Wheat Board. Their choice answers the contentions of those who want to cling to the outdated and outmoded free market concept in feed grains. I do not see why we should pander to them. We believe that full jurisdiction over feed grains should be returned to the Canadian Wheat Board. This piddling around with small lots of feed grain on the open market is of no benefit to most grain producers of western Canada.

I say that we should broaden and strengthen the responsibilities of the Wheat Board. This bill ought to do something we have advocated since the early 1930s, that is, put all grains under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. This means bringing commodities like flax, rye and rapeseed under the board's jurisdiction so that no significant quantities of grain in Canada are left to the whim of the grain speculators and the so-called open markets of Chicago, Minneapolis, Omaha, Winnipeg, and so on. In short, the Canadian Wheat Board should be the sole agency for dealing with all grains produced by western Canadian farmers. Farm organizations have been urging this for decades, as have certain members of parliament. But the government continues to ignore us. We say that this bill should bring under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board flax, rye and rapeseed. We will continue to fight for that.

● (1620)

In summary, when the bill gets to committee I ask the minister to make provision that whenever a quorum or majority of the advisory committee wants to have meetings in addition to the six provided for in the legislation, it is obligatory on the part of the board to call such meetings. In that way, no one could suggest that the advisory committee is a puppet of the minister for the Canadian Wheat Board. It would have some autonomy, some freedom of action. If circumstances arise where the advisory committee feels a meeting is warranted, the legislation should allow for that. The committee should not be limited to six meetings. Provision should be made for the payment of fees, allowances and expenses of the advisory committee meetings in those instances.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

We hope that in committee the minister will tell us what he and the governor in council have in mind with regard to the drafting of regulations under amended section 10.5 of the Canadian Wheat Board Act. We will be interested in knowing the ground rules for defining the borders of the electoral districts, as they are called in the legislation. What does the government have in mind with regard to the other provisions under that section? We would like some detail. Unless we have some idea of that, the minister and the governor in council could unwittingly cause things to happen that in effect detract from the need of and purpose for the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee. I hope that in committee the minister will be willing to discuss the government's intentions with regard to regulations under the amended section 10.5 as contained in Bill C-88.

In conclusion, we support the legislation in principle. We hope the minister will consider changes of the kind I have mentioned. Further, we hope the minister will take the committee into his confidence and give us the details of what he has in mind with regard to implementing the provisions of this bill by order in council.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words with respect to this bill. Our party really has no objection to the bill. I was pleased to hear the minister say he would welcome constructive criticism on various aspects of it. I am concerned primarily with clause 4. We agree with the concept of the advisory committee. It has an important role to play in the function of the Wheat Board. However, what is most important to me is that the advisory committee be made up of actual producers. Section 10.5(3) reads as follows:

> The governor in council may make regulations respecting the conduct of an election of members of the advisory committee and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations . . .
>
> (c) prescribing the qualifications of members of the advisory committee and of actual producers for the purposes of section 10—

What has happened here is that the governor in council is given the responsibility of naming the members of the advisory committee. I can visualize a situation where we could end up with members on the committee who are not actual producers. There may not be anything wrong with that, but it is an aspect that should be looked at when the bill is in committee. If, after hearing evidence from organizations and individuals, it is the feeling of the committee that members of the advisory committee must be actual producers, the bill should be changed so that it provides that members of the advisory committee shall be producers.

We have a situation here, as we often have, where the details are not spelled out in the bill. We are governed by regulations at the whims and fancies of the governor in council. Parliament is not given the opportunity of making the decision. If it is put in the legislation by parliament, there can be no changes. As members know, regulations can be changed as often as the governor in council or the cabinet wish. I quote from a news release dated March 10, 1976, page 2, where the minister is shown as saying:

> I have always thought that the 11-member advisory committee should be chosen from amongst farmers, with farmers themselves having a direct vote in their selection. It was with this thought in mind that I authorized the first election of the members of the advisory committee in 1975; the successful candidates in that election were subsequently

appointed to the committee by the governor in council as required by the act.

If it is the feeling of the minister that the members should be chosen from among the farmers, he should bring in an amendment at the committee stage to make it law. The minister has stated that he would like constructive criticism. I criticise the bill by making that suggestion. Clause 2, with regard to deferred delivery permits, is interesting. The explanatory note reads:

The purpose of this amendment is to correct errors in the present act.

If you compare the clause in the bill with the section in the act, the only change is changing the word "grain" in the original section to "wheat". I would like to know whether it is the intention that from now on deferred permits will only be granted for wheat. If you read the interpretation in the main bill, "grain" includes several types of grain. It includes wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax and rapeseed. By amending the section and changing it from "grain" to "wheat", unless you can stretch your imagination to say that "wheat" includes all these other grains, you end up in a situation where deferred delivery permits are only granted in the case of wheat. That will have to be looked into at the committee stage.

Clause 4 was included to remedy the situation that occurred in the 1974-75 crop year regarding malting barley. I and many other members of this House received letters from producers in the west complaining about the treatment they received with regard to their malting barley sales. I wish to quote from a typical letter that I received. It is from the town of Macrorie and is dated March 8:

Dear Mr. Neil:

I sold 1,854 bushels of barley in the 1974-75 crop year. This barley was accepted as malting barley but was graded as No. 1 feed. I have found out that the Wheat Board sold this barley at only 10 cents a bushel less than 2-CW malting barley. I would like to know why I received only 18 cents as a final payment, while producers with 2-CW barley received 99 cents a bushel. I do not think this kind of treatment is very fair. I also think that this mismanagement has to be stopped and producers in my situation should be reimbursed for the money they should have rightly received.

● (1630)

Instituting a separate malting pool will not help me now. I have been treated unjustly and would like to see the situation clarified. I do hope you can help me.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding, on the basis of information I have received from the minister's office and from the Wheat Board, is that in the 1974-1975 crop year there was a shortage of malting barley, the result being that maltsters purchased No. 1 feed barley from the Wheat Board to cover the shortage. Approximately one-third of the feed barley sold to the Wheat Board was sold as malting barley to the maltsters. The premium on malting barley during that period was approximately $1 a bushel.

If we look at the annual report of the Wheat Board for the crop year 1974-75, we find that No. 1 CW six-row barley realized an over-all payment of $3.26 per bushel, whereas No. 1. feed realized $2.33, approximately 90 cents a bushel less. The difference in grades 2 and 3 ranged from 90 cents to $1 a bushel. This is what individual producers are complaining about, and I can understand their feelings. I can also understand the problem faced by the Wheat Board in trying to straighten out this situation, and it is for this reason we welcome the amendments contained in the bill.

The minister realized there was a problem, because he wrote to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Stewart) with reference to a specific situation, stating:

To overcome this problem in the current year and in future crop years I introduced in parliament on March 8 an amending bill which, when approved, will enable the establishment of a separate pool for selected barley. I am enclosing for your information my press release of March 10 concerning this matter. As you are aware, changing the pooling system of the Canadian Wheat Board is not a simple matter which can be achieved overnight at the whim of myself or the board. The present system is regulated by the Canadian Wheat Board Act and in order to change that system and establish a separate pool for malting barley legislative amendments to the act must first be drafted, then considered and approved by parliament. Once the bill introduced on March 8 is approved, the returns to the board for barley which is selected and accepted by maltsters will be deposited in a separate pool. The final payment for No. 1. feed barley which was selected and accepted as malting barley will therefore fully reflect the board's selling price to the maltsters... The amendment will be retroactive to deliveries of malting barley in the current crop year.

So the present crop year, 1976-77, will be covered. Mr. Speaker, I have read carefully clause 4 of the bill which presumably refers to barley although I see no mention of barley in it. I know the minister will say that as far as this clause is concerned, wheat is barley; but this seems strange to me. Talk to anyone in western Canada and they will tell you that wheat is wheat and barley is barley.

An hon. Member: And never the twain shall meet.

Mr. Neil: For the life of me I cannot understand why, when amending the act, we should be called upon to say that wheat means barley. Nevertheless, that is the situation in the bill before us and it is typical of a lot of the legislation brought before the House. We do not call things by their proper names. We do not call a spade a spade: we might call it a manual, earth-moving machine. I cannot understand why in this bill it should be necessary to call barley, wheat. Part of the original Wheat Board legislation deals with oats and barley, and it seems to me it would be simple to amend that portion of the legislation so that pooling arrangements could apply. Otherwise, if the minister feels it is not possible, let us call barley by its true name and not call it wheat.

As things are, the ordinary individual reading this bill is likely to be confused. I should like to see the entire Wheat Board Act put into a form in which it is understood by the average individual, so that farmers would have no need to consult a solicitor to determine what a particular section meant.

I am sure the barley producers of western Canada will welcome the amendments contained in this bill. The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Hamilton) told us a few minutes ago that he would like to see included in the bill provisions for a protein grading system which would ensure that those who produce high protein crops would obtain a premium for their production. We all know that the board, when disposing of this high quality grain on world markets, receives a premium amounting to around 35 cents a bushel. I appreciate it can be argued that the pooling arrangement is fair to all, but generally speaking those in the high protein growing areas get lower yields than those who grow low protein wheat in the

wetter areas. I believe it would even out in the long run. Many farmers in western Canada are clamouring for changes in the system so that they can receive a premium for their high grade protein product.

As I said earlier, I am looking forward to seeing the bill sent to committee and having the opportunity to question the minister and his officials with respect to specific clauses. The minister has told us he is prepared to accept criticism, and I hope he is prepared to make changes if he considers that criticism to be constructive.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the debate on Bill C-88 and say a few words with regard to some of the changes suggested to the Canadian Wheat Board Act. Some years ago the Canadian Wheat Board Act was renewed on a ten-year basis. In practice it came up for renewal every ten years. Two years ago the government of the day suggested that this was wrong and wanted to demonstrate its good faith in the Wheat Board by making the act permanent and doing away with the ten-year review. Since that demonstration of good faith we have seen major changes in the operation of the Wheat Board, some of which I greatly fear are to the detriment not only of the board but of the farmers in western Canada.

I always believed that the primary function of the Wheat Board was to ensure equal market opportunities and fair treatment for the farmers of western Canada. The quota system is perhaps one of the ways in which this clear and equal opportunity can be demonstrated to the farmers of western Canada; yet the authority of the Wheat Board and its ability to provide fair and equal service to the farmers of western Canada is being eroded.

● (1640)

The minister has come along with a feed grains proposal which allows for the open market buying of grain but which has not clearly demonstrated a pricing system for open market grain. It is a "Guess and by God" proposal which is supposed to hinge upon the initial payment plus the expected future payment. Sometimes it is relevant and sometimes it is not. It has brought about high feed grain prices for the cattle producers of western Canada, and this has caused them hardship in what might be called a very difficult period for the cattle feeding industry.

It has also caused a great deal of difficulty to the grain producers because it has tied up a great deal of storage, particularly at Vancouver. Having to keep open quota grain and Wheat Board grain in storage at Vancouver for the grain companies—really for the farmers—has caused duplication of storage of grain and has tied up bins. The Canadian Wheat Board now comes along and tells the farmers of western Canada that they are going to dock, or deduct from the final payment a certain amount of money in order to encourage the building of storage at Vancouver.

I, personally, regret that the Wheat Board had to take this unilateral action of using the farmers' money to build storage at Vancouver. I think that the government and the grain companies could have done this on their own. I well remember the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), boasting in Calgary during the 1972 election that the government was

concentrating on overhauling Vancouver harbour and building greater storage facilities there. Well, Mr. Speaker, I happened to look up some figures, to be found in *Hansard* of February 5, 1972, which indicated that the government had spent very little money in Vancouver, that in fact the amount of money spent in Vancouver between 1967 and 1972 had gone down drastically. Yet Vancouver handles something like 30 per cent of the total tonnage moving into Canada through National Harbours Board ports.

Since the minister has failed to overhaul Vancouver harbour since 1972, the Wheat Board, acting in good faith on behalf of the farmers of western Canada, have taken this task unto themselves. They have lost faith in the government and in the Minister of Transport who acts and speaks for the Wheat Board in the House of Commons. I think there is great need for further space in Vancouver because of the complicated manipulations that are involved in an open quota grain system and a Wheat Board quota system for grain. The situation will only be further complicated unless somehow or other in the regulations governing malting barley a definite grade is approved by the maltsters.

Anybody who has attempted to sell malting barley in the past knows that you can take one load of grain out of the granary and it will go malting. Yet the very next load will not go malting. What does this mean in terms of dollars and cents, Mr. Speaker? In the past year it means something like 78 cents a bushel. One farmer can sell grain as malting barley consistently. Another farmer just across the road might well believe he has harvested grain with the same low protein content, with no peel or broken kernels, yet he cannot get malting barley.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I completely agree that there should be a separate pool for malting barley, but the Wheat Board at the same time should establish quite clearly a number of things. First of all, it should make quite clear that the maltsters can buy their malting barley only from the Wheat Board. If that is not made clear, the grain companies—and I fear the international grain companies because of their skill in marketing—might well be a jump ahead of the pool and in their search for customers might well use their ability to sell malting barley to the maltsters and give them a premium of some 78 or 80 cents a bushel. This would mean that the co-ops and other Canadian-owned grain companies would not be able to make sales to the maltsters.

Secondly, the Canadian Wheat Board should quite clearly lay down what in essence passes for malting barley and what does not. It should not be left to the maltsters to decide what they will accept as malting barley and what they will not accept, because I fear favouritism and that the big farmers will get the advantage over the little farmers. For example, if the maltsters want 5,000 or 10,000 bushels of grain and they can buy it all from one farmer, all from the same sample, there will be a tendency to do so. It will mean that the big farmers will get the 78 to 80 cents a bushel premium and that the small farmers will not have an equal opportunity to get the same premium.

We must always remember, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of setting up the Canadian Wheat Board was to ensure equality and fair treatment for the prairie farmers. I have seen the erosion of this equality during the past

number of years under this minister who now speaks for the Canadian Wheat Board. While I am in complete support of a separate pool for malting barley, I see the danger of further erosion of a guarded principle that I think most farmers treasure—that of equality and fair treatment. If necessary, steps must be taken to establish a couple of clear principles—that the Wheat Board is the only body to sell to the maltsters and that the Wheat Board sets the quality or grade of malting barley, not the maltsters themselves.

While speaking on this question, I might say that I am a long-time believer in a separate pool for high protein grades and that growers of high protein wheat should get a premium. It is a well known and established fact that the farmers in northern Saskatchewan and northern Alberta are more likely to grow malting barley. This is low protein barley and has a better chance of success in the area owing to the climate in that part of the country. Barley in that area has a better chance of having no peel or broken kernels.

The very opposite is true with regard to the protein grading of wheat. It is a well known fact that farmers in southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta have a tendency to grow high protein wheat. High protein wheat is grown in what is commonly referred to as the Palliser triangle. Farmers in the Palliser triangle should get a bonus or premium for growing high protein wheat. In the past year this would have amounted to 33 cents to 35 cents per bushel. That also should be kept separate so that this premium would be paid. The net result of paying the premium on high protein wheat would be an encouragement to produce high protein wheat, and the net result of paying the premium on malting barley in a fair manner would be an encouragement to produce malting barley.

● (1650)

These two factors would also decrease the subsidization that now occurs in the pooling system that has been in place in the past. The premium on high protein wheat has gone into a general pool, has been divied up and has tended to maintain a higher average price for low grade wheat. The premium on malting barley has gone into a general pool with feed barley and has tended to maintain a higher average price for low or what one might call feed barley. These two facts tend to keep the price of feed grain high on the prairies. With these grains separated out, the feed grain would bring a price more comparable with what the feeding industry is prepared, willing and able to pay. I suggest this should be done.

Before this bill is passed—and I hope this is the intention of the minister—we should allow the committee to call members of the Canadian Wheat Board before it to answer a number of questions that ought to be asked. Is the open feed grain policy causing congestion at the terminals? If that is the case, as the railroads claim, we should examine that policy. That is one question I should like to ask. It has always been my belief that an open feed grains policy was designed to aid the sale of feed grains domestically rather than internationally. Why, then, is it causing congestion at the ports and terminals? This particular question should be aired and examined very thoroughly by the committee on agriculture. When this bill goes to the committee it will provide an opportunity for examination.

Canada Malting Co. Ltd. is one of the largest buyers of malting barley. Who owns that company? Is it true that Molson's and Labatt's have members on the board of directors of Canada Malting Co. Ltd.? Does this not bring about a conflict of interest regarding the price to be paid for malt, which in turn reflects the price to be paid for malting barley? Do the maltsters and Canada Malting seriously desire to export malt to the United States and other countries? Surely, with our ability to produce malting barley, we should be prepared to export malt to a greater extent than has been the case in the past.

Surely, it would be desirable to bring about a fair grading system for malting barley so that it could clearly be identified on each occasion and not be at the whim of the malting companies. In this way, malting barley would be clearly identifiable by farmers, grain companies and the Canadian Wheat Board. They would then know what ingredients make a sample of barley qualify for the premium.

It is a well-known fact that farmers have sent in a sample of what they felt was malting barley which has been rejected, and then sent in the same sample two weeks later and had it passed as malting barley and shipped the same carload. If we are to pay an 80-cent premium, we must have a more definitive system than the one that exists. If we do not, we will cause even more dissatisfaction over the long haul. Certainly there is a great deal of dissatisfaction today on the part of farmers who grow malting barley. They resent very much losing out on the 78-cent or 80-cent premium.

The province of Alberta grows over 50 per cent of the barley that qualifies for malting, and therefore it is the duty of Alberta members particularly to point out that our farmers want that premium. We want that premium paid to those farmers who have the capability of growing malting barley, and we want the small farmer to have an equal opportunity with the large farmer in qualifying for the premium.

Members of the Wheat Board and of the Board of Grain Commissioners should be called before the committee to clearly state that they can set up a grading principle or system which in essence will be satisfactory to the trade and, most importantly, to the producers who are to receive the premium.

The hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Hamilton) suggested that in 1974-75, 18 million bushels were bought as No. 1 feed and sold as malting barley. This is a clear case of the grain companies picking up the 80-cent premium. This is another reason the grading system has to be clearly understood by the farmers so they can prevent the grain companies from what amounts to stealing the premium. The grain company can buy up the barley as No. 1 feed, send in a sample or a mixed sample later on and qualify for the malting barley premium. It is of paramount importance that we set up a fair grading system for malting barley.

It is extremely important that the Canadian Wheat Board be given sole authority to handle malting barley under a clearly defined grading system. It is also important that the premium should be paid on high protein wheat. These two points should be made to representatives of the

Wheat Board who come before the committee on agriculture to discuss this bill.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall)—Supply and Services—Lockheed contract—Arrangements for interim financing; the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—Airports—Pickering—Plans for use of land in view of abandonment of construction plans; the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston)—External Affairs—Cambodia—Request for report on alleged violations of human rights—Suggested withdrawal of aid.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to order made on February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Standing Order 19(1) applies. Notice of motion No. 2, in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). Shall the motion stand?

Mr. Alexander: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Notice of motion No. 15, in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan). Shall the motion stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Notice of motion No. 19, the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson). Shall the motion stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Notice of motion No. 20, in the name of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). Shall the motion stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Notice of motion No. 4. Shall the motion stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Notice of motion No. 45, in the name of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). Shall the motion stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government.

* * *

● (1700)

OLD AGE SECURITY

SUGGESTED RETROACTIVE PAYMENT TO DATE AT WHICH PERSONS ATTAINED AGE 65

Mr. J. Larry Condon (Middlesex-London-Lambton): moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider amending the Old Age Security Act to grant the Minister of National Health and Welfare the discretionary power to make retroactive payments under the Old Age Security Act to the date at which a person has attained the age of 65 years regardless of the date on which an application is received when it is shown that an applicant has failed to apply at the proper time due to sickness, justifiable ignorance, absence or for other serious and similar reasons.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention very early in my career as part of the government team that in respect of old age security there is a matter which has been of concern not only to me but, I am sure, to other members of the government and of the opposition. This concern relates to people who for some reason or other do not realize the advantages available to them in respect of the old age security pension and are not given the opportunity after one year has elapsed to have it made available to them. In such a case, obviously they lose at least one year's pension, a pension for which they have fully qualified.

I think the care of our senior citizens has become a passion for many of us. Obviously, the government has played a part in this. Representatives from countries all over the world come to Canada to study our social programs. I think we should realize that our senior citizens are the people who participated in the process of making this country great. In many ways it is because of our people who are retired that we have today a free, democratic system. Obviously, this has added to the greatness of Canada and for many of us has added to the quality of our respect not only for the old people but for the country in which we live.

The Liberal government, through its foresight and concern for not just the old people, or the senior citizens as they are now called, has over the period of its history brought in many social programs. I am afraid that on many occasions the government has neither taken nor received credit for this. At this time I think perhaps I should refer

to the credit the government should receive. Frequently in the newspapers we read of the problems governments face. Because they are governments they are criticized. However, let us look at the other side of the coin because it is obvious this has not been drawn to the attention of the people of Canada.

On many occasions we have heard of the great strides taken by the New Democratic Party, but we have not seen too much evidence of this. This is because the liberal government has won the elections. Why has the Liberal government won the elections? Is it because it has come in with promises before election time? No. It is because the Liberal government has shown the people of Canada that it listens to them and is concerned about the people of Canada both young and old. It is also because of the fact that the representations which are made to the people are acceptable to the people.

One problem in respect of this particular legislation has been the lack of retroactive payment after one year. Let us take a look at some of the reasons and some of the people who are affected by this loophole. We are very fortunate in Canada and in my riding that we have many senior citizens. The people who send congratulations to these people are amazed that some of them are 80, 90 or 100 years of age and have been married for 40, 50 or 60 years.

If I were asked why there are so many of these people in my riding, I think I would say that although it is neither a riding in which there is great poverty or great prosperity, it is one in which the older people had to work long and hard for a living. They did not have the benefit of the social security programs that are available now. They had to work in order to provide a strong base for future generations. Not all of us, when we reach age 65, will be able to say we will retain 100 per cent of our faculties. Many do, but others are less fortunate. I think we must have concern for these people.

Back in the so-called old days when our society was not as mobile as it is now, the children were around the family or were in very close proximity to their parents. In many cases the parents lived in their children's homes. Now, in this mobile society, when the children grow up they have great prospects right across Canada. Many of the children look for jobs outside the proximity of their homes. When the parents reach age 65 they do not have the opportunity to go to their children and ask what they should do in respect of a certain form. They know they are entitled to the old age pension but they are not sure how to get it. Not always in all areas are offices available to such people. It would be nice to say that they could go to any town in Canada to obtain the necessary information.

We must also realize that people 65 years of age have pride. This is not a false pride. They have pride in the fact that they have gone through life supporting their children, paying their bills and attempting to have a comfortable living without depending on anyone. These people had self-sufficiency. They depended on themselves. With their pride, they ask themselves whether people would think they were becoming senile if they asked too many questions. I do not believe these people who have a fear of asking questions should be left out.

The department, of course, has done an excellent job; there is no question about that. However, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the government to follow up on every particular case. When these people find out that a one-year period has elapsed, I think they should be given an opportunity to reclaim the money which is justly theirs. The legislation was set up to take care of these people and provide them with an income. Periodically we all receive letters. I have here a letter from a lady who is a senior citizen. When she became 65 years of age, because of her pride—as I mentioned before—she did not apply for the pension. However, she was under the impression that she could draw it later, with accumulated interest. She thought the money would be held in trust and that she could withdraw it later. As we know, this is not the case.

I understand that this lady is now out helping other senior citizens. She has not only given of herself for 65 years, but is now 71 years of age is still going around helping people in her area who are not as well off monetarily or physically. She was under the impression that she could leave the money there or hold it in trust until it gained interest, after which she could take it out and spread it around to more people. I can mention other such cases; there are many across Canada.

● (1710)

Let us assume that a woman reaches the age of 65 first, and that her husband is five, six or ten months younger. All these years the assumption was that the husband was older. In the old days I suppose that meant something. They had lived together for 40 years, and on the wife's sixty-fifth birthday she did not claim her social insurance because she did not want it coming into the house, thus making it obvious to the husband that she was 65. There was a bond in that marriage, a bond which kept the marriage together for many years. It is a bond that the wife did not want to break because her husband felt she was the younger of the two. I am sure that on many occasions this happens. Wives in the old days had to be younger than the husband to get married. I am sure there are many Canadians in that category. Why should they be penalized for this? Why should they be penalized because of that bond and sincerity they had for perhaps 40 or 45 years?

I suggest it is time this legislation was either changed in some way or that discretionary power was given to the minister. This could be done very simply and it would show the sincerity and concern we feel, not only for the ones who apply for and receive social security but for all Canadians whom we want to enjoy the opportunities which Canada offers and which they so richly deserve.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the previous speaker, has suggested that the legislation on old age security should be amended in the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, the motion which my colleague has presented certainly has a great deal of attraction, but I would like to examine carefully the implications of the measure he is proposing. At present an applicant has a period of two years within which it is possible for him to file an application, one year preceding his sixty-fifth birthday and one

year subsequent to it during which the law permits the payment of retroactive benefits for as long as 12 months.

The motion introduced by my colleague, the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon), is intended to permit payment of a lump sum benefit equal to at least 13 or more times the monthly amount of the benefits payable under the Old Age Security Act. Such a proposal does not really fit one of the basic objectives of the old age security program, namely, that it is an income security program for older persons designed to provide a basic current income on retirement to residents of Canada. The program is intended to provide a regular flow of income to enable those who might not have had the opportunity to set aside savings during their working careers on which to live in retirement, to meet the daily expenses of an adequate standard of living on a current basis.

The guaranteed income supplement further enforces this objective by providing additional moneys monthly for those who can demonstrate that the flow of cash receipts they have obtained within the period of the past year or less is insufficient to meet their immediate maintenance needs. I should like to say that the program is not designed to be a long-term savings plan or to provide benefit options to meet different contingencies. It is available to all eligible applicants for day to day living needs, but is not a method of capital accumulation for later withdrawal.

The requirement that an application be filed before benefits are paid is essential to the operation of the old age security program since, if potential applicants do not come forward, it would be virtually impossible to identify and locate those who are eligible in order to begin the payment of benefits. At present, an application for benefits may be filed well before eligibility for pension commences, although for administrative reasons persons are advised not to apply more than one year in advance, as I said earlier. For those who might miss the eligibility date, up to 12 full months of retroactive benefits may be paid, as I have indicated. Thus, a potential recipient has at least a full two years within which to file an application without any loss of benefits whatsoever.

It has been shown that of the Canadian population in general, 95 per cent are familiar with the old age security program. Because of their greater interest, it is not unreasonable to assume that the awareness of the program is even higher among the population approaching retirement age. My colleague, in his motion, itemized a number of circumstances which he feels would justify the increased retroactive payment of benefits. One of these is absence.

All hon. members are aware of the fact that an application for old age security benefits can only be accepted and approved from a non-resident of Canada if that person had previously resided in Canada for at least 40 years after reaching the age of 18. Therefore, in many cases an application cannot be accepted or a benefit paid to a person who is out of the country. I trust that my colleague is not suggesting that this clause should serve as a means whereby persons whose non-residence in Canada would normally disentitle them to benefits would be able to circumvent the eligibility reuqirements by applying for benefits retroactively and pleading absence.

For those persons who would be eligible to apply for benefits from abroad, the fact that they are required to have lived in Canada for 40 years of their adult life means that they could not have left this country before the age of 58. As I mentioned earlier, they would have a full two years or more within which to remind themselves of the need to apply for the benefit and submit the application, without any loss of old age security benefits. Even our much maligned postal service would no doubt be equal to the task of delivering an application within 24 months from the very farthest corner of the globe.

Sickness is another circumstance where this greater retroactivity would apply under my colleague's suggestion. As we have heard, under the current old age security legislation a special provision is made whereby a person who cannot apply for benefits on his own behalf because of infirmity, illness or any other good reason may have someone else apply for him. Also, when a person is not sufficiently mobile to visit one of the many Old Age Security or Canada Pension Plan offices across the country, representatives of these offices will make home visits—a service which few ill persons can expect even from their doctors these days.

Justifiable ignorance is another reason which is accepted in awarding larger retroactive benefits. "Ignorance" is a rather open-ended word. Ignorance of what? Are we speaking about ignorance of the program? If so, let us look at that question. As I said earlier, 95 per cent of the full age range of the population know about the old age security program. As personal interest in such things grows with the proximity of potential benefits, the older age groups who are thinking of retirement—let us say from 55 years and up, an age group about which I am particularly sensitive—are doubtless even more aware of the program.

● (1720)

Of the population aged 65 and over, more than 98 per cent are receiving old age security benefits. Of the remainder, less than 2 per cent who are not receiving the benefits—a goodly number, approaching 1.5 per cent—would not be eligible for the benefits because they do not meet the residence requirements. Others who are not receiving the benefit at one point in time, although eligible, will apply and begin to receive it within a year, and so are covered by the existing retroactivity provision.

Once we eliminate all these groups, we are left with very few potential cases. Who are the people in this group? Their most important characteristic which we should consider is their financial position. If someone over 65 is in financial need and seeks assistance from virtually any source in this country, he or she will be made aware, if they are not already, of the old age security benefits available to them. Social assistance agencies, private benefit plans, financial counsellors, retirement groups and friends all know of the program and would refer them to the old age security program. One quarter of the people over 65 who do not receive old age security do receive some other form of government transfer payment and therefore are doubtless aware of the old age security program.

Of course, in some cases pride enters into the question. My hon. friend discussed pride—pride upon which, presumably, a marriage survived over a long period of time. I understand the circumstances and I find them a little unusual. However, it is not unusual for a retired person to

refuse government income even though he or she is in need. This position can, and does, apply to old age security as much as to other public benefits. Where persons of their own free will choose not to apply for OAS benefits, as they are entitled to do, I question whether the government can or should interfere with that choice. Again, where it can be shown medically that such a choice is the result of physical or mental deterioration, some other person may apply for the benefit of behalf of the beneficiary. Finally, there are those in our society who are in the happy position of not needing OAS benefits. For these people the limit on retroactivity is not a financial hardship.

I wish to reiterate that OAS benefits are designed to provide current income to meet day to day needs. Although, as a result of various circumstances, a person may meet these needs by some other means for an extended period of time, this should not serve to transform the basic purpose of the program to that of a means of capital accumulation.

There is another type of ignorance to which we might refer. That is personal ignorance of one's own age. In a limited number of cases when people come forward to apply for OAS benefits and are asked to provide proof of age, they discover that they are older, sometimes by several years, than they had always thought themselves to be. With more accurate records, and so on, this situation will become less and less common. However, for those in this situation now the late determination of their true age means the loss of OAS benefits. Of course, this discovery will affect more than just OAS, and the interaction of a large retroactive OAS payment with other affected benefits or legislation must be considered. Payments under the Canada assistance plan, war veterans' allowances and some private pension plans are fully or partially offset by OAS benefits. A long-term retroactive payment of OAS benefits would retroactively affect the recipient's status under such programs or plans. In addition, there are the possible income tax effects of the receipt of a large cash benefit payment in any one year.

Finally, the hon. member's motion states that where an acceptable reason for late application is presented, the OAS benefit is to be paid retroactively to the date at which the person attained age 65 in all cases. I want to talk about this. Such a provision, if interpreted in the manner in which I think it could be interpreted, would introduce a far greater and more serious inequality than that which the motion purports to remedy.

Let us consider one or two possible hypothetical cases. The proposal might entitle a person to a retroactive benefit for the full period from age 65, even though had he or she applied for that benefit at age 65, he or she would not have been eligible for the payment at that time. This would occur when the applicant had ten years continuous residence at, say, age 68 and applied then for a retroactive benefit on the ground of justifiable ignorance. However, at age 65, with only seven years of residence, that same person would not have qualified for OAS.

Another example to which I referred briefly earlier is the applicant who is resident in Canada at age 68 when the application is made for the retroactive benefit, but at age 65 was living abroad and did not have long enough Canadian residence to qualify for receipt of OAS benefits abroad at that time. I must concede that these are hypothetical cases, and the hon. member who proposed the motion might well agree that it would be possible to make amendments in drafting the legislation in such a way as to make sure that the clear intent of parliament when the legislation was introduced would not be thwarted.

I suggest that there is no major inequity in the present situation. I am suggesting to hon. members that they must look at the basic objective of the program, and that is to provide a decent standard of living, so far as possible, on a current basis. The purpose of the program is not to provide a savings program, not to accumulate assets and not to accumulate credits. For these reasons, I suggest that this House might want to think fairly carefully before extending the period of retroactivity under the legislation.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of becoming involved in this debate, but I was impressed with the seriousness of the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon). I listened to him with a great deal of compassion because I have had one or two experiences in which people who for one reason or another did not apply in time or, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, within one year after having attained the age of 65.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It was Ottawa West (Mr. Francis).

Mr. Alexander: Well, I think we all know to whom I am making reference. I do have some knowledge as to the possibility of hardship, but I did not realize just how many people would be involved. I was pleased to hear that if there are any, there are not many. It is something like 5 per cent who for one reason of another were not in a position to apply for old age security. I think that is a very significant statistic.

In order to assist the hon. member who moved this motion, I suggest there might be a need for more advertising; for example, a full page ad once a year in the daily newspapers saying, "You are entitled to old age security if you can meet the following criteria." Is this being done? Perhaps it is, but not often.

● (1730)

As members of parliament we are responsible for advising constituents, including old age citizens, of available government programs. Certainly I try to tell my constituents that unemployment insurance is available in such and such circumstances, that old age security and the old age supplement are available in certain circumstances. Many members send their constituents newsletters, some of which are factual, but many of which are partisan. Perhaps our newsletters should be more constructive and tell constituents what is available. After all, we are concerned about people who have worked for years. They are entitled to benefits.

Why do people sometimes not apply? Well, what about the wife who is older than the husband? Perhaps she is embarrassed to admit she is 65, when her friends thought her only 55. Some do not apply because they are afraid of some possible stigma.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): And others apply automatically.

Mr. Alexander: Yes, and others apply automatically. Or there could be peculiar circumstances which inhibit an application.

The hon. member suggests in his motion that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) should be given discretionary power:

> . . . to make retroactive payments under the Old Age Security Act to the date at which a person has attained the age of 65 years regardless of the date on which an application is received when it is shown that an applicant has failed to apply at the proper time due to sickness, justifiable ignorance, absence or for other serious and similar reasons.

Old age security gives a monthly income to the retired. The phrase in the motion "regardless of the date on which an application is received" troubles me. You see, Mr. Speaker, if we adopt this part of the motion we shall open the door for all sorts of abuse. What if a person waited five or six years before applying? He would be entitled to a lump sum payment. I do not think the original act intended that. I respect the hon. member's motives; they are grand. But there is a fault here.

The motion speaks of an applicant who fails to apply at the proper time due to sickness. Well, someone else can apply on the applicants' behalf. There are such procedures. Surely uncles, aunts, brothers, sisters, even parents, of the sick can forward applications. There is entitlement to old age security if the proper application is made.

The motion then uses the word, "that an applicant has failed to apply—due to—justifiable ignorance." It is an interesting phrase, but I don't know what it means. Does it mean ignorance of the law, ignorance of this motion, or ignorance of rights? And what is "justifiable" ignorance? That is open to interpretation in court, and we all know what happens in court when lawyers argue.

The concluding words of the motion are, "—absence or for other serious and similar reasons." Absence is a tricky word. Does it apply to residency? If it does, it could frustrate the legitimate intention of the law having to do with residency periods. And the last few words, "—or for other serious and similar reasons" are merely a catch-all phrase defying definition. I say all this while conceding the hon. member's good intentions.

All this talk of senior citizens reminds me of the minister's bill which was to provide spouses' allowances. There was a great hue and cry all over this country when the bill was first introduced. Members of parliament heard from widows, widowers, single people and divorced people, those who had not reached 65 and were not married legally, and those who were 65 or over but were not able to get the allowance. After all, the idea of the supplement was to make life more tolerable. I am still getting letters about the spouses' allowance. People take a dim view of it. It seems to me that under the minister's proposal—and I say this with sincerity—people living in sin could be entitled to spouses' allowance, whereas 60-year old widows, widowers, single people and divorced people would be put out the pasture, so to speak.

The hon. member's proposal involves money; I do not know how much. He mentioned 5 per cent of the people being affected by it. Apparently 5 per cent of our people, for some reason, do not apply for benefits. I wish the hon. member had told the House how much money his proposal would cost. These are days of restraint. Even so I recognize that, because inflation has eroded the value of our dollar, some people are in dire need of financial assistance. We ought to be concerned about them.

In my opinion the present law allows those who cannot themselves apply, or have failed to apply, one year's retroactive benefits. Really that is a lump sum payment. The government provided for a sort of trust fund and took cognizance of the kind of situation about which the hon. member is concerned. No matter when you apply, you cannot get more than one year's benefits.

I do not want to talk the motion out. The hon. member brought the motion before the House for the edification of members and their constituents. This debate has shown that we are always thinking and want to improve the lot of those who did so much to develop this country. Even so, I suggest that the number of people the motion would affect is not great.

In conclusion I say that it is our responsibility as members of parliament to advise constituents, especially people falling within the purview of the motion, of government programs set up for their benefit. As I said earlier, the government should vote money every year to advertise these programs. I do not know what it would cost, but it would be a dollar well spent if there were an advertisement, even once a year, advising people of programs such as this.

• (1740)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon) is learning this afternoon what it is like to be a member of the opposition. He got hold of a good idea, he brought it before the House, he was hopeful it would be received favourably but has found that it is being jumped on by his friends and opponents and that in due course, it will be talked out.

If the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton had proposed a wide open provision that would enable persons to defer taking old age security for five or ten years and then pick up a nest egg with interest and so on, that proposal might have deserved the kind of criticism that was given by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) and in part by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. However, I want to emphasize, in supporting the hon. member's idea, that he is not asking for a wide open provision. He is simply asking that in certain special cases there be more discretionary power than there is at the present time. The act now provides, and it is spelled out in the regulations under the act, that a regional director can go back at least a year. All that the hon. member is proposing is that it be possible to go back further than that in special cases.

It is possible to criticize some of the reasons the hon. member has put forward. However, all he has placed before us is a resolution. This is not the language to be put in a bill. I am sure he would agree that the language in a bill could be more restrictive.

Both of the last speakers have suggested that not very many persons are affected by this situation. I can testify to

that as well. I agree with the hon. member for Ottawa West that Canadians from 55 up pretty well know what the provisions are with respect to old age security and are ready to apply when the time comes. However, I remind the House that not many months ago the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker) brought up a case of one person, a veteran, who had stayed in the United Kingdom for some years after the war. He failed to meet the precise qualifications even though he was a Canadian in all other respects. It was finally agreed by the government that, even if there were only a few cases, here was an injustice that should be corrected. That injustice has been corrected, or at least is in the process of being corrected.

I receive a great deal of correspondence about pension matters, but I have had only two persons write to me about this matter because if affects them. However, they are extremely grateful that an injustice has been corrected. That is one of the things that is great about parliament; if there is an injustice, even if it affects only a very few persons, it deserves to be corrected.

I quite agree with those who say we should not go hogwild in this. However, I believe there is room for a greater element of discretion where there is a clear, justifiable reason for a person failing to apply for old age security within the year that is now stipulated in the legislation.

Even though the hon. member many suffer the fate of other private members and see his motion talked out at six o'clock, I hope that his having raised the matter for discussion will result in its being considered in the department. If he has cases that are specific, such as those to which he referred, he would be well advised to present them to the department. Others of us should do the same so that an injustice, even to a half dozen individuals, does not remain in our statutes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I give my general support to the intent of motion presented by the hon. member. I will refrain from participating in any talking out process. In fact all I will say before I sit down is that I am glad the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) raised an issue which most of us think is of very great importance right now. I refer to the discrimination being experienced and felt by thousands of Canadians who are spinsters, widows, bachelors, and widowers in the age bracket between 60 and 65.

When the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) brought in Bill C-62 in June, 1975, he stood in this House and said that what he was trying to do was to solve the problem of two persons living on one pension. That is his plausible excuse for this arrangement that pays a pension, on a means test basis, between 60 and 65 to a person who is married and living with a spouse over 65, but not to a person in the same age bracket who is alone. Indeed the spinster, widow, bachelor or widower in this country who is between 60 and 65 cannot understand why a pension is available to a woman of the same age who has a husband over 65, but is not available to the woman who is a widow or who is not married. That is an issue that should be corrected in this very session of parliament.

I realize this is beyond the confines of the motion before us, but each member who has had the floor so far has gone beyond those confines for a moment. I shall settle for what I have said. Although there are many things that need to be done in the pension field, one fact above all others that is annoying thousands of Canadians today is this discrimination of the spouses' allowance in that it discriminates against single persons between the ages of 60 and 65. I hope that will soon be corrected.

I sit down simply saying again that despite the rough ride the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton has had, I hope that his bringing this issue before the House will result in the matter being considered, at least in the department.

● (1750)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Marceau (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, when I examined the motion of my hon. colleague, the member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon), it brought back a very pleasant recollection, that is the beginning of my public political life.

As for all those who are in this House, the time comes when one has to choose the political party answering one's aspirations. I obviously had the opportunity to consider the platforms of all political parties and after a thorough consideration of the Liberal platform, especially that dealing with the old age security legislation, my choice became easier. Moreover, I do not regret it, since the real intentions of the party to which I belong have been shown and continue to be shown in favour of deserving citizens who after many years of untiring work have succeeded in establishing a better community and are entitled to our consideration and more particularly to a financial assistance as subtantial as possible according to the resources of the country.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it might take too long to recall all the legislation the Liberal party has had passed in this House in the last 30 years, but it should not be pointless to mention that history reminds us it was the government which, in 1927, passed the Old Age Security Act, followed in 1952 by the old age security program.

At that time, one had to be 70 or over to be eligible. In addition, in the last decade, the steps taken by the government reflect, to my mind, in a very concrete sense, the intention of the government to resolve the various difficulties our senior citizens confront. Let me say immediately, Mr. Speaker, that we all meet on the floor of this House in a common ideal, that is ensuring our senior citizens to the greatest extent possible access to the old age security pension to which they are entitled. And I am sure that, on both sides of this House, there is no question of adopting a negative attitude towards this motion; the few words I want to say certainly are not meant to encourage unfair treatment of our senior citizens, nor to deprive them of the means or services offered to help them by the Canadian Parliament. Still, Mr. Speaker, there are basic principles we must not hesitate to discuss in this House when, for instance, it is claimed, as did my hon. friend, that the senior citizens are not responsible enough to take care of their own affairs and to make their own requests of the state, or even through intermediaries, when their health does not allow them to take advantage of the means put at their disposal by the old age security program.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to the citizens who, during 65 years, have always behaved like responsible people and have taken care of their business, their families, their work, and who, at a certain age, are now able to take advantage of legislation introduced for their benefit.

I believe it was the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) who suggested that more complete programs, and more substantial and extensive information should be made available to all citizens so that, as the previous speaker said, no one who is entitled to it be deprived of the advantages of the old age security program. And in this regard, I agree with the hon. member who spoke before me when he said: "Even if only a few could not take advantage of the legislation, it would be unfortunate. This would be an injustice that we could not tolerate."

However, Mr. Speaker, if the motion of my hon. friend is adopted, we would have to extend the debate and apply the same provisions to other classes of citizens who have not yet reached pensionable age and who, because of a lack of training or because of illness, cannot take advantage of the other acts which have been passed for their benefit.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues probably know, people often tell my colleagues or myself: I did not submit a project under the local initiative program, for instance, because I was sick or because I did not know that the program would end on such or such a date. If we applied the concept of extension because of ignorance, illness or other reasons, the same concept should also be applied to all classes of citizens and all programs.

In my view this would make the government's position impossible since the discretionary power, which my hon. friend wants to place in the hands of a minister, is, I believe, an extremely delicate tool which ought to be used only in exceptional circumstances. The word "discretionary" is, in my opinion, extremely dangerous and so is the word "retroactive". I suggest that laws should be retroactive only in exceptional cases and the discretionary power used only on the rarest occasions.

Be this as it may, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity to discuss this most important subject. I think as the previous speaker mentioned that an open and sincere discussion was made possible for hon. members who are assuming their responsibilities and who, on a matter as important as the one which is before us, have adopted a constructive attitude which will enable us to try to work together to help senior citizens. They certainly deserve that we stop squabbling and start cooperating to ensure their welfare.

[*English*]

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to note the overwhelming interest of the scribes and Pharisees who occupy the seats above Your Honour.

Mr. Paproski: They are not Pharisees.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This is going to be one of your best speeches.

[Mr. Marceau.]

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Thank you. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has stolen most of my speech and made it already. I wish to add my congratulations to those offered to the hon. member for Middlesex-London-Lambton (Mr. Condon). I believe his motion has been put forward in the true spirit of liberalism and he is to be unreservedly congratulated. I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre agrees.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No; because the Liberals have sat on it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hour set aside for the consideration of private members' business has expired. I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6.01 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT (No. 2)

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-88, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (No. 2), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act are always the subject of great interest to western farmers. The Canadian Wheat Board is a very unique institution about which Canadians should know much more. Under the Canadian Wheat Board Act of 1935 we give the power to this independent board to buy the grains of western Canada, and we give the power to this independent board to sell the grains of western Canada, so that in one sense parliament, by drawing power from the provincial governments, has delegated monopoly power to the board to sell the goods of a very large productive area of Canada, the grain growing area of the western provinces, including parts, of B.C. and Ontario.

This organization or institution is unique, as I say. Even though it has all the powers that our so-called socialist would say he stands for, of delegating to a board complete monopoly over the buying and selling of a farmer's product, actually it is not a selling board and it is not a monopoly in the real sense of the word. What the board does that makes it unique is that in turn it delegates its power to be the sole agent that buys the grain of the farmers to private enterprise. It delegates its power to the grain companies such as the great co-operatives, the Alberta Pool, the Saskatchewan Pool, the Manitoba Pool, and to

the UGG. These are supposed to be the greatest co-operatives in the world in terms of the volume of business that they do.

At the same time it delegates the power to any group of people who have enough money and responsibility to go to the Wheat Board and buy the grain from the farmers as the board's agent, so that any group of people who can collect the money have the right, under the management of the Canadian Wheat Board, to become the agent of the board and, in effect, provide competition among the buyers or agents of the board in the buying of grain from the farmers.

That is one side of the equation. When the board transfers the grain from the farmer through its agent, these private companies, it then turns the power to sell—which is a monopoly—over to a series of agents, so that any group of people, Canadian or foreign, who can prove to the Wheat Board they have the financial responsibility can become agents of the Canadian Wheat Board and sell all over the world.

I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that not only do many people across Canada not understand how the Canadian Wheat Board operates but many people in the west are uncertain too. We do not get too many opportunities to discuss the Canadian Wheat Board and the amendments made from time to time to the act.

This unique institution has worked exceptionally well. It has attempted to give to the farmers a fair price averaged over the year. The technique it uses is to give an initial payment, and when the grain is sold to give an interim or final payment, and this is averaged grade by grade.

To put the matter into perspective, I do not think there is any question but that 85 to 90 per cent of the farmers have been reasonably satisfied with the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board over the last 40 years. However, that does not mean that there has been complete satisfaction; doubts do arise from time to time.

One of the amendments in Bill C-88 which is before us is to set down the terms for electing an advisory board based on districts in the grain growing area. This is an amendment that I am positive every political party in western Canada supports. We have no choice but to congratulate the government on putting this proposal into law, and I am going to give the House some reasons why those congratulations are worth-while and necessary.

There always has been an advisory board. Under the original act power was given to the minister to appoint members to an advisory board, and as a general rule the minister picked the heads of the big grain organizations as members of the board to advise the Wheat Board. When I was minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board I added an additional person, a representative of the National Farmers' Union. Why, then, do I say that an elected advisory board is better? The reasons are very simple.

● (2010)

When you began to watch, observe, and assess what the old advisory board was contributing to the actions of the Wheat Board you got the strong impression that the advisory board you had appointed yourself, made up of the heads of the big grain companies, was in fact very friendly and cosy with members of the Canadian Wheat Board. They were there representing not only their farmers and their organizations, they were representing the businesses they managed, and as managers they were very anxious to have this system work smoothly and efficiently. You rarely got criticism from these people about the actions of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Remember what I said earlier—the Canadian Wheat board selected these companies as its agents. Therefore it was a meeting really of top management, the Canadian Wheat Board and the advisory board which was in effect the agent of the Canadian Wheat Board. It was naturally a cosy relationship.

The great grain companies are very large and they make good returns. Their first responsibility to their rank and file is to maintain the profit margin they have obtained through the handling of grain. I got the impression, as the minister watching their activities, that this was not really the type of advice I thought the farmers deserved when they had to rely on the Canadian Wheat Board. That is the reason why I added the farm unions, hoping they would represent these farmers in a better way, not having a vested interest and not having a great army of country or seaboard terminals to manage. Even this was not too strong a representation for the simple reason that we soon found out the National Farmers' Union rarely disagreed with the wheat pools.

Therefore I say with all sincerity to the minister that by putting this board in as an elected board, giving the farmers directly a chance to elect their representatives to advise the Wheat Board, he is going to get a little more independent type of advice as well as criticism of the Canadian Wheat Board. Even if the Wheat Board were made up of the most perfect people in the world it could not be anything more than human, and it makes mistakes, but it is nice to know there are at least ten or 11 independent elected people representing their electors, watching what is going on and giving advice.

With these advisory meetings as laid down in the amendments I hope this will result in more cogent criticism of the Canadian Wheat Board. This will make it even better than it has been. Just as an example let me refer to a report of one of the independent members who got himself elected. He comes from the province of Alberta and he submitted a report of which I have a copy here. Just listen to his language, and remember that this is a report of an elected representative on the advisory board which we are now legalizing by this legislation. He says in this report:

> Did you know: that grade and dockage must be agreed upon by both the elevator agent and the farmer?

That is a routine question. He goes on to state:

> A "subject to grade" storage ticket ensures that a government inspector will grade this grain; or you can have a sample government inspected at the government inland terminals. If to your advantage, haul it there, consign it to the elevator company of your choice and receive the $ benefit of official grade and dockage.

Then he says:

> (For example, a government inspected sample of your barley may grade 2 CW Barley instead of 1 Feed Barley, to your advantage of 91 cents a bushel.)

I stop there, but that is the type of advice he is giving. This type of thing has been known all along, but not too

often have we found people who are advising the farmers and being so frank with them. In fact this advisory member of the board is telling the farmers in his area to make sure they shop around and get the best price from the grain companies.

I was struck by this because I am sure one of the reasons why we have this amendment before us is that there has been a squabble over barley this last year. This is dealt with in clause 4 of the bill. Under this amendment it will be possible for the Wheat Board to set up a malting barley pool. No member has to be told that barley is of several grades. In addition to being of several grades, some of it is selected in a very mysterious manner and called malting. Very few people, if any, are able to tell us or the farmers exactly what is a malting grade of barley. You can haul one load in from your granary and the elevator man will look at it and say it is malting. You can then bring in another load from the same granary and he might look at it and say it is No. 1 feed. The farmers have been unable for years to find out what it is that makes some barley malting and some feed grain, but the price is different. This year it was some 91 cents different.

As the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) was saying before the dinner recess, the key to making this part of the bill work is strict definition of grades. With the knowledge and experience of the elevator agents I think they require a type of description which has never been given before. Some farmers, who for years have been getting malting, will suddenly not get malting but will get No. 1 feed. This year with that 91-cent a bushel spread this represented a very serious loss. My point here is that I think the hon. member for Crowfoot was not gilding the lily when he used the word "stealing".

The grain act makes it very plain that every time a farmer hauls grain to an elevator the law of Canada requires that the farmer be paid for what he delivers. For that reason it is very necessary to have a clear definition of the difference between the various grades we have been using for years. If a farmer does not like the grade given by an elevator agent he can appeal to a government inspector and to the Board of Grain Commissioners. Theirs is the final decision. This system has worked very well over the years. It is very important that the law be carried out, and that each farmer is paid for what he delivers.

No one has told me as yet the full story of what happened last year. Apparently the farmers took in their barley. Many of them got feed grades, and no one knows why. Later on it was discovered there was not enough malting barley on hand, so they took the barley which had been graded No. 1 feed, which gets a lower price, and arbitrarily raised it to malting, and then made the maltsters pay another 91 cents a bushel for that malting barley. Somewhere along the line the farmers were done out of the full 91 cents difference for malting barley.

The hon. member for Crowfoot suggested that the difference went into the accounts of the grain companies. I have heard another story, namely, that it was the Wheat Board that mixed the grain at the terminals up to a malting barley grain which the maltsters accepted. The board took this excess money for this barley that was raised up in grade and distributed the extra money equally in respect of all No. 1 feed deliveries. Some got 18 cents extra and some got 91 cents extra, and that is what the issue is all about.

I understand from reading the press that a number of farmers have grouped together in Alberta and are suing the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain companies for many millions of dollars because they claim they got No. 1 feed grade for their barley and found out that this was later graded malting barley, yet they only got a final 18 cents a bushel extra payment. In effect they are accusing the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain companies of stealing their grain and are asking for recompense in a class action. I suspect that is the reason for this sudden amendment. This is being made retroactive so that it can be legitimately pooled this year and so that there will be some way to know that the farmer receives the amount of money he should receive rather than having it given to the grain companies or having it spread over all the feed grades.

● (2020)

I say that even though the Canadian Wheat Board has a long record of successful activity that satisfies the great bulk of the farmers, every so often something goes wrong. When it comes to not paying the farmer for the grade of grain as delivered to the elevator and when he is not given the exact price for the exact grade, it is in effect stealing from that farmer and is in breach of the Grain Act.

This brings up the third point I want to make. Twice this afternoon the necessity of protein grading has been mentioned. I think the minister has been very delinquent in not taking the opportunity to get amendments into the act and in not having used this opportunity to make it mandatory that the grain companies provide protein grading at the elevators. Going back 20 years, the argument was that it was impossible for the Board of Grain Commissioners and for the Canadian Wheat Board to grade at the elevators. It was argued that the elevator men were not smart enough to carry out the protein grading technique. That was always a fallacy. So long as the farmers were paid on the basis of the number of pounds brought to the elevator and on the basis of the colour, there was no breach of the law. Now that we are not selling grain on the basis of pounds and colour but on the basis of protein content it is a different story.

Today we are selling at the coasts to overseas buyers wheat graded on an average of 13.5 or 12.5 per cent protein. That is what we are paid for. Our customers demand a guaranteed percentage of protein in the wheat they buy. They are buying protein and not wheat. Therefore under the Grain Act if you sell grain on the basis of protein content you must pay the individual farmer in respect of what he delivered to the elevator on the basis of what it is sold for, and if it is sold on the basis of protein content he should be paid at that rate. If this is not the case then there will be a breach of the Grain Act because this will represent stealing from the individual farmer. Therefore the minister, who knows all this, should have attempted to put into this legislation a clear mandatory direction that grain be graded on a protein content basis so that each farmer would know the amount of protein he delivered. If the grain were mixed after that, that would be fair enough. But the farmer should be paid on the basis of percentage of protein he delivered.

I say very bluntly to the minister that I suspect that so long as we continue buying from the farmer on the basis of the existing grading at the elevator, and turn around and sell his grain on a different basis of protein grade, the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain companies are in breach of the Grain Act and are subject to class actions for damages by the farmers when they get mad enough and find out about it.

The minister should have been on top of this. He should have forced the grain companies to modernize their systems and put in this type of grading. I think that is what we should have been discussing here tonight because I believe it is even more important than just the barley malting pool. The principle in both cases is identical.

The pool system is being amended to provide a malting pool so that the farmers will be paid for what they deliver. Why should the farmers not be paid for what they deliver on the basis of the protein content of the wheat, which is nine or ten times more important relatively than the barley problem?

I suggest that the royal commission which is now holding hearings in the west on transportation and grain handling should make a very strong recommendation that the Canadian Wheat Board be asked to have the Canadian Wheat Board Act amended to make it mandatory that the Board and its agents, the grain companies, pay the farmers for what they deliver to the elevator on the basis of the protein grade of the delivered wheat.

I am very annoyed that after all these years, when we have an opportunity to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, we do not get at this basic weakness which has existed ever since Canada began to sell on the basis of protein grade from the elevators. I realize this means that the elevator companies will have to be modernized so that they can not only buy the grain and dry the grain but also grade it on a protein basis.

Once again may I say I think this royal commission should very strongly recommend to the government that the elevator companies be asked, as the royal commission has asked the railway companies, to bring in a rational plan for elevators all through the prairies instead of having this 30-year old long drawn out struggle to avoid giving up older elevators in place of the modern ones we should have had 30 years ago. Now that the elevator companies are exposed I think they should be asked by the royal commission, just as the railways were asked, to bring in a rational plan to modernize elevators so that we are not overwhelmed by irrational building by the various companies. I hope the royal commission will see that as a good recommendation to make. Naturally I would have liked the government to have heeded the pressure of public demand and common sense and to have done it in this legislation.

The next point I wish to make is one that does not require an amendment. There is an interesting clause in section 25(2) of the Canadian Wheat Board Act. I will read this section because it deals with farm storage:

The Board shall,—

I think this is understood by the minister.

—if directed by regulation, pay to each producer at the time of delivery of wheat to the Board, in addition to any other payment authorized by this section, a sum per bushel on account of storage of the said wheat on the producer's farm, . . .

If we are to have a rational grain storage system both at the sea coast terminals and at the country terminals, into that storage system must be built, if we are to have a rational plan, some provision for farm storage. I bring this up particularly in respect of the branch lines.

There has been an ongoing difference of opinion between the farmers and the railroads on these branch lines where the steel is not too good and where the roadbed has not been maintained during the last 20 or 30 years. These branch lines do not operate in the winter months. In some cases where the lines have been built up it is relatively easy for the railway to keep them open and service them in the winter, but there are many hundreds of miles of branch lines where it will be many years, and require the expenditure of many millions of dollars, before they are raised high enough and will be of heavy enough steel to warrant their being kept open during the winter season when the snow has drifted across the tracks.

● (2030)

If the railways could save money by not having to operate trains on those branch lines which only require one train a week, for example, if those trains were stopped for the winter—as most of them are now anyway—so the railways would not have to expend money to snowplough the tracks,—if the railways were given instructions from the Canadian Transport Commission to let these lines lie idle during the winter months, then the farmers along those lines would be quite satisfied if they had the opportunity to get paid for the grain stored on their farms during the periods of non-delivery. They would be glad to store this grain at half the rate that the grain companies demand.

It is an injustice to the farmer who cannot get his grain into the elevators in the fall, and who cannot transport it in the winter because of lack of movement of trains, that he cannot take advantage of the provision in the act which allows the Canadian Wheat Board to pay for the storage of his grain on his own farm until the spring. If he kept his grain on his farm, and assuming it did not interfere with the Wheat Board deliveries to market, he could be compensated at 5 cents a month or 3 cents for six months, and he would be quite satisfied that justice had been done.

I would have liked to have heard some mention made by the minister that he was aware of the fact that this should have been part of the over-all rationalization of the handling of grain on the western farms which would not force the railways to go to extra expense if they did not have to, and at the same time which would allow grain to be held back from lines which would not have to be kept open in the winter. It would be fair both to the grain companies and the farmers along the lines if they got paid for their storage as were farmers along other lines who got their grain into the elevators or could get it to market. I put this suggestion forward knowing that it does not require an amendment to the act because the act allows it now. This requires a decision of the minister and of the Canadian Wheat Board, and I would like to see them think about it and do something about it rather than being told by the

royal commission, when it reports in a year or so, that this should have been done.

In summary, what I have tried to do tonight is to put in perspective the work of the Canadian Wheat Board in serving the western farmer as equitably and fairly as it can, to point out that the minister should be congratulated for having made the advisory committee an elected body which we hope can give good advice to the Wheat Board, and to give the minister a little bit of a poke to amend the act insofar as the barley malting pool is concerned. This pool is necessary to get around the difficulty which arose last year, not only because it arose once but because it was so serious last year that we had to amend the act. I should like to suggest very strongly that the minister made a great error in not making protein grading mandatory. I think this should be part of a comprehensive, rational system. I think this amendment would meet with the approval of most members from western Canada, but I could not resist the opportunity to put forward a few suggestions that would have made it much better.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. First of all I should like to speak on the portion dealing with the advisory committee. I think I can accept what the minister has done, although I will say that I had hoped the advisory committee would keep the Wheat Board closer to the producers and closer to the principle on the basis of which the Board was established. We have to remember that in the last six or seven years the political process had a great deal of influence on what has gone on in Wheat Board circles.

As I understand it, the Wheat Board was given the specified duty of getting for the farmers the best price that their product could bring, whether it was selling abroad or in Canada. It is quite easy to sell abroad at a good price, but it is not always so easy to sell the product well in Canada particularly when it comes to feed grains and products consumed in other parts of Canada. For instance, if feed barley is sold by the western farmer, should he receive all the money he can get on the world market or should he in the national interest accept a lesser price in order to give the feeder in eastern Canada an advantage or to eliminate excess price?

It is important that the Wheat Board be as close to the farmers as possible, and that the advisory committee to be elected by the farmers act as a watch dog on what the Wheat Board is doing. It should be noted that the Wheat Board will function best if the political input from Ottawa is kept down to the minimum.

I should like to comment on the problem of barley which this bill seeks to rectify. It has come about because the producers of No. 1 feed barley this year are now seeing red. A good many of them have lost more than $2,000 a car lot because their earnings were lumped into the same pool as funds from lower priced feed barley.

Indications that a separate pool for selected and accepted barley will be instituted this year are not going down too well with producers who lost heavily in the past year. As some producers have said:

It has never been this bad. It's the same as if someone puts their hand in your pocket and takes $2,000.

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

At this point we're unwilling to accept this kind of legislation. We feel there is mismanagement to the point where the government should rectify their errors.

It has all come about because of the shortage of malting barley and the fact that some feed barley was put in but the grower of better grade barley did not receive his proper return.

I have received a letter from a constituent, who made what I thought was a very good comment, in which he stated that he hoped that any proposed legislation and change would be retroactive to the 1974-75 crop year at least because this was the crop year when any significant difference in the pricing of the two types of barley took place. He writes:

Feed barley producers who have had their final payments increased by selected barley producers in 1974-75 should have no objection to have their final payments reduced by a like amount in 1975-76 to correct a situation that should never have been allowed to exist in the first place.

● (2040)

He suggests that the only known way to correct a wrong is by making it right. He goes on to say that it is not just luck that a barley sample is selected for malting. Malting barley requires any number of conditions which do not necessarily apply to feed barley. First, a variety must be grown which is acceptable to maltsters, and most barley varieties have disadvantages. They are usually lower yielding than feed varieties. They generally require earlier seeding to mature. They are more intensive and need more expensive weed control. They need proper timing of swathing to avoid damage by frost or shrinkage. Harvesting is a problem, and more care must be taken. Cleaning and marketing are more variable.

I think the minister in charge of the Wheat Board should consider what he could do for barley producers who have found themselves caught out this year. It is certainly true that many farmers do try to raise malting barley. They give it extra attention, but very often they do not succeed because of conditions beyond their control. When they do have the good luck and the good fortune to have a carload of malting barley, they should receive benefit from their work.

There is one other clause in the bill which interests me. It is clause 5 at page 8 of the bill. The explanation given of this clause is to correct an anomaly in the act since the act does not provide for an initial payment in respect of rye, flaxseed, and rapeseed. I should like to hear an explanation of the purpose of this clause from the minister because it is my understanding with regard to rye, flaxseed, and rapeseed on the open market that there would be no necessity to have an initial payment unless it was decided to put these under the Wheat Board. However, I think it is important that before any of these grains be put under the Wheat Board the views of the majority of producers be ascertained in the usual manner.

Because there is not usually very much opportunity to discuss the problems of the wheat grower, I should like to speak about a problem which is common to the northern part of the prairies, particularly my area, which is a parkland area. All wheat now grown in the parkland area, which I understand this year is approximately 100 million bushels, is grown in the area stretching from the Peace River country through northern Alberta, northern Sas-

katchewan and on into Manitoba. All of it is pretty well graded No. 3 Red this year. The next grade below No. 3 Red is No. 3 Utility wheat, or what is commonly known as feed wheat.

The price differential between No. 3 Red and No. 3 Utility is anywhere from 40 cents a bushel to 60 cents a bushel. This seems to have come about because of the change in the grading system, and it is causing a great deal of consternation and reassessment about what farmers should grow in my area. We in the parkland area have always accepted that we grow lower protein wheat, but generally speaking we grow more bushels, and by and large there has always been a market around the world for the parkland wheat even if it has not commanded the same high price as southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta wheat.

The recent changes in the grading system seem to have made No. 3 Red wheat a relatively unwanted variety in the grain trade. The changeover from the grading system meant, presumably, that No. 1 and No. 2 were to go into the new No. 1 Red; No. 3 and No. 4 were to go into No. 2 Red; No. 5 and a bit of No. 6 were to go into No. 3; and the balance of No. 6 and feed wheat were to go into the new grade 3 utility. However, while the drawings and the propaganda put out by the Board of Grain Commissioners have these all neatly circled, in practice I have found that the government grading system as well as that of elevator agents—and they are not to blame—is that they are putting pretty well all wheat in the parkland area in No. 3 Red. In other words, they are really grading protein by areas.

I had occasion to take a sample of wheat to two individual elevator buyers. I asked them what this would grade under the old system, and they said it was at least a poor No. 3 or a good No. 4. This should have put it into the grade 2 Red, but in effect it did not because the Board of Grain Commissioners people graded all this No. 3 Red, which is considerably below what it would have graded under the old grading system.

What is the effect of this? The effect has been that No. 3 Red wheat has had a hard job this year finding a market around the world. Many farmers in my constituency have delivered no wheat this year because there was no room. One country point only had ten cars in the last four months, none of which was No. 3 Red wheat. Even No. 3 Utility wheat is moving faster than No. 3 Red. Furthermore, elevator agents and farmers point out that the difference between No. 3 Red and No. 3 Utility was 60 cents a bushel last year, 40 cents a bushel this year, and that the difference between grading No. 3 Red and No. 3 Utility in many cases is not easy.

These changes are having a very adverse effect on the grading of wheat on many millions of acres. I should like to know why this is. Is there some collusion, so to speak, between the Wheat Board, the Board of Grain Commissioners and grain handling companies? It will obviously be easy for the Wheat Board to sell grades 1 and 2 around the world. The percentage of high grade wheat moving in international circles has remained fairly high, at 26 per cent or 27 per cent. It has been fairly consistent over the last number of years.

But what about No. 3 Red? That is a harder thing to sell, whereas previously it was easily sold, particularly this past year. Is the Wheat Board always making an effort to sell No. 3 Red wheat? A good deal of the wheat is being pushed down into No. 3 Utility and into feed grain, and I suspect that the Wheat Board does not find this all that bad because it is relieved of attempting to dispose of a sizeable portion of the No. 3 Red crop around the world. I think this is unfortunate.

I think we are doing ourselves out of a market, and as the amount of grain involved is one hundred million bushels at $4 or $5 a bushel, that represents half a billion dollars. If this is lost, our farmers and our economy are certainly much worse off. If grain is not going to be graded any higher than No. 3 Red and if it will not be easily sold, there may be a shift in farming practices. I suggest that in the new grading system there should be another grade between No. 3 Red and feed wheat.

Of course, having the new system has been advantageous to grain handling companies because it has reduced their binning requirements necessary to carry out more grades. Grading is not uniform. I have known elevator agents say, "If you were in southern Saskatchewan I could grade this grain as No. 1; but here we must grade it as No. 3." That shows that the grading system is hazy in operation and not serving the farmers. I hope the minister and the grain commissioners will look at the matter and correct it. Possibly the solution lies in introducing another grade which could be equivalent to Nos. 5 and 6 under the old grading system. This, I think, would best serve the farming community, particularly the farming community of western Canada.

● (2050)

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring two or three matters to the attention of hon. members, particularly those interested in the production and movement of grain. I suggest that all hon. members ought to be vitally interested in what is happening to prairie grain on world markets, as grain sales vitally affect our country's well-being. We sell about $3 billion worth of grain on world markets. These grain sales improve our balance of trade, something we should not forget.

I was concerned, on returning to this House, to discover that the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, who is also the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang)—

Mr. Benjamin: And acting government House leader today.

Mr. Towers: —and acting House leader could not answer our questions during the question period. He said he did not know the answers. Obviously the reason is that he has not been in Ottawa, keeping in touch with events; he has been in western Canada, traipsing around in the Jetstar and trying to sell his stabilization bill to producers. The minister reminds me of Nero who fiddled while Rome burned. He was fiddling around in western Canada, trying to sell a program not too acceptable to western grain producers. By accepting our advice he could have designed a workable program. He would not have needed to spend several weeks out west trying to sell his program to producers. When he appeared in Red Deer, two known Liber-

als clapped their hands—not at what he said, but perhaps because he is such a good looking fellow.

We question certain aspects of this bill and will consider them further, in detail when the bill is in committee. In some ways the faults of this bill are similar to the faults of the grain stabilization bill. As was pointed out at the meeting in Red Deer, the grain stabilization bill is dictatorial, as is this bill. After the stabilization program has been in place three years, the producer cannot opt out. He is locked in. Orders in council can raise or lower tariffs, but it is dangerous to introduce a program from which the producer cannot opt out. The same is true of the bill we are considering.

Mr. Benjamin: That's nonsense. You can't opt out of the Canada Pension Plan.

Mr. Towers: Yes, but the government is assuming too much control over the administrative aspects of the bill. I know that on second reading we are not supposed to speak in detail on the clauses of the bill. Nevertheless, allow me to read part of proposed section 10.5(3) wherein it says:

> The Governor in Council may make regulations respecting the conduct of an election of members of the Advisory Committee and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations . . .

The following subparagraphs specify that there shall be regulations prescribing the qualifications of members of the advisory committee, regulations governing the making and withdrawing of nominations, and so on. The provision for elections puts me in mind of what happens in Russia. If the government wants to introduce such regulations, why must we elect an advisory committee? Logically, if the advisory committee is elected, it should control the program and be responsible to its electors. Why should control of the program be vested in Ottawa, in the cabinet? Why should the minister in charge of the Wheat Board try to exercise control of the committee? I cannot accept that provision as logical or reasonable.

If an advisory committee is to be elected, surely it will be composed of members who will want to act in the best interests of prairie grain producers. Why should the governor in council be given ultimate responsibility? The point is one of fundamental importance.

The bill contains other provisions for the making of rules and regulations for the pooling and sale of grain. It will be to the advantage of grain producers if malting barley sales are pooled. Certainly members representing grain producing ridings have received letters from producers complaining about losses in the last two years. On average producers lost about $2,000 per carload; no small amount. If the minister in charge of the Wheat Board had been sufficiently far-sighted, he would have foreseen what could happen. Why should producers on average have lost that $2,000? Grain producers have every right to know.

Sometimes the difference between various grades of barley used for malting is small. There could be little difference between No. 1 feed and 3C grain or barley used for malting. I had a letter from a man who took two carloads of malting barley from the same bin. One was graded 3CW and the other No. 1 feed. To all intents and purposes it was the same grade of grain. He wondered why the grain had been graded differently. He lost about $2,000 on the deal. Clearly, eliminating such discrepancies would be to the benefit of producers.

As the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) suggested earlier, the $2,000 lost might find its way to the pockets of some grain companies. There is a loophole here which ought to be closed. The advisory committee could close it. I do not think it is up to the governor in council to make an order in this regard.

The bill also deals with the pooling and handling of grain. I do not like the provision in the bill for a further tinkering by the governor in council with regard to the cutoff date for the pooling aspect. I do not think it is right, necessary or logical.

● (2100)

Hon. members will recall that during the 1972 election campaign the minister in charge of the Wheat Board did a little tinkering. He had a final payment made prior to the end of the year. This upset a lot of producers because they were used to getting the final payment after the year end and had governed their sales accordingly. This payment upset their whole financial operation. They had to pay income tax on an income they had not anticipated.

This upsetting aspect was not just limited to producers, but to members of the other place. Immediately after that, they brought in a bill stipulating that payments only be made after the beginning of a new calendar year. They were aware of this tinkering by the minister in charge of the Wheat Board.

The minister is now going to do more tinkering. In this bill there is provision to allow adjustment of the pooling cutoff. It is neither reasonable nor necessary; in fact, the advisory committee could do that. They know when the cutoff should be. If an election is to be held in a year or two, the minister in charge of the Wheat Board could manipulate the final payment to such a degree that it would be of benefit to the government. I do not like this kind of tinkering. It is not fair. I am sure that members opposite do not appreciate that provision the minister is including in this bill.

There is something else that concerns me. The Wheat Board is making provision for an amount in the vicinity of $10 million to provide a storage facility on the west coast. This is made up of producer dollars. We see what is happening in other aspects of industry. Governments provide facilities for the provision or development of manufactured products. We see what is happening in CIDA. Canadian dollars are made available for the promotional activity of manufacturers in this country. I do not see why the federal government cannot undertake this obligation rather than having the Wheat Board undertake it.

There are many things that could be of great benefit to the prairie grain producer. These provisions could be made by the advisory committee. I suggest they will be well versed on the requirements of the industry. More cognizance should be given to them rather than having the control left in the hands of the governor in council.

It is time we realized that all knowledge of the grain industry and the future well-being does not necessarily rest with the government of the day, whether it be with the present government or some future government. More

power should be given to the advisory committee because they know the score. They know what is taking place.

I hope that in committee government members and the minister in charge of the Wheat Board will give consideration to the comments that I have made. I do not think the government should take much more control of the industry. A shortcoming of all governments is that they try to build empires. There is no room for any empire building in the production of grain in western Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

MOTOR VEHICLE TIRE SAFETY ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH SAFETY STANDARDS FOR TIRES

Hon. C. M. Drury (for the Minister of Transport) moved that Bill S-8, respecting the use of national safety marks in relation to motor vehicle tires and to provide for safety standards for certain motor vehicle tires imported into or exported from Canada or sent or conveyed from one province to another, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Drury (for the Minister of Transport) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on third reading of Bill S-8. I might say at the outset that we are generally pleased to see this bill brought forward for third reading—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kempling: Just wait for the lines. I might say something nasty before I am finished. We are pleased because several on this side of the House, including the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), had considerable input into the second reading debate and the committee hearings. I also commend the minister's parliamentary secretary—

Mr. Benjamin: Don't do that.

Mr. Kempling: Well, you have to give a bit of credit once in a while.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kempling: All right, you win.

Mr. Benjamin: It was all written out for him.

Mr. Kempling: We made several amendments to the bill. As a result of some private meetings a consensus was reached on the amendments and the final form of the bill. This is one of the better bills that have been handled since I have been here. We were able to make reasonable progress both at second reading and committee stage.

As hon. members know, the bill deals with tire safety standards and a national tire safety mark. In its original form it provided for the establishment of a record keeping system at the retail level and for a system of inspection to ensure that the records were maintained. I am happy to say that the government recognized the weakness of such a procedure and withdrew that provision in committee. As a matter of fact it was agreed to proceed with the debate on second reading only on the understanding that this provision would be removed.

● (2110)

During the committee stage further changes were made. The term "distributor" was defined along lines more in keeping with those understood by the trade. The bill was further amended to require record-keeping by manufacturers, importers, and others connected with interprovincial trade. Notification of a defective tire was required by certified mail rather than by registered mail as originally written in the bill—we felt this would be an easier, faster, and less costly procedure.

Some amendments were made to Part II of the bill having to do with inspectors and powers of inspectors. As a result we feel the measure now has a reasonable chance of being accepted and implemented broadly across the country by all levels of the trade.

There were other clauses we would have liked to have seen changed. We are still not happy about the definition of safety standards in clause 20. However, we reluctantly accept the testimony of the department's officials that there was no intention to lay down design criteria—nor are they, in fact, capable of designing tires.

Mr. Mazankowski: We know that. They are bureaucrats.

Mr. Kempling: We know they are not capable of designing anything except a lot of red tape. Hon. members may have noticed recently that a new tire process has been developed in Britain. The tire tread is compressed on to the casing in such a way as to resist cuts in the tread. This promises improved safety and much longer tire life. Such developments are, of course, in the nature of the tire business. It is highly competitive, a high profile business which requires a well organized distribution chain backed by competent service. In the tire business you will find thousands of small businessmen. Both they and the consumers will benefit from this legislation.

When this bill passes and is proclaimed, tires which are being imported into Canada in increasing numbers will come under its control. This is an aspect which concerns us. I do not know whether the legislation we are considering will straighten it out or not, but our tire industry is floundering rather badly right now. The last time I looked at the statistics I found we were producing only about 50 per cent of the radial tires consumed in Canada. If there is any industry in Canada with a potential which is not presently being fulfilled, it is the tire industry. Perhaps

when this legislation passes and imported tires are required to go through the inspection process, we may see our own tire dealers become a little more expansionary in their thinking and make added capacity available to serve the domestic market.

Under the bill as presently written, a customer purchasing a tire will have to fill out a card on which the serial number is recorded. This information will be kept by the manufacturer, or importer, or by the interprovincial distributor, and in the event of a tire being found defective they will be required to notify the consumer by certified mail. We think this is how it should be done. The tire industry in general agrees with this procedure. I believe the retail and wholesale dealers across the country are in favour of it and, as I said earlier, the legislation has a reasonable chance of being accepted broadly across the country to the benefit of everyone who purchases tires.

The bill before us started off in the other place and, after lengthy hearings during which some really good evidence was presented, it found its way to this House. Really, it was the evidence presented at the Senate hearings which gave us the idea where to go to get certain changes made. What seemed strange to me was that the government appeared reluctant to accept the testimony presented at the Senate hearings by knowledgeable people.

When it became apparent that the original intent of the government with regard to safety standards was being changed in such a way as to mean the establishment of another great bureaucracy of inspectors to check the records of retail stations, many people who looked at the legislation objectively became angry. Subsequently, to its credit, there was a change of mind; there had been a change of ministers and parliamentary secretaries and we were able to negotiate, one might say.

We wanted to see the legislation passed but we believed the government should remove the record-keeping clause applying to retail tire dealers. As I say, the minister, the parliamentary secretary and the officials saw the wisdom of this approach, and to their credit they made the change which we were proposing. We thought it was a good move. As a matter of fact it was this concession which got the bill going again and prompted us to take it through second reading into committee and pass it there in a relatively short period of time. I hope we can dispose of it this evening so that it can proceed, presumably, to the Senate—

Mr. Benjamin: And you and the minister with it!

Mr. Kempling: I hear the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) say something down there. If he gets involved in this discussion we will be talking about it this time next year. In spite of what he may say—and I know he is capable of saying anything—I still believe that those on all sides who were involved with the bill before us deserve praise because it is one of the few bills with regard to which I have seen close co-operation. If we could only do the same with respect to more pieces of legislation we in this House would be very much more productive.

● (2120)

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this third reading debate on Bill S-8, which was originally introduced in the other place as Bill S-3, I think something over two years ago. As the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) has pointed out, we on this side of the House generally support the principle of the bill, though quite frankly the first version presented to the House of Commons, having passed the other place, was a very bad piece of legislation. As the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth said, Bill S-8 represents a vast improvement over that first version with which we were presented.

Had Bill S-3, which is now Bill S-8, been passed in its original form I venture to say that probably one half or three quarters of our independent tire dealers in Canada would have been out of business. Testimony presented to us clearly brought to light the bureaucratic nightmare that this piece of legislation would have caused, and which would have made the whole operation quite unworkable.

In saying this I suppose I am criticizing those in the other place and I am not sure it is parliamentary to do so, but I will take a chance on that anyway.

Mr. Paproski: Come on, feel free.

Mr. Mazankowski: I think the examination of this legislation in the other place left much to be desired, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. members of the other place touched the periphery of the contents of this bill, but although some very major objections were raised and talked about, very little action was taken. While the intent of the bill and the principle of the bill are both laudable, I do not think the provisions of the bill would have been properly realized, nor would the objective of safety have been properly achieved had it not been for the close scrutinization by the members of the House of Commons and the further scrutinization that took place in the transport committee.

I think as originally presented the bill was clearly a classic example of bureaucratic overkill as a result of which the objective of safety would not have been fulfilled. I base this statement in part on testimony presented to the committee, as well as on testimony given in the United States where a similar registration process is currently in existence and where the compliance record is something in the order of 20 to 30 per cent.

Bringing in a piece of legislation that is unworkable, unmanageable, and which will not be complied with will never achieve the purpose for which it is intended. This was the major fault we saw in this piece of legislation. As I said before, these points were clearly identifiable in the testimony examined in the committee and debates in the other place, but our hon. friends in the other place failed to pursue the issues and thereby failed in their attempts to make it a workable piece of legislation. I must say I regret that.

As the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth pointed out, while the bill is far from perfect there have been some major improvements made to it which can be either added to later or improved upon once the legislation comes into force. Certainly the bureaucratic mess that the bill in its original form would have created would not be in the best interests of motor vehicle safety.

As presently framed the bill provides for a form of voluntary registration and for a recall mechanism between

manufacturer and end user, which in this case is the final consumer. We think it is in the best interests of consumers to take advantage of the safety provisions in this bill, the recall system, and the registration provisions as prescribed in the regulations. In the event that a consumer purchases a tire from a tire dealer or manufacturer and that particular type of tire becomes defective, the consumer will be notified if a recall is necessary.

As the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth has said, there are some areas in the bill that still give us on this side of the House cause for concern. For example, the notification of a defect as provided for in clause 8 still causes us some concern. We are indeed delighted that the bill has eliminated the necessity for the small tire dealer and retailer to notify the consumer. Now the onus is placed directly upon the manufacturer.

Another criticism that we have relates to clause 8(1) under which, as we read the bill, a manufacturer is guilty of an offence if he fails to give notice of a defect in a tire that is not necessarily sold but which is moved through the merchandizing system of the company. The manufacturer must give notice by certified mail of such defect, otherwise he is guilty of an offence. That is all very well and good when it applies to the end user, the consumer, and we certainly find no fault with that.

Mr. Benjamin: You want it both ways, do you?

Mr. Mazankowski: My hon. friend from Regina-Lake Centre would not appreciate this because he really does not understand business. He believes the best way to achieve an objective is to nationalize or socialize; he does not really understand or appreciate the ramifications of competition in the workaday world of business among small entrepreneurs, at the distributor level, and so on and so forth. As far as he is concerned, the more regulations the better. He and his colleagues are great advocates of that, and to some extent the government of the day has fallen for that sort of poppycock, which is why we are in the trouble we are in today.

An hon. Member: Has he worked for the CPR too?

Mr. Mazankowski: He has probably worked for the CPR and the CN. As far as he is concerned he would probably much rather have worked for the CN because it was a nationalized corporation. If he had his way he would nationalize the whole railway network.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member return to Bill S-8.

Mr. Benjamin: Don't do that; that would ruin everything.

Mr. Mazankowski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but these kind of interjections lead one into a discussion of the whole transportation industry, and a lot of our goods are transported on rubber. That is one of our problems. As far as the hon. member is concerned, we should be using steel wheels.

● (2130)

Mr. Benjamin: How about square wheels?

Mr. Mazankowski: As I was attempting to point out, it is all well and good to engage in a registered mail or certified letter process when notifying the end user, but in the case of notification of the merchandising network, such as the distributors, dealers and sub-dealers, there are perhaps better and more effective methods.

The wording of the bill as it now stands makes it an offence for a manufacturer not to notify by certified mail. In the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the committee in support of this piece of legislation it was brought out that there may very well be other methods that could prove more effective in the notification process than registered mail. The manufacturer, however, is faced with the possibility of being guilty of an offence if he fails to notify his dealer or distributor by certified mail. All I am saying is that there are other ways and means, such as the telex system. There could be a telephone call within the system. I think there is a differentiation to be made here.

Within the merchandising system we have a different situation than in the case of the consumer or end user. I have no argument or qualms about the provisions which require that the end user be notified by registered mail or certified letter, but there are procedures and methods that could be utilized in notification within the merchandising process. We were given the assurance by the parliamentary secretary and officials of the Department of Transport that such regulations which clarify the notification process will be presented so that the process will not only be effective but also not overly burdensome.

It stands to reason that it would be sheer lunacy to suggest that when a manufacturer ships out 75,000 tires to 3,000 dealers he must send out a certified letter or a letter by registered mail notifying them of a pending difficulty. Surely there are other more appropriate ways and means. It may well be suggested that this is a technicality, but I think it is a matter of some concern to manufacturers.

Our second area of concern is that part which deals with the definition of safety standards. While we appreciate that the definition does conform to the definition in the Motor Vehicle Act, after which this particular piece of legislation is patterned, we were not convinced by the testimony and arguments presented by the parliamentary secretary and the officials that the final test is in performance. We believe the safety standard definitions could in fact regulate the design and construction to such an extent that this may well affect future advancement in the manufacture and production of tires. The Michelin people, for example, in a letter which was submitted to the committee on November 19, stated:

> We feel that the definition of "Safety Standards"... should not be worded in a manner which could considerably restrict future design possibilities and innovations. "Safety Standards" should mean actual performance standards and all marking requirements specifically. We feel that design and construction of a tire, as we would define those words, are such that they should be left specifically to the manufacturer.

In addition, it is pointed out in a letter to myself from the Michelin people as follows:

> We would like to point out in more general terms, to yourself, that in establishing new performance standards, which are in essence minimum standards, that they can have quite the reverse effect to that

desired, instead of bringing up the standards of the lesser grades of a product it can encourage design down to those minimum standards.

An hon. Member: What is the date of the letter?

Mr. Mazankowski: That date of that letter is March 19, 1976, and I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention because I think it is a very pertinent and logical argument.

We do not want to bring forward a bill that would provide for minimum safety standards. What we want to do is encourage optimum standards in respect of automobile tires, whether that be safety and/or performance.

The suggestion here by the Michelin people is that the current definition in the bill establishes a minimum standard which could in fact encourage the tire manufacturers to design downward rather than upward. This is something that may well be a valid consideration. Quite frankly I think the definition could have been dressed up considerably. I do not believe it is the intention of the ministry to dictate design and construction to automobile tire manufacturers. That being the case, this should not be included in the bill.

Safety standards as now defined at page 2 of the bill mean standards regulating the design, construction or function of a motor vehicle tire for the purpose of protecting persons against personal injury, impairment of health, or death.

Quite frankly we believe the key here is performance rather than design and construction. It really does not matter what sort of formula is used in the fabricating of a tire as long as it is safe, performs properly, and meets these standards. We think we can live with that. However, in the opinion of the minister and his representatives, that was not a valid argument. I simply reiterate that we have some reservations about that aspect of the bill.

The other area about which we have some concern is the power of the inspectors. Here again we may be overly concerned, but I feel I must place on the record some of the concerns that have been advanced by the Michelin tire people. I do not have any association with the Michelin people, but I do know, as I am sure many of my colleagues do, that they have set optimum standards in terms of tires and tire safety. Therefore I value the points they have advanced in respect of this particular piece of legislation. They are somewhat concerned about the wording of the section as it relates to the design and construction, but more so in terms of clause 11 as it now stands.

● (2140)

I refer to a letter directed to the Committee on Transportation and Communications dated March 24, 1976. It states:

With clause 11 as it stands now, there is no limitation of power of the inspectors, therefore an inspector can enter any Canadian tire manufacturing facility, photocopy all documents to his liking, freeze all movement of products for a period of 90 or more days and walk away.

The consequences are easy to imagine: work methods and procedures, trade secrets as well as production capacities available to all government employees, thus the Canadian public. Frozen movement of the products will stop production lines causing massive lay-offs and therefore economic hardship to the affected company and to the employees of that company.

It may seem an exaggeration, but with the clause 11 of the act as it is worded now, this is possible and it is in the hands of one inspector who, according to clause 11 (1), may reasonably believe there is any motor vehicle tire of a class etc.

Gentlemen, we appeal to you, as members of the standing committee, to reconsider the powers of the inspector, to seek assurance that only when an actual safety related problem is evident, is the inspector entitled to the search and seizure powers conferred by this act.

Perhaps that may be a bit of over-exaggeration but nonetheless I think it draws attention to the very wide powers the inspectors have under the provisions of this bill.

With those reservations, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in seeing this bill move forward because I believe it is a bill which clearly all Canadians would support. We on this side of the House support it. We are grateful to members on the government side for accepting some of our suggestions and for dealing in a very serious and sincere way with the reservations we advanced.

Along with my good friend from Halton-Wentworth I wish to pay a tribute to the parliamentary secretary, who indeed has been very helpful in respect of this bill.

In closing I want to say this piece of legislation has one glaring loophole in that it fails to recognize the retread tire. As I pointed out in my initial remarks, this bill has been before the House for over two years. During that time in the testimony that was advanced we were led to believe there would be a code of standards brought forward by the government relating to the safety standards of retreads. It is very discouraging to note that there has not been any progress in this particular area.

While there has been some concern by the government about moving this bill forward, there has been absolutely no progress, so far as we are aware, concerning the question of the retread tire. I think the Ministry of Transport and the government have been derelict in providing leadership to bring together the retreaders and manufacturers in the kind of association that would provide the kind of standards which should govern the sale of retread tires across the country.

It seems to me that a retreaded tire should pass a performance test just the same as a brand new tire. I am told that in the United States a retreader is responsible for maintaining the same standards as those required for a new tire. I think that is a very simple standard. During this two year interval in which we have focused attention on the question of tire safety I think it would have behooved the government and the Ministry of Transport to have come forward and established a proper code or a proper standard governing the sale of retreaded tires.

Mr. Benjamin: I wish you would make up your mind.

Mr. Mazankowski: While we welcome this particular bill as it applies to new tires, we must say very simply that we regret there has been little or no initiative taken in the area of retread tires. My friend said that he wished I would make up my mind. I am as interested as he is in the safety of tires. He does not have a monopoly on the question of safety. I happen to know a little more about the tire business than he. He may be a little jealous. I can assure him that I am as concerned about retread tires as I am about new tires, both of which are being sold very readily on today's market.

In the two years that this bill has been before the House one would have considered that the government, particularly this minister and his very effervescent and knowledgeable parliamentary secretary, before engaging in an attempt to sell us on this measure would have come forth with some positive recommendation in the area of retread tires. I hope that now we are giving them the satisfaction of the passage of this bill they will not delay too long in coming forward and perhaps orchestrating the kind of a system which should govern the sale of retread tires in this country.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this evening to see that on this occasion we are back before the House of Commons once again at the report stage of Bill S-8 to consider a number of amendments that have been proposed and approved by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. I hope this indicates that the House will give this bill its approval very shortly. In this connection I am very pleased to have heard the remarks of the hon. members who spoke just before me.

I want to express a word of thanks to the members of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and also to the witnesses who appeared before that committee in the course of our deliberations. I should like to thank the committee members for their co-operation in the thorough and fair consideration which I believe has resulted in some improvements to the bill. I should like to commend as well the very real contribution to this bill by the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) and the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

Dealing very briefly at the outset with the concluding comments of my friend from Vegreville, I want to assure him sincerely that the issue to which he referred, the matter of retread tires, is not one which has escaped the attention or the concern of the government. Indeed we share the concern he expressed this evening. I assure him work is going forward in that particular area, and I hope we may be able soon to contend with the problem which he outlined earlier this evening.

The history of this particular piece of legislation I think is pretty well understood. It was introduced in the Senate in its original form two years ago as Bill S-3. After examination by the Senate Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and subsequent approval by the Senate, the bill unfortunately expired on the order paper of the House of Commons. It was re-introduced and passed by the other place in October, 1974, as Bill S-8. First reading was given to Bill S-8 in this House in October, 1974, and second reading was completed on March 4, 1976. Our Standing Committee on Transport and Communications has given careful study to the bill and has approved a number of amendments which I believe have improved this piece of legislation, as I said earlier.

● (2150)

The general objectives of the Motor Vehicle Tire Safety Act have not changed in the course of the last couple of years of work. This bill, when passed, will lead to increased safety of Canadian motorists and will prevent unfair competition for Canadian tire manufacturing plants.

During discussion of this bill, both at second reading and in the standing committee, the need for such a bill has been questioned. In particular there has been some suggestion that the implementation of this legislation will not contribute greatly to road safety. On the other hand, I believe many of the comments made during second reading related to the very real concern that many of us have about the quality and safety of the tires that are offered for sale in this country.

The testimony that many of us had the opportunity to hear in the committee demonstrated that Canadian manufacturers are indeed doing an excellent job in producing first class tires for the Canadian consumer. However, there was also testimony that indicated that on occasion defective tires do get produced and do result in serious road accidents. It is the objective of this bill to see that these occasions are rare and that when they do occur that motorists have the opportunity of being notified in advance of the defects so that they may avoid driving their cars on potentially dangerous tires.

The passage of this bill will also enhance federal-provincial co-operation by assisting the provinces in overcoming problems involving the control of tire safety at the point of retail sale.

The main provisions of this legislation probably bear repeating and emphasizing at this time. The bill will establish the authority for the governor in council to prescribe safety standards for minimum tire safety requirements. These standards will be established for new tires manufactured in Canada and for all tires imported into this country. The bill establishes a national tire safety mark and, by use of the mark, tire manufacturers will be certifying that they comply with the prescribed safety standards.

Manufacturers and distributors will be prohibited from exporting or from sending or carrying from one province to another motor vehicle tires to which the national safety mark has not been applied. Manufacturers and importers will be required to give notice of any safety related tire defects of which they become aware. The bill establishes the method by which this notice must be given.

As has been mentioned earlier in the House this evening, the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications has given careful consideration to the problems this bill might have created for small distributors and dealers. As was mentioned during the second reading, it was never the government's intention to require dealers to maintain a detailed record system of their tire sales, nor was there any intention to establish a large staff of inspectors to ensure that the act was being complied with at the small distributor and dealer level. For this reason two main amendments were proposed, one establishing a record system in which consumers could have their names recorded if they so desired, and a second providing that inspectors already designated under the Motor Vehicle Safety Act be designated as inspectors under this act.

The committee, as a result of consultation, settled on a number of amendments which will limit certain responsibilities under the act to manufacturers, importers, and only those distributors who are in the business of selling in more than one province or country; the responsibility for giving notice of safety related defects, as a result of these

amendments, has been clearly left to the manufacturers and importers.

I think that as hon. members go through this legislation and compare the bill which is before the House this evening with the one which was referred to the committee some weeks ago they will find that a number of amendments have been made to it. For the information of those hon. members who would like to follow the course of this legislation I would point out that the most significant of these amendments are to clauses 2, 4, 5, and 7, and probably the most important is to clause 8.

The proposed change to clause 8 will result in the distributors having no responsibility for notifying subsequent tire purchasers of safety related defects. Instead this responsibility will lie entirely with the manufacturers or importers. Therefore the consumer will still be assured that he will be notified of a defect if he has his name recorded with the manufacturer or importer. However, distributors and dealers will not be responsible for maintaining a record of tire purchasers.

Clause 8(2)(a) is also to be amended so that certified mail may be used rather than registered mail in notifying purchasers of safety related defects.

Clause 10 is also a clause to which hon. members may wish to refer to see some of the work of the standing committee. Clause 11 was another such clause. In view of the lateness of the hour I will confine my concluding remarks to clause 11, and be brief with respect to it.

The proposed amendment to clause 11 will ensure that inspectors do not have a completely free run of a manufacturer's premises. Inspectors will be able to inspect tires at the point of manufacture. However, they will only be able to inspect completed tires that are to be offered for sale. Therefore they will not be involved with experimental or developmental tires. This possibility concerned the industry and, as the House has heard, it concerns hon. members opposite as well, and I believe these amendments will satisfy the industry that the inspectors will only be concerned with tires that will find their way into the market place.

I am satisfied that these amendments do not compromise the original objectives of the bill. In fact I believe they will strengthen the bill by making it more practical, and by more clearly defining the responsibilities of manufacturers, importers, and distributors. In view of all this I believe that at this time Bill S-8 is worthy of the support of all parties in this House.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the one minute left I only want to say that while we agree that this legislation should be passed we think it is window dressing. In spite of all the nit picking by the official opposition and the protestations by the government it will not guarantee proper safety and performance.

I would like to remind the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), who said he knows so much about the tire business, that I too dealt with it for about eight years and I know that every reputable small businessman and retailer keeps accurate records of the serial numbers, kinds, makes, and sizes of tires, and that whatever fears he might have had have nothing to do with safety and performance and the protection of the public.

[Mr. Goodale.]

The legislation can well be passed tonight but it will make little difference in experience in the next few years because both the government and the official opposition have chickened out and have not done something really important about tire safety.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could the acting House leader tell us what is the business for tomorrow?

Mr. Lang: At present it would be our inclination to call Bill C-89 and possibly Bill C-68, although the alternative would be to go to Bill C-61 and attempt to finish it tomorrow.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SUPPLY AND SERVICES—LOCKHEED CONTRACT—ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERIM FINANCING

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, without upsetting any delicate arrangements that may be about to be culminated with respect to the replacement of the Argus or interfering with it because all of us, particularly on this side, are very concerned that Maritime Command get a replacement, I wish to say that there is no question that we continue to agree that that replacement should be the Orion. However, we continue to have some very grave concern about mismanagement and very bad handling with respect to the details of the contract, and my purpose tonight is to try to touch on three questions which I raised shortly prior to the Easter recess with respect to perhaps a narrow aspect of this situation. They have to do with the authority or the absence of authority for the spending of any moneys by the Department of National Defence or on behalf of National Defence by the Department of Supply and Services, or the authorizing by Supply and Services of the expenditures of any funds prior to the establishment of a contract.

● (2200)

I think it would serve the understanding of Canadians, particularly hon. members on this side of the House, quite substantially if we were to understand a little more about the background for proceeding in the absence of a contract,

and particularly for proceeding when there was reason to believe that the contract would give rise to some considerable problems.

As I indicated, I do not particularly want to make comments or observations this evening which would jeopardize the situation as we now have it. I think we would be reassured if the parliamentary secretary could indicate to us tonight one or two things; first, if he could touch on the nature of the authority and from whence it came with respect to expenditures which were made in the absence of a contract; second, if he could give us some indication with respect to timing, because I understand that, perhaps even more than the Department of National Defence, the Department of Supply and Services continues to be very closely and deeply involved in this contract; third, we would appreciate hearing tonight a reiteration of the assurance that in connection with any announcement either the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) or the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) might again undertake immediately to table the contract and that the minister will refer that contract to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence so that the members of that committee and Canadians in general will have some understanding of the contract and some understanding of just what it is we are getting into.

Finally, there is a fourth area. I recognize that this falls a little closer into the area of policy which would be more clearly national defence, but in this interim period has any consideration been given by the ministry, by the Treasury benches, or by the Department of National Defence to proceeding with the development and work up of a contract which would effectively reduce, change or alter the form of the replacement equipment? What I am getting at is whether there has been any consideration given by the Treasury Board to charging other user departments a portion of the capital cost of the Orion so that the cost to the Department of National Defence will not be in the order of $60 million to $70 million, or possibly even $75 million or $80 million, but rather more in the order of $30 million. It seems unreasonable that the Department of National Defence should be asked to pay twice as much for an aircraft in terms of its capital cost when other government departments will utilize to an extensive degree the capacities and capabilities of this aircraft.

Those are the four areas upon which I should like the parliamentary secretary to touch. I think we would be enlightened and grateful, and I appreciate his being here this evening.

Mr. Walter Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to answer the hon. member's questions in three minutes. I shall begin by speaking on the interim financing arrangements for the Lockheed contract.

Regarding the interim financing for the Lockheed contract, it must be recognized that, as the contracting agency for most government departments, the Department of Supply and Services is not directly responsible for the provision of program funds to support the requirements of customers. Officers of the department and, particularly, the DSS members of the LRPA joint project office have been actively assisting the Department of National Defence in endeavours to resolve the DND cash shortfall in the early years of the program.

The matter has not been finalized as of this date and we have been requested to enter into an option arrangement with Lockheed whereby the price, schedules, and industrial benefits for the LRPA acquisition would be protected through April, 1976. This afternoon the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) said that he hoped to be in a position to make an announcement soon.

Let me now say a word with regard to the authority to spend the money. The cabinet initially approved the selection of the Lockheed P3 LRPA aircraft on November 27, 1975, and approval to contract was issued by Treasury Board on December 2, 1975. On this basis a conditional acceptance of Lockheed's offer which otherwise would have expired was issued in order to preserve the integrity of the offer, including price and Canadian industrial benefits. The same approval process has been followed in the case of the recently negotiated option to extend the original conditions, price, and benefits to April 30, 1976.

The hon. member also raised another question concerning the P3 LRPA. The aircraft is essentially configured to meet specific defence requirements, although certain items of surveillance equipment can also be utilized for non-military purposes such as pollution protection, ice reconnaissance and so on. During the definition phase a policy decision was made not to ask other departments to contribute to capital costs. However, new tasks could arise in future and cost recovery principles may apply when the aircraft are used on missions dedicated for other departments.

The Minister of National Defence has said on several occasions that negotiations taking place between the Lockheed company and the banks are going ahead in a constructive way. Earlier today, replying to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), the minister said that negotiations are in the final stages and an announcement will be made shortly. There is no change from the initially expressed intention of the Department of National Defence to proceed with the contract for the Lockheed long-range patrol aircraft which is to replace the Argus.

AIRPORTS—PICKERING—PLANS FOR USE OF LAND IN VIEW OF ABANDONMENT OF CONSTRUCTION PLANS

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the question I am raising tonight is connected with the question I directed initially to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on April 7. I then directed it to the acting Minister of Transport, who was then the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey); he, in turn, referred the question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Goodale) who said, as reported at page 12580 of *Hansard*, ".... I will certainly bring the question to the attention of the minister."

My question concerned Pickering. I simply asked if the government intended to return the Pickering area lands to previous owners and, if not, what exactly did the government propose to do with those lands. I asked the question even though in the last two or three years 84 oral questions concerning Pickering have been directed to the government. There is still tremendous doubt on what the govern-

ment's decision is to be on this unfortunately conceived project.

I asked my question because current statistics show that air travel in Canada and in many other parts of the world has, so to speak, "plateau-ed out." The government's repeated statements that somehow Malton will become overcrowded do not appear to be backed up by existing statistics. I would also point out that another tragedy, Mirabel, is perhaps becoming the most costly white elephant in the world. I think that we, as members of this House, have to accept the responsibility of ensuring that the government, in spite of itself, does not create a still more costly white elephant than Mirabel is at the present time.

● (2210)

I say this because when we review both the answers to written questions on this subject and to oral questions, we find there is a great discrepancy among the ministers who respond to the questions. For example, as long ago as May 1, 1974, in answer to a written question, the then parliamentary secretary to the minister of transport stated that the total cost, expressed in 1973 dollars, of Pickering would be $434,429,000. That seems to have been the high admitted cost of Pickering. Ever since, ministers one after another have played down the total cost of this concept, sometimes stating it might be about $200 million that is committed.

We know from the current estimates that the government is still proposing to spend money on Pickering in spite of the fact it is clear the majority of those in the Toronto area do not want this airport. It is clear the Ontario government has asked that the airport be delayed.

In short, my question of April 7 was simply one of clarification; would the present administration now tell us what it proposes to do with these lands, not only the expropriated lands, but the noise lands that it has so unfairly caused to be frozen surrounding the Pickering airport site?

Last fall my colleague from Blind River asked what it proposed to do with the farm land it had expropriated. At that time the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) indicated the government was going to endeavour to get farmers to come in and farm it while it waited for the actual development of Pickering. Hopefully the answer tonight will give some further knowledge. Has it in fact rented the land for farm purposes? Spring is here. It is important that those 18,000 acres be devoted as much as possible to agricultural production.

Historical sites are involved. What is the government's position? Has it finally accepted that there are certain significant historical sites there that should not be permanently destroyed, as was apparently the original intention of the present administration?

I would also like to point out that there has been much talk about the Gibson report. When you review the questions in this House, there was great anxiety on the part of the members as to the position of that inquiry. Subsequently there was a general feeling that the Gibson report gave fairly good evidence that the present administration should not continue with the project as originally intended. What is the attitude of the present administration? Does it intend to proceed in spite of the Gibson report, and

[Mr. Stevens.]

in spite of the attitude of the Ontario government that the project should not be allowed to continue?

It is time that the present administration gave us a candid answer. I hope it will come to its senses and say that it has agreed to abandon the project, it was an unfortunate concept in the beginning, it was something of a civil service dream that it finally realizes is not needed, and that the money that would be spent on Pickering will be spent on a much more worth-while cause than was originally proposed.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to respond this evening to my friend, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). I believe this is the first opportunity that I have had during a late show proceeding in this House to discuss an issue with the hon. gentleman. I take the gist of his question to be this: what plans does the Government of Canada have with respect to the land involved in the Pickering airport site?

While final statistics are not yet available, there appears to have been little or no growth in Toronto's air traffic during 1975, but this in itself is not sufficient reason to throw away for all time the option for the people of the Toronto area ultimately to establish airport facilities at the Pickering site. There have also been slowdowns in the past, but the hard lesson that must be learned in the art of forecasting demand for airport facilities is that one cannot decide major long term options on the basis of short term fluctuations in traffic.

We have reason to believe that the 1975 air traffic pattern is just that, a short term fluctuation in what would still appear to be an over-all upward trend, at least in the foreseeable future. This growth plateau is not surprising when one considers economic conditions in 1975 and the unusually high rate of growth between 1971 and 1974; Toronto traffic increased 56 per cent over those three years in comparison with total United States traffic growth of about 20 per cent in the same period.

On the likely basis then that traffic will increase again, it remains the view of the federal government that a second airport may well be needed in the Toronto area. For this reason it is our intention to retain the option for the people of Toronto of providing needed airport facilities at some time in the future. Whether facilities are needed in 1980 or 1985 does not alter the long term need. The government cannot wilfully commit itself to a course of action such as has been suggested, one which would inevitably mean the loss of all flexibility in meeting future needs.

At present Toronto handles about 25 per cent of the nation's air traffic, and we feel that failure to provide adequate facilities in the area would ultimately hamper Toronto's ability to compete effectively on an economic basis with other cities in North America. In the meantime the land at Pickering will be retained by the federal government and is being put to productive use through leasing of the properties for farming.

As most people are now aware, at the time of expropriation over 50 per cent of the airport site was owned by speculative interests and only about 10,500 acres of the 18,000 total acres were being actively farmed. The production yield from the site was considerably below the aver-

age for similar agricultural land elsewhere in Ontario. Since the expropriation we have attempted to maximize the use of the land by leasing all the rentable residential and farm property. At present some 14,000 acres are devoted to farming, an increase of over 33 per cent since the land was acquired. The government has committed itself to developing a long term program to maximize agricultural production on the site, even in the event airport facilities are developed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member agrees that the only responsible course of action is the one we are presently following. It allows adequate flexibility in the long term while making the best use of present facilities in the short term. At the same time, the agricultural resources now in the government's charge at the Pickering site are being productively managed to the advantage of the Toronto area.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CAMBODIA—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS—SUGGESTED WITHDRAWAL OF AID

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I should like to expand this evening on a question I first asked on March 18, and continued to repeat as lately as April 7. In so doing I wish to quote from the *Sunday Times*, a British newspaper, of April 18, a date subsequent to my last raising of this subject. I propose to quote from an article by Jon Swain, named "Journalist of the Year" in the 1975 British press awards for his despatches on the fall of Cambodia to the Communists. He has now returned to the borders of that country to report on the tragic and profound revolution forced on its people in just one year. He says:

> If any country deserves the world's compassion and interest it is Cambodia.

Nevertheless, the attempts made by myself and others in this House to obtain any sort of response when we raise this subject have been met with precious little interest and, certainly, with no compassion.

Writing about this particular revolution, Mr. Swain says:

> It is now clear that this has obliterated what little progress had been made in the past hundred years and destroyed an ancient civilization which had stayed intact for centuries.

● (2220)

He goes on to say:

> But it has been the Khmer Rouge, forcing a uniquely painful brand of communism on to a bewildered, demoralized peasantry at the point of a gun, that has prolonged and darkened the tragedy.

Further he says:

> Probably the world will never know how many Cambodians have died or had their lives irreparably broken by the Khmer Rouge's rush to force a new society . . .

Other reports have been bold enough to estimate the dead to be as high as 600,000. The government's hesitancy to display any interest in this area is to me very strange. I can recall during the twenty-seventh parliament we were constantly sending special missions to Hanoi, which is not all that far from Phnom Penh in Cambodia, in an endeavour to lessen hostilities. No amount of American bombing or danger could keep us out of Hanoi at that time. We found a way to overcome every obstacle and to send our special representatives to Hanoi.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we know that the government, which oddly enough does not even have a parliamentary secretary in the House at the moment to respond to my question, is prepared to make a big gesture in responding to conditions in some other parts of the world. We have seen in the last few weeks threats to cut off federal assistance to the Olympics for the Handicapped because a South African team, which was integrated, was permitted to enter that competition. The action of the federal government at that moment was swift and sure. I find it a strange double standard.

I made inquiries whether this country was prepared to send a special mission to Cambodia to ascertain what had happened in that country. I received no response. I inquired whether our aid to the Khmer Republic had been cut off and was told there was no aid. This was reassuring because in 1972 our aid amounted to $30,000, in 1973 to $50,000, and in 1974 to $100,000. I notice the parliamentary secretary has now arrived so perhaps I can have an answer to my questions.

If this accelerated rate in the growth of aid to the Khmer Republic has been cut off, I wonder when it was cut off and what was the motive. Was it their unilateral action, or was it as a protest by this country against the situation developing in that part of the world once the communist Khmer regime had taken over? I admit the amounts spent were small, but was there no residue of good will in that country? Cannot we find among the representatives in that area over the years someone we could send to that country to plead for some respect of human life and to give an indication of our interest in and compassion for that extremely troubled land?

[*Translation*]

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Okanagan Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) has spoken on several occasions about the question of aid to Cambodia. He mentioned previously that the United States deemed it timely to withdraw their aid. Now, I fail to see the relevancy of this statement to Canada. In fact, this country no longer provides assistance to Cambodia since April 1975 and no aid program is being considered for the time being. No Canadian diplomat is accredited with the Cambodian government and the contacts we have with the few Cambodian diplomats posted abroad are very casual.

I think he will remember that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) and myself have declared on several occasions that it was extremely difficult to obtain reliable information on what is going on in Cambodia at the moment. None of our allies has any diplomat stationed in Phom Penh and reporters have no access to the country. According to our information, chances are very remote that this situation will change in a forseeable future because the Cambodian regime has clearly indicated that it is not interested in receiving diplomatic missions from countries that recognized the former regime of General Lon Nol, of which Canada was.

Their attitude is the same with regard to international agencies which managed assistance programs under the

former regime. Their representatives were expelled from Cambodia at the same time as all other foreigners in the spring of 1975. Even the International Red Cross, which tried to reestablish ties with its Cambodian branch, has had no success to date. The policy of isolationism, devoid of any practical concessions, of the present Cambodian government makes it therefore extremely difficult for the Canadian government to attempt to get information on the development of events in that country.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, to my mind, there is little probability that the United Nations will be asked to look into the matter of the rights of the people and all other related matters unless individuals or non-governmental groups, with a first hand and reliable knowledge of recent events in Cambodia, bring forth directly a grievance for violation of human rights before the agency of the General Assembly of the UN entrusted with that type of problem, as that is the procedure that must be followed when human rights are violated, or in cases of torture, which cases have repeatedly been reported as occurring in Cambodia.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, April 27, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION ON WAGE SETTLEMENT OF INCO WORKERS AT THOMPSON—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity arising from the Anti-Inflation Board roll-back of a settlement reached between United Steelworkers local 6166 and International Nickel Company of Canada which concerns a work force of 3,000 employees in Thompson, Manitoba. In view of the fact that there is a clear historic relationship between the Manitoba Division of INCO Limited and its employees and settlements between INCO Limited and its employees in Sudbury, Port Colborne and Shebandowan, Ontario, which settlements were reached prior to the implementation of AIB regulations and which historically always precede Manitoba negotiations by six months; and in view of the fact that an AIB imposed settlement in Thompson significantly lower than in the Ontario operations will result in a critical shortage of employees in Thompson, and in view of the fact that maintenance of operations in Thompson is vital to the continued existence of the city of Thompson because the INCO payroll is 80 per cent of the total payroll in that city, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser):

That this House instruct the Prime Minister to table forthwith a telegram from three thousand citizens of Northern Manitoba protesting the roll back and the Government's misleading statements in this matter, and that the Prime Minister and Cabinet immediately consider the destructive consequences of the roll back to the city of Thompson, other northern communities, and the mining industry of Canada and take appropriate steps to alleviate the situation.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the motion proposed by the hon. member can only be put forward with the unanimous consent of the House. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No!

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN PROPOSALS TO UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity under Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that the standing committee on external affairs and national defence filed a report on international development on Wednesday, April 14, and in view of the fact that this report calls attention to the urgent importance of the forthcoming meeting in Nairobi of UNCTAD, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and in view of the fact that the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be representing Canada at the conference, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche):

That this House request the Secretary of State to give to the House an outline of the constructive proposals to be made by Canada with a view to ensuring the success of the UNCTAD IV conference which is all-important to the relations between Canada and the developing world.

Mr. Speaker: The motion can only be put with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No!

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE STUDY OF STOCKS AND PRICE OF CHEMICAL FERTILIZER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

Since last spring the manufacturers of chemical fertilizers were not in a position to provide normal supplies to farmers; since chemical fertilizers were so expensive in 1975 that a great many farmers were unable to buy some to meet their needs; and since there were price fluctuations, even taking into consideration the location of supplies, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House take all the necessary steps in the shortest possible time to establish a special committee to undertake an immediate study on the availability and prices of chemical fertilizers and thus exercise a control on the prices of chemical fertilizers to prevent farmers from being exploited at that level and to guarantee a sufficient supply of fertilizers to meet the demand.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, such a motion cannot be moved without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; the motion therefore cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INTRODUCTION OF ANTI-INFLATION BOARD—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. On Tuesday, December 23, 1975, the Prime Minister in a television conversation with Bruce Phillips and Carole Taylor said, and I quote:

● (1410)

In the first half of this year, for instance, the public sector salaries have grown by something like 22 per cent as against 14 per cent in the private sector because in the private sector there is a limit that's called bankruptcy. In the public sector there's not, so we obviously have to change that.

The change introduced by the Prime Minister is called the Anti-Inflation Board. The *Financial Times*—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Motions pursuant to Standing Order 43.

* * *

ABORTION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF BADGLEY COMMITTEE REPORT AND DEBATE ON ISSUE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I too rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the latest report of the ARCAL referral clinic of Ottawa that out of 859 women referred for abortion after counselling only 50 were able to obtain a therapeutic abortion in Canada, the remainder being performed in the United States, and in view of the lack of debate in this House on this important national issue, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn):

That this House request the filing of the Badgley Committee report within two weeks, and further that the House leaders set aside a reasonable period of time for debate on this important national issue to commence no later than one month from this date.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—TENDERING FOR INSTALLATION OF SOUND REINFORCING SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport, who I assume will be reporting on the questions I asked yesterday whenever he is ready. Today I would ask him, or perhaps his colleague the Minister of Supply and Services, whether he can assure the House that to his knowledge there were no improprieties or irregularities surrounding the tendering for, and letting of, some of the contracts for the installation of a sound reinforcing system at Mirabel airport.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. member generally that I know of no irregularities with regard to the tendering system. If he is going to stand up every day and ask about irregularities on some other contract—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: —then in that case he may be seen by his colleagues opposite to be doing a service, but I do not think that he will be seen by the country or by anybody else to be doing a service.

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I am only trying to be helpful to the minister; he certainly needs help. Can I then ask the minister whether he will inquire into the circumstances surrounding this particular contract with a view to explaining how it is that the single and only bidder whose tender was found in the tender box when it was opened was not the bidder who won the contract?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it is rather intriguing that the hon. member chooses to make these sorts of allegations and insinuations without—

Mr. Fairweather: Let us have an official inquiry, then.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Cleanliness is next to Godliness.

Mr. Lang: The hon. member does so, even though he attaches so little importance to the matter that he does not even give me an hour's notice about the situation so that I can return with the answer. I recognize that hon. members opposite, who are only interested in making a point and getting a headline on the basis of a question, will not be interested in an answer and therefore do not want any notice to be given. For instance, having given me notice of a certain matter yesterday, which was rather a puff of nothing, he now goes to another issue rather than returning to yesterday's issue.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

NUMBER OF INCIDENTS REQUIRED BEFORE INQUIRY ORDERED

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): It may be a puff of nothing, Mr. Speaker, or it may be a puff of something. May I direct my final supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the right hon. gentleman indicated that if there were a system or pattern of irregularities, he might consider a judicial inquiry in order to clarify matters. In order to ascertain whether the Prime Minister is establishing new political jurisprudence in which he may be saying more than one incident is required for an inquiry, will he inform us if he has formulated guidelines as to the number and types of events which are conditions precedent to an inquiry, or will he be having his own parliamentary pre-enquête?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is up to parliament to decide whether it wants a pre-enquête.

An hon. Member: We want one.

Mr. Trudeau: On the one hand when I say parliament should decide the other side seems to object, and when I say that I should decide, they say it is up to parliament to decide. I suggest they should make up their minds, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: We want you to decide.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You have just had a week's holiday; don't get testy.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I repeat the astonishment expressed by the Minister of Transport, that having asked a series of questions yesterday, which the House obviously thought important and which the Minister of Transport has looked into, the opposition is no longer interested in having the answers but just wants to ask questions. I suggest that if they want to ask questions, in order to ascertain truths and get answers, they should ask the questions and not move on from one thing to another.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PERSON AUTHORIZING VISIT TO OFFICES OF JEAN RIVARD—RELATIONSHIP TO MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND COMMISSIONER

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Solicitor General. I wonder whether the minister would inform the House who authorized the visit of the RCMP to the offices of Jean Rivard, journalist for Tele-Media, on April 15, 1976? Did the interrogation originate as an internal initiative of the RCMP or was it inspired by requests from political sources?

An hon. Member: You are insulting the RCMP now.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it certainly was not authorized by anybody in a political position, but I will be pleased to find out which officer authorized the visit.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, will the minister indicate to the House whether there is any direct or indirect relationship between the visit to Mr. Rivard and conversations held between the Prime Minister and RCMP Commissioner Nadon just two days previous?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have no information that there is any such connection, and I would be interested if the hon. member has any.

An hon. Member: Why don't you check it with the Prime Minister?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could be allowed to answer that. There was no question of Mr. Jean Rivard in any discussion I had with the Commissioner of the RCMP, and I am astonished that the hon. member is insinuating to the contrary.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: We are not insinuating, we are asking questions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

POSSIBILITY TREASURY BOARD CONSULTED ON RENEWAL OF SKY SHOPS LEASE

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister and I do not at all share the criticism levelled at the hon. member for Central Nova for doing exactly what a good MP should be doing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question that does have reference to an answer given yesterday, and that is the question I asked about the role the Treasury Board may or may not have played in the decision reached to extend the franchise of Sky Shops. Yesterday the Prime Minister indicated he hoped to have an answer to that question later on in the day. Therefore, I should like to put it to him, has he found out whether the Treasury Board was consulted with respect to the extension of the franchise to Sky Shops and, if so, will he tell the House what Treasury Board's advice was on the matter? If Treasury Board was not consulted, why was it not consulted?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that this answer was given to the House several weeks ago by the Minister of Transport when he answered in a rather detailed way about the renewal of the Sky Shops lease. He indicated then, and perhaps he could give the exact reference as I do not have it before me, that the Sky Shops lease, which originated with the Diefenbaker government, was renewed under our government at very substantially improved conditions to the benefit of the government. He indicated that was done in a routine way without any political intervention whatsoever. It was done in a routine way by officials. I would suggest that the House should return to the answer of the hon. Minister of Transport, reflect on it and give it some publicity, rather than pretending he had not given that answer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REASON FOR ORDER IN COUNCIL EXTENDING SKY SHOPS LEASE

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Before you clap too loudly, wait until you hear this one. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister has just said the decision was made by officials, would he mind telling the House why the cabinet passed an Order in Council dated August 24, 1972, just prior to the election of that year, which extended the franchise of Sky Shops at Dorval by another five years when the normal process would have been to call for a re-submission of tenders, a procedure which, in fact, had been stated to be the case by the then deputy minister Mr. O. C. Stoner and which was overturned by the cabinet by order in council.

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, these are allegations which I cannot—

An hon. Member: Why don't you clap?

Mr. Trudeau: Surely, the House must understand that I cannot vouch for the exactitude of every fact of every decision which is quoted by the opposition which they presumably think is accurate. In this particular case, if there was an Order in Council I will look it up. I will look at the minute of cabinet, see what happened and report to the House, assuming the opposition is interested tomorrow in getting the answers rather than just putting questions.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I went back to the Prime Minister today following up on a question I asked him yesterday, so I resent that pettiness. On the question of whether or not there was an Order in Council, I could tell the Prime Minister that I checked myself with the Privy Council office this morning. So I repeat, Mr. Speaker; will the Prime Minister check because he will find out from the Privy Council office that there was an Order in Council passed on August 24, 1972 which extended the franchise and will he undertake to make a report back to the House tomorrow concerning the reason the cabinet reached that particular decision?

[Mr. Broadbent.]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): I will, Mr. Speaker, also let the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby have the reference to the previous discussion some months ago concerning the nature of the extension of this particular lease involving the Sky Shops concession. It is in *Hansard*. It is all on the record. The actual decision to recommend the extension of the lease was made on the basis of a much increased revenue in the remaining three years which the lease still had to run, and was the basis for its renewal. I will give the hon. member the detailed information on that. That was in the nature of a decision, and recommendation which in due course in the ordinary way had to go forward to the Treasury Board for confirmation. That is the order of confirmation to which the hon. member referred. It is a routine one in relation to the awarding of a contract of this nature, in this case a five-year lease.

I would advise the hon. member that he might go back and look at it. In the original contract which still had three years left to run a rather lower revenue was specified and a very much higher revenue, particularly on liquor sales, was specified for the remaining three years of the lease as well as for the renewal and the five-year period. We will, from time to time, have renewals in a variety of circumstances. If the hon. member will look back at this one he will see as well that it had to do with the fact that this was an area and an airport where a great deal of change was going to occur at the end of the period because of the transfer of the international traffic from Dorval to Mirabel, and of course a duty-free shop is essentially related to international traffic.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FLOODS

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS IN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance.

According to the Quebec government's latest estimates concerning the recent floods throughout the province, the damage has been assessed to roughly $34 million. Has the Minister of Finance been contacted by the Quebec Minister of Natural Resources or of Finance and has he received a request pursuant to the federal act providing for assistance in case of natural disasters, amounting to $1 per capita in the province whenever the damages exceed, let us say, $6,500,000?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has pointed out, there exists indeed a federal program to cover part of the expenses due to such flooding. I did not, personally, receive a telephone call from my Quebec counterpart but I can inquire and report to the hon. member.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE DECISION OF ANTI-INFLATION BOARD ON WAGE SETTLEMENT OF INCO WORKERS AT THOMPSON WILL NOT BE REPEATED

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that if the Anti-Inflation Board ruling regarding steelworkers in Thompson, Manitoba is allowed to stand, the continued viable existence of the city of Thompson is in jeopardy, because if INCO cannot get workers they will seriously cut back operations which slashes the pay roll upon which the city depends, and in view of the fact that this specific situation will be repeated in other northern communities as wage settlements are negotiated later this year, what assurance is the minister prepared to give labour in Canada that the Thompson situation will be corrected, and further, that it will not be allowed to be repeated in other Canadian communities?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): I believe that after full representations the Anti-Inflation Board took all these considerations into account when they made their final award, and I trust they will do so in the future.

Mr. Fraser: I would point out through you, Mr. Speaker, that the payroll of INCO is over 80 per cent of the total payroll of that town and that the town will die if this ruling is allowed to stand. I should like to ask the minister the following question. On October 20 last the Minister of Labour advised Mr. Wilf Hudson of the steelworkers in Thompson to continue bargaining as usual. The answer which the minister gave was in reference to the concern as to whether the historical relationship between Sudbury and Thompson would be maintained. In view of the situation today in Thompson where normal bargaining did not result in maintaining historical relationships—contrary to the advice of the minister—how will the minister restore the confidence of labour in the restraint program when the Thompson case illustrates how the minister himself has failed to understand the implications of his government's policy on the collective bargaining process?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Certainly, I do not agree with what the hon. member has stated and I would like to know the source of his information. I think that any reference I made—and I stand to be corrected here—was relative to the INCO and Falconbridge situation in the north. I am also aware—and the hon. member might be interested in this—that the United Steelworkers of America were down here to make representations last week to the Anti-Inflation Board with reference to Elliot Lake and the situation developing there, and following that with reference to Thompson. I am not fully aware of the precise reaction of the Anti-Inflation Board to the representations made by the United Steelworkers in support of a request for a review of the situation, but I will try to find out and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Fraser: I should like to advise the minister that there is a telegram signed by 3,000 people living in the north with respect to this situation which was delivered to the office of the right hon. Prime Minister yesterday or the day before and I ask the minister to look at that. It is not just Thompson; it is Snow Lake, Flin Flon—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ALLEGED STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE CONCERNING PARITY BETWEEN INCO WORKERS IN THOMPSON AND SUDBURY

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. On the program "Cross Country Check-Up", several months ago the minister was asked whether the INCO steelworkers in Thompson would be allowed the same increase in wages and benefits that the INCO steelworkers received in Sudbury. The minister said they should receive the same but no more. Can he tell the House why he made this statement in light of the fact that the AIB ruling is in direct contradiction to the assurance the minister gave?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I would want to check to see whether the hon. gentleman's quotation is accurate. I have always pointed out that it is for the Anti-Inflation Board to make this decision, as recommended by parliament.

● (1430)

Mr. Smith (Churchill): Can the minister give the House and the people of Thompson an assurance that he will immediately raise this matter in cabinet and press for an appropriate solution?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Parliament has created the Anti-Inflation Board for the purpose of dealing with this particular question. Indeed, the hon. member probably voted for it at second reading, and I think we should obey the law.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: What about the town? What are you going to do?

Mr. Stanfield: It couldn't have happened to a nicer fellow than you.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): You voted for it, too. You advocated it and voted for it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

SUGGESTED NEW COMPETITION FOR DESIGN OF NATIONAL GALLERY

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. It seems that the government, and specifically the Department of Public Works, has incurred the wrath of the architects of our country as a result of the provisions which have been set out for taking part in the competition for design of the new national gallery. Would the minister consider calling

for a new competition for this design, which would allow more individual architects to submit plans?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should point out to the hon. member that so far as the architects are concerned there have been some expressions of contrary view, and that the competition was organized along lines in agreement with the representative associations for the architects of Canada.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY OF INSTRUCTIONS NOT TO PROSECUTE OIL COMPANIES WITHOUT CONSULTING MINISTER—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Last April 7 Dr. Stephen, a senior official of the Canadian Wildlife Service, in giving evidence before the Berger Commission admitted that certain prosecutions had not been commenced because they might have a political impact. On being challenged on that Dr. Stephen made this statement: "I consider it my job to put a halo and wings on my minister." While I will refrain from comment on the very impossible job that civil servant has, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if instructions were in fact given to this and other civil servants in the minister's department to report first to the minister before engaging in prosecutions of oil companies, which might have a political impact.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the answer is definitely no.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the statement which obviously was made before the commission of inquiry, and which has the effect of sworn evidence, will the minister make an inquiry into the question of these prosecutions and why it was admitted that certain prosecutions for shooting were brought against ordinary individuals, but prosecutions against oil companies were not launched as they should have been? Would the minister inquire into that and report back to this House?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I asked my deputy minister to make a full inquiry and make a report to me, and after that I will see if I can give some information.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF THE HERITAGE OF CANADA

Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. In view of the fact that over a year has passed since the RCMP launched an investigation into the Society for the Study of the Heritage of Canada, and in view of the fact that the minister's seatmate and another ministry have spent over $1 million of taxpayers money in this organization, which is now defunct and bankrupt, is the minister now in a position to advise us whether he has received a full report and whether the investigation of the RCMP is now complete.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, when the RCMP complete investigations, they present their reports to the Crown prosecutors in the different provinces, but I could get a report from them on what progress has been made in this investigation and report.

Mr. Brisco: I appreciate the answer of the minister, but in view of the fact that the matter has been brought to the floor of this House, and in view of the fact that numerous questions have been asked, would the minister not consider it routine to advise the House as to whether the RCMP had completed their investigation?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member had given me notice of his question, I would have been pleased to give him an answer today.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Allmand: Thousands of police investigations are going on across the country, and I do not have reports on all of them for the House at all times.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST TO FACILITATE ENTRY OF LEBANESE TO CANADA

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Since Canada had to close its offices in Beirut following the political turmoil in Lebanon and since many Lebanese whose second language and culture are akin to and shared by many Canadians of French expression intend to migrate to Canada and since it is important to ensure a better linguistic balance among immigrants in Canada, would the minister tell the House whether he is prepared to consider the applications from Lebanese citizens who request a visa to immigrate to Canada as political refugees and thus facilitate their settlement in Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we are giving high priority to processing Lebanese, particularly those Lebanese who are related to Canadians or to landed immigrants in Canada.

Incidentally, our immigration officer in charge travelled to Beirut on April 22 to begin the administrative processing of some 200 files which were pending. However, in the sense of the UN definition of the word, these people are not refugees in that they are not fleeing persecution on political grounds, although there is no argument that they are in a very disturbing and unstable situation, which we hope is temporary. We will give sympathetic consideration in the sense of not asking Lebanese people here in Canada who are not related to Canadians, to return while this disturbance continues. We are giving high priority to processing those who have been nominated or sponsored.

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR CABINET CONSIDERATION OF DECISION OF BOARD ON WAGE SETTLEMENT OF INCO WORKERS AT THOMPSON

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. My question relates to the subject already raised by the hon. member for Churchill and the hon. member for Vancouver South, but there is one further direct question I should like to put to the minister.

In view of the seriousness of the situation at Thompson, Manitoba, where a ruling by the Anti-Inflation Board seems to ignore completely a historical relationship, and in view of the fact that it will be perhaps some days before the new appeal procedures will be in place, will the cabinet consider this case, review it and make it clear to the Anti-Inflation Board that a change ought to be made in favour of the INCO workers at Thompson?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly there will be a great many cases to be considered by the Anti-Inflation Board under this program, and where the board is going to have the full opportunity to review the facts in these cases through its representatives and to be in contact with the parties, I do not think it is appropriate for the cabinet to try to set its judgment over and above that of the board in the vast majority of these cases.

With regard to the appeals procedure, I hope I might engage the support of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues for an early passage of Bill C-89 so that we can indeed have the appeals procedure in effect, which would be available for this union as for others.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is the minister then saying on behalf of the cabinet that it will not review this case? Is it saying no to the delegation from Thompson before it even gets here?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I understand that the delegation from Thompson is coming down to meet the representatives of the Anti-Inflation Board.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE DEBATE ON BILL C-84 WILL NOT TAKE PLACE WHILE COMMITTEE CONSIDERING BILL C-83

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Solicitor General a question. It is very important today. As Bill C-83 was rammed through parliament by closure and now the committee will have five hearings a week on it, would the minister assure the House that the debate on Bill C-84 will not go on while the committee is studying Bill C-83? Many of the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs are interested in the debate on Bill C-84. Can the minister assure the House that that debate will not proceed until the committee has considered Bill C-83?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker. I think it is necessary that we proceed with Bill C-84 some time soon, although we will take the recommendation of the hon. member into consideration so there will be as little conflict as possible.

Mr. Woolliams: Because the two debates will go on at the same time in different places, one in the committee and one in this House, is the Solicitor General saying that there is no relationship between what might happen to the bill in committee, Bill C-83, and the debate which will take place at second reading of Bill C-84? Is that the position of the Solicitor General?

Mr. Allmand: No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

OPPORTUNITY OF PERSON APPLYING FOR MORTGAGE TO CHOOSE SOLICITOR

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Urban Affairs. There was an admission last week by a member of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation that it is required to operate from lists of notaries and lawyers supplied by the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Transport, the former minister of justice, confirmed this fact and described it as political patronage. I should like to ask the minister if he is now prepared to revise this procedure in order to give Canadians who find this procedure repugnant, the opportunity to choose their own solicitors when they are looking for mortgages from CMHC?

● (1440)

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to welcome the hon. gentleman as official critic in this area; I know we are in for some interesting and lively times. With reference to the listing of solicitors, all institutions of course must provide a list of solicitors who are qualified and who they would choose. I would be most interested in finding a system that is more satisfactory and fair. Indeed, I just came from a meeting with directors of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and posed this problem to them for their consideration so that their interest can be observed by all. As long as people are competent and fulfil their role well, that is our main consideration. I might add that in most instances of public housing and non-profit housing where the organizations themselves provide their own solicitors who have been acting on their behalf, we generally accept the recommendation providing he is a member of the bar in good standing.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question. May I ask the minister if he is prepared to give consideration to revising the procedure to make provision for patrons of CMHC who would want and demand the right to use their own solicitor? Since they have to pay for the convenience anyway, is he prepared to allow for that procedure?

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, it is common practice that the lender must choose his lawyer. The borrower can also name a solicitor of his choice but the taxpayers' interest must be served and I think that is the case.

* * *

ENERGY

IMPACT OF DELAYED DECISION ON MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE ON UNITED STATES AND CENTRAL CANADA

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Having regard to comments made recently in northern Canada by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with respect to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, I should like to ask if new information is now before the government which would put the feasibility of the pipeline in the north in question? I should like also to ask the minister to explain how this new turn of events can be reconciled with the decision of the government recently to commence drilling in the Beaufort Sea?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is making an absolutely straightforward observation when he says that until the hearings are over and all the information is in the hands of the National Energy Board and in the hands of the government, no decision can be taken.

Mr. Oberle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform the House whether he has been able to assess the impact of this casual and off the cuff statement by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on the decisions the United States would have to make in securing supply for their own purposes and also the impact the decision would have on the security of supply for central Canada?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the United States has its own set of regulatory hearings. It is considering this matter as well in Congressional committees and has by no means as yet sorted out the particular timetable.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

EFFECT OF DEFINITION OF CHARITABLE DONATION AS RESTRICTED EXPENSE

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance and I have given him notice of it. It has to do with charitable donations being defined as a restricted expense under the Anti-Inflation Act regulations. The result is causing considerable confusion among corporate givers as to whether they are able to increase their charitable donations or will have to register them if other items within the restricted expenses column rise?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me notice of the question. With respect to the category of restricted expenses, I am advised by the Anti-Inflation Board that the total of restricted expenses which may be expended by a firm may not be increased at any greater rate than the total revenues. It is possible that a firm may allocate the amount within the six categories of restricted expenses and may choose to reduce advertising, for example, but increase the amount to be made available by way of charitable donations.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I take it the reverse is also true, that if a corporation decides to increase the amount in the five other categories they may have no alternative but to reduce their charitable donation or even eliminate it?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, if that particular corporate management chooses to spend more on convention fees, management fees or advertising rather than on charitable donations that would indeed be the result.

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN AMOUNT ALLOWED FOR RESEARCH AS A RESTRICTED EXPENSE ITEM

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's last reply and bearing in mind that one of the restricted expense items is research and development, would the minister consider giving more leeway to corporations that wish to increase their research and development, especially with the productivity problems we have in industry today?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): As I said, Mr. Speaker, a firm could, if it chose, reduce the amounts paid by way of management fees or convention expenses and increase both research and development and charitable contributions. It has to be a matter of priorities for that particular management.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

POSSIBILITY FOR LEBANESE CITIZENS TO VISIT CANADIAN RELATIVES

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Could the minister assure Canadians of Lebanese origin who during the current tragic situation in Lebanon, would like to have their relatives come to Canada as tourists for a temporary period until the fights are over, that they will be allowed to do so?

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSPORT

REASON FOR GRANTING KINGSTON-OTTAWA AND KINGSTON-BELLEVILLE SERVICE TO VOYAGEUR COLONIAL

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport concerning a matter that affects the economy of the Canadian National Railways and the interests of all taxpayers in Canada. I ask him to use his authority to investigate this matter. According to today's press, why were the low tenders of Carleton Buslines of Antrim and Wagar Coachlines of Napanee totally ignored by the Ontario Highway Transport Board on the respective Kingston-Ottawa and Kingston-Belleville feeder services runs to convey passengers to Ottawa and Belleville from the Kingston stop of the Montreal-Toronto turbo train, ignored in favour of the higher tender of the Voyageur Colonial?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member fails to establish to me how that comes within the jurisdiction of the federal department. Is it the Ontario Highway Transport Board to which the hon. member refers?

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Speaker, I realize it does not come within the jurisdiction of the minister, but I want him to investigate this. This question goes beyond the provincial pale and is of national scope affecting the economy of the CNR and every taxpayer in Canada.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree and I thank both Your Honour and the hon. member for pointing out that this is a matter for the Ontario board which has been allowed jurisdiction under the law. Since it does concern the Canadian National Railways however, I have already taken note of the matter and have asked for an explanation. Of course, I await the actual judgment of the board with interest. I agree with the hon. member that it is a matter of serious concern.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED CONTROL OF PRICES OF FERTILIZER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Considering that the price of chemical fertilizers has increased considerably and scandalously in the last year and considering also that because of that increase one can wonder if enough fertilizers will be available this year, could the minister tell the House whether he intends to take certain steps to control prices so that farm producers are not exploited as they were last year in that regard and to ensure an adequate supply to meet farmers' needs?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the records of my officials show that fertilizer is in adequate supply if farmers would take delivery of it instead of waiting until the day they are going to plant. The price has come down $10 to $60 per ton from last year.

Oral Questions

FOREIGN ENLISTMENT ACT

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF POSSIBLE BREACH

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Solicitor General. An advertisement has appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of Saturday, April 12 which on the face of it appears to be aimed at the recruitment of Canadian personnel for mercenary operations. In light of the Foreign Enlistment Act, Section 11, which clearly prohibits recruiting of any person in Canada to enlist in the armed forces of any state or other armed forces, will the minister cause an investigation to be made by the RCMP to find out whether or not there have been or are contemplated breaches of the Foreign Enlistment Act?

● (1450)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, as a result of the hon. member's notice to my office earlier, I have asked that an investigation be made on that particular point. I hope to be able to report to him very shortly.

Mr. Brewin: May I ask the minister to also take into account correspondence coming from the office named in the advertisement which refers to foreign countries requiring men with specialized skills to make a modern force?

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

POST OFFICE

DISCONTINUATION OF SERVICE TO FOUR INDIAN COMMUNITIES IN MANITOBA—DATE OF RESUMPTION

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. It is related to the discontinuation of postal service to four Indian communities, namely Wassagamack, Poplar River, Blood Vein and Garden Hill in northern Manitoba which I understand, following talks with individuals in Manitoba yesterday, continues and has been in effect since April 1. In view of the fact these isolated communities rely on the postal services for such important matters as receiving of old age pensions, family allowance and outside news, will the minister indicate if he is aware of this situation and, if so, can he indicate when the postal service will be reintroduced or alternate services will be instituted to ensure an immediate return of this vital service to these communities?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for giving me notice. The services, particularly to a community known as Island Lake, has been temporarily suspended, as is the practice of the post office, because an audit indicated a shortage of close to $6,000, possibly through error, possibly through inefficiency or possibly through fraud. In that particular instance, a post office is closed and other temporary post offices are found, hopefully close by. This morning we were able to make arrangements to deliver the mail for that particular community to another post office six miles away situated in a Hudson Bay office. I hope that will

satisfy the situation until such time as we find another postmaster in the community.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF NEW HEALTH OF ANIMALS REGULATIONS—APPLICABILITY TO CATTLE SLAUGHTERED FOR BLUE TONGUE

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. When is the minister going to announce the new health of animals regulations, especially those concerning the payment of compensation to farmers for cattle ordered slaughtered under the slaughter eradication program?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Soon I hope, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mitges: Since farmers in the B.C. area are facing serious economic losses with the recent outbreak of blue tongue resulting in the slaughter of hundreds of cattle, will the minister apply the new schedule of compensation payments, which I understand are much more favourable in keeping with inflationary costs?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, we feel we have been quite fair in the past and we intend to be fair in the future. However, the treatment with regard to the loss of cattle is the same regardless of the disease, whether it be blue tongue, brucellosis or whatever. They will all be treated the same.

EFFORTS TO ERADICATE BLUE TONGUE DISEASE

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the fact that anaplasmosis and blue tongue are transmitted primarily by biting insects, yet the minister for weeks on end has claimed that Canada is free of the disease, will he inform the House how he stopped the insects from crossing the United States border? Since it is common knowledge that Canada does have the disease and Australia and Britain have cut off all semen imports, will every effort be made to eradicate the disease in co-operation with the United States department of agriculture?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I know that one cannot stop pests from moving about—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: —or insects either. However, I am told these insects do not move very far. Our records show that blue tongue disease was not brought into Canada by an insect, but by people importing cattle which had the disease from the United States. We feel sure this is the way it was spread in Canada. We feel we can be successful in eradicating this blue tongue disease in the same way as we have other diseases that could have damaged the livestock industry. I am surprised that the hon. member, perhaps unknowingly, suggests that we do not control this disease by eradication and damage our livestock industry as far as exports are concerned, which amount to millions and millions of dollars a year.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

* * *

FISHERIES

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON LOBSTER FISHING—REQUEST FOR ELABORATION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State (Fisheries). In view of the confusion which has arisen because of a statement made by the minister over the weekend that he was removing restrictions because of the start of the lobster season in some areas and the adjudication of appeals, can the minister elaborate on that statement for the benefit of this House and the country? Will he indicate what areas he was referring to and if any have been left out?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, the decision to delay the implementation of the policy for one season, that is for the spring and summer lobster seasons, was made because of the large number of appeals to me as minister. I had to ask for additional information and doubtful cases could not be settled before the season began. In order to be fair to everyone, it was decided that licences would not be withheld for one season, and this applied to the maritimes area. In the case of Newfoundland, where the access to the lobster fishery has only been limited in the past year, the regional director asked for a few days delay in order to consult. In fact, I am to see him later this afternoon. We may have some statement tonight or tomorrow.

Mr. Marshall: I just visited the west coast of Newfoundland and found inequities in many areas and many decisions made by appeal boards that I intend to bring to the attention of the minister. Will the minister consider that the season opened in district 11 on April 20 and does not open in district 12 until May 5. Therefore, the province of Newfoundland should be given consideration. I hope the minister will make the right decision.

Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent): Mr. Speaker, if there were inequities, I would be very worried because the appeal boards did their work very well and very carefully with local input. However, I am very open to the hon. member's suggestion. I should have more to say this afternoon.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CANADA'S POSITION ON 200-MILE FISHING ZONE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The government has been telling the Canadian fishing industry to wait until the end of the New York Law of the Sea Conference since it would likely produce a

settlement. As officials of the minister's department do not feel any decision will be made at this conference and as the United States has already declared a 200 mile fishing limit to come into effect on March 1, 1977, can the minister give the House and the industry a progress report on Canada's position on a 200 mile fishing zone, which to date has not even been dissociated from the economic zone activities at the conference?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I recently attended the Law of the Sea Conference. I agree with the conclusion the hon. member has reached that it is not likely by the end of this particular session either a partial treaty relating to fisheries or a general treaty will emerge. The possibility of a second session this summer is under consideration. I have not been advised whether a decision has been taken to resume the conference in Geneva later in the year. However, whatever may be the results of either the first or the second session, I stated in my speech to the plenary session that in so far as Canada is concerned, 1976 is the year of decision and that if the conference failed to reach a conclusion this year, in all probability it will not be able to reach a conclusion for a long time in the future. I should also say that we are obviously watching the conference in its concluding days and we are obviously influenced by the action taken by the United States.

● (1500)

Parallel with these developments we are continuing our bilateral negotiations with countries fishing in what will be Canadian waters in future; recently, we had discussions with the Russians which registered very substantial progress. My general attitude is a positive one. I feel that at this time Canadian policy is well in hand and moving well in the direction of achieving the overall objective of a 200 mile extended fisheries jurisdiction.

CANADA'S POSITION ON REMAINING WITHIN ICNAF

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): One brief supplementary. Between June 6 and June 24 of this year ICNAF will be meeting in Havana, Cuba. In the event that this meeting produces no agreement, is it Canada's intention to declare its own fisheries management zone or will it remain with ICNAF?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): It appears to me—and here I am subject to the superior judgment of my colleague, the Minister of State for Fisheries—that in any foreseeable regime of extended jurisdiction by the United States or other coastal states the function of ICNAF, though it may be useful, would be changed considerably. I am sure the hon. member realizes that these changes are inevitable should coastal states acquire jurisdiction which at the present time is in part exercised by a consensus at ICNAF meetings. We have presently under consideration instructions to be given to the delegation which will attend the meetings, taking into account the particular factor I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Yesterday the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar raised a point of order at the conclusion of the question period in which he was supported by

the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. Arguments were advanced in favour of a contrary opinion, and I undertook yesterday to give the matter careful review. That review included a reference to remarks I made in the House on April 14, 1975, which, as hon. members may recall, was just after the Easter recess of that year.

I made those remarks for two reasons. First, it was just at the time we had begun to operate under new procedures with respect to the question period and, second, as a new Speaker I felt hon. members would wish to know as soon as possible my attitude toward the handling of the question period. I attempted to make that statement a thorough review of my attitude toward questions that ought to be permitted. I tried to make it as positive as possible and in line with a theme different from that of the past. Instead of there being a number of restrictions such as had grown up, somewhat vaguely, affecting the right of members to put questions, I attempted to put forward a positive statement as to what could be done, rather than a negative statement expressing what could not be done.

In respect of the responsibility of ministers and the areas which could be covered, I said this as recorded at the top of page 4763 of *Hansard* of April 14, 1975:

> Sixth, a question must be within the administrative responsibility of the government or the minister. Obviously, the government in general cannot be responsible for those areas which are beyond its own administrative responsibility. Furthermore, the minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his ministry; that is, his present ministry. He is responsible to the limits of that ministry, but not beyond that. In this regard I find no reason to change the earlier decision I made in respect of the capacities which ministers enjoyed in previously-held portfolios.

I think that statement is clear, and by and large it has not been challenged, I have to be concerned whether that ruling unduly restricts the right of members to put questions in respect of a situation facing us where information is sought about influence which members—indeed, ministers—might have exercised with respect to decisions affecting tenders. I am satisfied that the ruling I have quoted is a fair one still because, of course, questions can always be put to the Prime Minister concerning the conduct of any minister; questions can be put to the minister responsible for the tendering in the particular department involved, they can be put to the President of the Treasury Board with respect to general tendering practices, and they can certainly be put to the Solicitor General or to the Minister of Justice if there seems to be any suspicion of irregularity.

In some cases there is no doubt that questions are deflected to ministers who have served in previous capacities, but it seems to me that this is within the limits of jurisdictional responsibility as we have always known it and extends ample opportunity for hon. members to put questions at least during the question period. We have to remember, after all, that we are not attempting to afford complete investigative powers in the question period, but simply trying to manage the question period which is an extremely important aspect of our procedure and one whose duration each day is limited.

Finally, I am sure hon. members will understand that there are circumstances in which the enforcement of this rule is not easy for the Chair: ministers, in making one answer, may voluntarily go across the line and it is dif-

ficult for the Chair to interrupt further questioning on the same point. There are also circumstances in which statements may be made by ministers with respect to their former capacities, and the Chair has to hear at least one or two preliminary questions in clarification of such statements before it can rule definitively that the questions appear to go beyond the limits of the administrative responsibility of the minister concerned. These do not constitute exceptions; they are simply circumstances which cause the Chair some difficulty in specific enforcement.

All members will, I hope, agree with the practice I have followed. When in doubt as to the acceptability of a question, I have sought to resolve that doubt in favour of the member putting the question, rather than the member having to answer it.

Mr. Ellis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with the questions I directed to the Postmaster General yesterday. The Postmaster General said that certain distributors "get a discount which is below the regular retail value". We were talking about the price of stamps. On page 12859 of *Hansard* for yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Postmaster General, answering a question on the order paper by the hon. member for Don Valley, is reported as saying that sales of Canadian postage stamps are not made at a price less than face value. I think those two conflicting statements should be clarified so that I might proceed a little further with the investigation of this matter.

Mr. Mackasey: I appreciate the hon. gentleman bringing the apparent difference of view to my attention. I will have the matter clarified by tomorrow. By way of a short cut I called it a discount. The Post Office prefer to call it a subsidy of rental, travel expenses and other types of expenses associated with the selling of stamps in Europe. I will ascertain the precise official, bureaucratic terminology. I may have fallen into the error of incorrectly calling it a discount.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ENERGY

TABLING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "AN ENERGY STRATEGY FOR CANADA—POLICIES FOR SELF-RELIANCE"

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, in both official languages, copies of a document entitled, "An Energy Strategy for Canada—Policies for Self-reliance" and a summary of the same document.

Mr. Speaker, it is now almost three years since this government published "An Energy Policy for Canada—Phase I". That publication, issued in June of 1973, presented a comprehensive overview of the Canadian energy situation, its history, prospects and problems. Our intention was to begin a process of consultation, reflection and debate which would enable us to develop a set of national energy policies.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Barely four months later, war broke out in the Middle East and the Organization of Petroleum exporting Countries raised the international price of oil substantially. In the fall of 1973, oil in the Persian Gulf sold for $2.20 a barrel. Today the price is $11.50. This fivefold increase in the price of the singlemost important energy commodity, occurring as it did in a period of less than two years, has sent a series of shockwaves through the international economic system. It has contributed directly to the worst recession in the industrialized world since the 1930s, coupled with continuing rapid inflation. No country has been unaffected.

● (1510)

Canada has been more fortunate than most countries. Because we have domestic oil reserves we have been able to cushion the effects of higher international prices. The price of oil in Canada is currently about $4.60 per barrel lower than the price eastern Canadians would have to pay for imported oil if there were no subsidy program. However, proved reserves of Canadian oil and low-cost proved reserves of natural gas are declining. Canada now imports more crude oil than it sells abroad. As well, drilling results in Canada's frontier areas have been disappointing and the recent experience with the Syncrude project indicates that the further development of the oil sands will be extremely expensive. Finding new oil and natural gas reserves, developing them and transporting them to market will now cost substantially more and will require Canadian prices higher than those currently existing.

While our proved reserves of oil and low-cost gas continue to decline, Canadian demands for these energy forms continue to increase. The growing gap between our energy demands and our ability to supply them from domestic reserves suggests that we could become increasingly dependent on the rest of the world, and the OPEC cartel in particular, for our future oil supplies. This prospect carries with it economic and political risks that the government views with concern.

We have, within Canada, the people, the equipment, the expertise and the potential energy resources to reduce substantially our dependence on imported oil. We can do this by reducing the rate at which our energy requirements grow in the future, by substituting those energy forms which are in relatively abundant supply in Canada for those that are not, by accelerating the search required to find new oil and natural gas—to convert the potential of our undiscovered energy resources to proved reserves from which our needs can be supplied. These options will be expensive, but all must be pursued. The alternatives are energy shortages which will require increasing dependence on high cost, insecure oil imports or rationing available supplies among Canadians. It is within our power to avoid both of these alternatives and we must act to do so.

The publication that I am tabling this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, sets forth a national energy strategy for Canada. It is a strategy that is consistent and comprehensive. The strategy consists of three well defined parts: first, an objective—energy self-reliance; second, a series of specific energy targets; and finally, in support of this objective and target, nine policy elements or priorities.

The national energy strategy for self-reliance presented in this paper is directed, through the next ten years, at minimizing the risks of growing dependence on imported oil. Self-reliance in energy means reducing our vulnerability to unanticipated changes in price or prolonged interruptions in supply. It means supplying Canadian requirements from Canadian resources to the greatest extent practicable, but it is not a strategy of self-sufficiency at any cost. It recognizes that we will have to rely on imported oil to a certain degree and an important policy element is emergency preparedness to ensure that Canadians using imported oil will be adequately protected if supplies should be curtailed.

Above all, it is a strategy that is both balanced and flexible: balanced in the sense that it recognizes that the policies we adopt will have costs as well as benefits, and a choice that provides the maximum advantage to Canadians must be found; flexible in the sense that many aspects of the international oil market and our own domestic energy situation are uncertain and continuing to evolve. The approach we have adopted will be dynamic enough to adapt quickly to changing circumstances.

The first target is to move domestic oil prices toward international levels, and to move domestic prices for natural gas to an appropriate competitive relationship with oil over the next two to four years. Domestic energy prices must continue to increase, to reinforce efficiency and restraint in energy use; to encourage the development of additional Canadian supplies; to reduce the magnitude of the transfer of real wealth from Canadians to oil exporting countries; and to reduce the subsidization of oil consumers by the general taxpayer. They need not move to international oil prices if it is clear that new Canadian resources can be found and delivered to markets at prices that are lower.

The second target is to reduce the average rate of growth of energy use in Canada over the next ten years to less than 3.5 per cent per year. This can be attained by appropriate pricing measures and energy conservation initiatives. It represents a reduction of the historically observed growth rate by over one-third.

The third target is to reduce our net dependence on imported oil in 1985 to one-third of our total oil demands, that is, to approximately 800,000 barrels a day by 1985.

The fourth target is to maintain our self-reliance in natural gas until such time as northern resources can be brought to market under acceptable conditions.

Finally, the fifth target is to double at a minimum, from $350 to $700 million a year, exploration and development activity in the frontier regions of Canada over the next three years, under acceptable social and environmental conditions. This is a minimum target that will facilitate the development of the information necessary to make appropriate decisions about our energy options.

In support of the objective of energy self-reliance, the government proposes nine major policy elements. These are: 1, appropriate energy pricing; 2, energy conservation; 3, increased exploration and development; 4, increased resource information; 5, interfuel substitution; 6, new delivery systems; 7, emergency preparedness; 8, increased research and development; 9, greater Canadian content and participation.

These policy areas are elaborated in the paper. In many cases specific examples of the kinds of programs and measures we will be introducing are indicated. For example, to further increase exploration and development we will be introducing a mandatory, company by company reporting system to monitor the cash flow of the petroleum industry. We will also move to reduce the period during which geophysical data remains confidential. To increase resource information flow we will be acting to require companies holding potentially important geological structures to have exploratory drilling undertaken within a reasonable time period. To promote new delivery systems for coal we are taking the position that before new export commitments are made producers should endeavour to determine whether a market exists within Canada for the additional coal production. Other specific measures such as conservation, research and development and greater Canadian participation that have recently been introduced or will be introduced shortly are described in the paper.

The precise nature of all future energy policy initiatives will continue to be determined within this framework but will, of course, be dependent on the course of future events. Such initiatives will embody the balance and flexibility that is essential if our policies are to be appropriate, and will reflect a changing relative emphasis among these nine policy areas as circumstances warrant. They will be developed with appropriate federal-provincial consultation and with due regard to the social, environmental and economic objectives of Canadians.

● (1520)

With the constructive co-operation of provincial governments and industry, and with the support of Canadians in all regions of the country, Canada can achieve the objective of energy self-reliance. Success in this endeavour will increase both the confidence and the options with which we can plan for years beyond 1985.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, we, like all Canadians, welcome this report today—a report of fundamental significance and importance for the development of Canada over the course of the next few years. I am sure that in the course of the next two or three weeks we will be discussing it, commenting on it and asking the minister questions about it in the House. This afternoon I want to take only a moment to point out two or three things which we think are of significance in respect of this important document.

The document has implicit in it three fundamental decisions on energy policy, and all but the final word on a fourth. The fact that these decisions have been made behind closed doors at 580 Booth Street, with barely a word to provincial governments and consumers who are so vitally concerned with this policy, makes a mockery of the so-called federal-provincial consultation mechanisms for energy development in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillies: The government seems to have forgotten the constitutional principle that the resources of this nation belong to the provinces and decisions made in that respect must be made in consultation with them. That this document should come down without that sort of consultation is, indeed, too bad.

We are now also told to expect higher oil prices. Consultation with the provincial governments in respect of this important situation is not even mentioned in the document's blueprint for a phased increase toward international levels, and no assurance is given to Canadians that our prices will not exceed those of the United States, our biggest competitor. Surely the cornerstone of the development of our resources and the development of our energy policy in this country has to be established in the face of our enormous international trade deficit. If Canadian buyers and consumers of energy are not to face a comparative disadvantage because of present policies toward energy, then an assurance of this kind will have to be given.

Secondly, it is quite clear that the government has apparently decided to ignore the special energy problems faced by Atlantic Canada. In the immediate future, maritimers can look forward to nothing but the hardship of escalating energy costs, in particular electricity prices which continue to mount and which will undoubtedly result in many more families being forced to find other ways to heat their homes. Nothing is planned to ease the burden of these costs, nor is there any federal assistance suggested to help in the generation of more electricity where the maritime provinces have some particular advantages. Nothing is said about the construction of a national grid, a policy which the Progressive Conservatives have advocated since 1969—indeed, since 1958. This matter must receive a great deal more support than this document suggests, if Atlantic Canada is ever to benefit and if ever such an energy grid is to become a reality in the nation.

Thirdly—and the minister said very little about this in his statement—the government has decided to press ahead with nuclear power as a major source of energy in this nation. The document cites a need to develop between 20,000 megawatt hours and 27,000 megawatt hours of new nuclear capacity within the next 15 years, a figure which is about equivalent to five reactors constructed every year. This is a massive commitment to an energy source which has attached to it many unanswered questions. How will we manage the highly toxic and radioactive wastes produced? How do we protect plants from natural and man-made disasters? Nothing is said about that. How are we going to protect ourselves against these disasters which can occur with the use of nuclear energy within our nation?

What is the competitive nature of this source of energy? A recent report prepared for the United States Energy Research and Development Administration showed that at current prices quoted for CANDU reactors, electric energy developed from the use of coal is competitive with nuclear power. Although the Canadian people are, by virtue of this document, committed to nuclear power, there is little discussion, especially in respect of the conclusions and the implications of this development. We simply cannot embark upon this road without more thought and discussion.

The fourth decision is one which is implied throughout the document but never stated; that is, that the government has all but made the final decision to go ahead with Arctic oil and gas development. If the so-called policy of self-reliance upon which the document puts such emphasis is to be realized in the timetable set forth, it is apparent that Arctic gas must come on stream by the early 1980s. Even though the document states that no policy commitment yet exists, if the self-reliance policy is to succeed in reducing our projected oil imports to one-third of total demand, the Mackenzie Valley pipeline must surely become a reality. The question of whether or not we should have a pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley has now become a question of when, not whether. The Berger Commission and the National Energy Board hearings, in light of this document, are not about whether a pipeline should be built but how it should be built and when it should be built. The decision has obviously been made.

There are a number of other features to this paper. The first is the government's virtual admission of ineptitude on a substantial scale in the budgets of 1974 and 1975. It is quite clear now that but for the prompt action of the Progressive Conservative government of Alberta, irreparable damage would have been done in respect of finding new supplies of gas and oil in Canada. It is to be hoped that when the new budget comes down the government will take into consideration the reflections in this report on its mistakes of the past, and we will then have a new and appropriate policy for oil and energy development in this country.

The government seems now to recognize the need for increased producer revenues. The minister has not outlined what specific measures he will take to ensure that this increased revenue will go back into exploration and development of energy in the future.

Finally, one can conclude that no matter how well or how badly conceived these policies may be, they have been put forward as a *fait accompli* without even the pretence of provincial consultation. Decisions have been made of fundamental importance without public hearing or debate. The minister has said in the past that his energy policies must become the policies of all Canadians, not just the government's. This document will not assure Canadians that that policy is being followed.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the document which the minister has tabled, entitled "An Energy Strategy for Canada—Policies for Self-reliance", represents the greatest retreat that has been seen since Napoleon withdrew in disarray from Moscow. In 1970 this government was telling the people of Canada that we had all the energy resources we needed for the foreseeable future. In 1973, when the government woke up to the deplorable situation in which we were, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the minister of energy, mines and resources at that time told us the government was launching a program which would make us self-sufficient in energy supplies by the end of the 1970s. Last year the government modified that pledge and said it would make Canada self-sufficient in energy requirements by the mid-

1980s. Now the minister tells us he is introducing a policy for self-reliance.

When we consider what the minister means by self-reliance, we find it is this: whereas this year, 1976, we are a net importer of oil to the extent of 240,000 barrels per day, by 1985 we will be a net importer of 800,000 barrels per day. If that is self-reliance, I would look with horror on a policy of dependency.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If one considers what that means, he will find that 800,000 barrels per day in 1985 means that we will be an importer of some 292 million barrels a year. If the price at that time is $15 a barrel—and that is not an exaggerated figure because Syncrude was undertaken on the basis that the price at that time would be about $15.50 a barrel—and if we are importing 292 million barrels of oil per year, we will have a bill of $4.380 million a year for imported oil.

● (1530)

I ask the government to look at the catastrophic effect this will have on Canada's balance of payments and what position it will put us in with regard to our competitive status with American industry. The United States, by means of a blended price, has been able to keep the price of oil in that country $2 or $3 a barrel below the international price. Moreover, in the past few years we have witnessed, and may witness again, oil being used as a political weapon. By 1985, under this policy Canada would be very vulnerable both economically and politically.

What does the government propose to do about this as outlined in the report the minister tabled today? First of all, the minister said that the matter is mainly to be left to the private sector. He says that Petro-Can will have an important role, but he does not spell out what the role will be. As a matter of fact, this morning's paper carries a story by Mr. Maurice Strong, the chairman of Petro-Can, in which he says that that Crown corporation is seriously considering investing money overseas in the North Sea and in developing the oil sands of Venezuela. We have billions of barrels of oil in the Canadian oil sands, but our publicly-owned oil company is considering the possibility of developing the oil sands of Venezuela. Is that the role for which the Canadian people are putting up money?

The government proposes to deal with this situation by the old policy it has followed throughout the years, which I think is a disastrous policy. It proposes raising the domestic price to the international price within two to four years, which it is estimated will be $13 a barrel and perhaps higher. What guarantee does this House or the consumers of this country have that these additional millions of dollars we will pay to the oil industry will be plowed back into exploration and development in Canada rather than in the North Sea, Venezuela or the Middle East?

The minister says the government will monitor these companies to make sure that they use these additional earnings for exploration in this country. We were promised that by the minister's predecessor last year when the government raised the domestic price of oil from $6.50 to $8 a barrel. Has this monitoring taken place? What monitoring machinery does the government propose to set up?

In the last three years the price of oil has gone from nearly $3 a barrel to $8 a barrel. If one looks at the record it will be evident that the money spent in exploration in Canada, as a percentage of the oil companies' earnings, has actually declined. The minister asks us to pay within the next two to four years $13 a barrel for oil and says that this money will be spent on finding oil and gas in this country. As a result, it is the Canadian consumer who buys the oil products—the Canadian taxpayer—because of the concession the government has so generously given the oil companies who will supply the funds for new exploration which will take place.

When the oil is found, the same people will buy it. This is known as a policy of pay now and pay again later. In the next ten years, the Canadian people will pay hundreds of millions of dollars in higher oil and gas prices in order to pay for the fact that this government for years allowed 60 per cent of our oil and gas to be exported to another country at prices only a quarter of what we will have to pay now for imported oil and domestic oil.

In this connection I want to say this is not a policy of reliance but it is a policy of drift. The tragedy is that once again the government is accepting the advice and acting on the recommendation of the very same powerful corporations which got us into this mess in the first place. The government is now proposing that we place our major reliance on pipelines into the Arctic and on nuclear power plants. In so far as pipelines into the north are concerned, the minister himself admitted that we do not have supplies or even proven reserves of oil or gas to justify the tremendous investment which will be necessary.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan), in the statement he made yesterday in Yellowknife, said that unless we can prove up significant additional reserves we throw into very grave question the whole matter of the pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley. Some of us have been saying that for many years. The best estimate of the National Energy Board is four trillion cubic feet of gas reserves in the Mackenzie Delta. We require 12 trillion cubic feet as a minimum.

Why are we asking the Canadian people to approve an expenditure of $8 billion to $10 billion for a pipeline, the main function of which will be to transport Alaskan gas from Pudhoe Bay to the United States? The fact is that if we invest these tremendous sums of money in pipelines and in nuclear power plants, we will have nothing left with which to finance or to further develop alternate sources of energy. We are locking ourselves into two programs that will shut out what could be much cheaper sources of energy and in some cases would be less detrimental to the environment.

The government has not announced its policy with regard to looking at alternative energy sources. At page 145 of this report we are told that the government will spend, in 1975-76, $1.6 million and will spend in this current year $1 million in looking at such things as solar energy, wind energy, tidal power, and so on. That is a mere bagatelle. Other countries spend tremendous sums of money looking at these sources of energy. The government has done no realistic investigation into secondary recovery of oil. There are billions of barrels of oil in western Canada which have not been economically viable to extract, but with second-

ary recovery methods and with higher prices this should be looked at. The government has not come down with any policy about secondary recovery or any policy of gasification of coal.

I say this is is a policy of treading old paths. It is a policy which is lacking both in vision and imagination. We face a situation in Canada in which our energy resources are running out. Apparently the government has no clearcut policy. Napoleon said that an army marches on its stomach. A modern industrial state moves on energy. If, in the years ahead, as a result of this policy of drift we find ourselves in difficulty with regard to supplying our people with the necessary energy, then this country will face very serious years. I see no hope, from the statement of the minister today, that the government even conceives the seriousness of the problem, let alone producing a policy to grapple successfully with it.

● (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, a policy based on requirements is long overdue instead of a policy based exclusively on trade or consumer demand. Let me explain.

It is paradoxical today, when the minister is reporting on a relatively alarming energy situation, that we should wonder whether there will be another energy shortage, especially as concerns oil and natural gas. The fact that Canada is still exporting daily hundreds of thousand barrels of oil or cubic feet of natural gas proves without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, the lack of foresight of a government that has failed to develop the required policy when it was needed.

We really should establish the energy requirements in Canada on the basis of our actual needs instead of foreign trade. I do not believe that in a country as vast as our ours, so full of all sorts of energy sources, with only 23 million inhabitants spread over a territory larger than the United States and larger than the whole of Europe, we should be talking about an energy shortage. It is only the mismanagement of governments that leads us to such an economic dead end in the field of energy. Indeed, how can we possibly have an oil shortage if we continue to export it? Mr. Speaker, the government should reply to such simple questions before sounding the alarm.

On a few occasions, I had the privilege in this House under Standing Order 43 of asking the government to make an inventory of the Canadian energy potential. Obviously, such an inventory would require the closest possible co-operation of the provinces, and I agree with the hon. member who spoke on behalf of the Conservative Party a while ago when he said that meaningful discussions and a coherent energy policy is not possible without the co-operation of the provinces. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that Quebec has a great energy potential as concerns hydroelectric power. It seems to me that this energy, which has required an apparently substantial capital investment, which is easy to preserve and relatively unexpensive, may compensate for the oil shortage that might happen in eastern Canada. But there is no co-ordination, no planning whatsoever in this regard. Thus, some provinces have energy surpluses while others are at grips with shortages and there is no co-ordination. The federal government should promote such co-ordination between all energy sources existing in the various regions of Canada. Of course, this cannot be done without extremely close co-operation.

Therefore, a precise inventory should be drawn up sometime. It should be kept up to date to enable us to know precisely what is available and what can be developed in Canada. We must no longer base our economy on those famous balances of trade with other countries or on exports. Let us simply ask ourselves, and this gives us the opportunity to do so, what we can do as Canadians. What are our energy requirements for the 23 million Canadians? Moreover, we must consider our energy potential. Mr. Speaker, once this has been seriously done, we will find out that we have all the energy required to meet our needs.

As long as the government refuse to see things as they really are, I suggest that we will always come to the point where we are told, as we were a few years ago, to turn down our thermostats, to shut the windows and not open too many doors. This is in my view a narrow policy, and it is time for the government to consider the introduction of a more serious, more positive policy, so that we know exactly where we are going.

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the minister. I am looking at the summary of the proposals in the paper and the 13 programs for self-reliance on page 8. Is the fact that there is a total absence of the mention of tidal power in the Bay of Fundy specifically, or tidal power anywhere in this country, an indication of the government's views with regard to this potential source of energy and the low priority it gives to it? If so, what a disappointment that is to many Canadians who thought tidal power would be part of the self-reliance program.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley pointed out that he was referring to the summary which is a shortened version of the larger document on strategy—the blue book. If he were to refer to it, he would find reference to tidal power; indeed, specific mention is made of the importance of the potential of tidal power and the fact that the federal government, in co-operation with the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, has already undertaken a particular program.

Mr. Nowlan: I appreciate that in the more comprehensive text on policies for self-reliance, tidal power is mentioned along with other sources of power. I believe that the statement—which I do not have before me at present—is that further research is necessary. My point is that certainly in Atlantic Canada, where the sound of tidal power is as strong as some of the talk about its development, research in terms of the studies that have gone into this energy package is not much further down the line than in other areas of Canada where it was suggested that the extraction of energy from such sources was perhaps not feasible for ecological or other reasons. Research into energy from James Bay is pretty far down the road, while research into the Bay of Fundy tidal power is being reviewed and reviewed following the review of the Fundy Power Authority. Can the minister give us any hope that some stimulus and priority will be given to this non-polluting,

renewable resource in the Bay of Fundy which could revolutionize the economy of Atlantic Canada, as did TV in parts of the United States?

Mr. Gillespie: The answer to the question is that we are betting $1.5 million that an updated research study, which is a $3 million joint study between the two provinces and the federal government, will show that there is, in fact, a realizable asset there. The hon. member must know that many research projects have been undertaken with respect to the tidal power potential in his area, but every one of them actually turned down the realizable potential when it came to putting it together. In other words, until now the experts have not been able to put together a package which is technically and economically feasible. We think that as a result of the increase in the price of energy generally caused by the OPEC oil price increase, a new, second look is now appropriate at tidal power sources.

● (1550)

Mr. Nowlan: The minister well knows, even though I think it was before he came into the House—and I might have been in the House—that in the first report on Fundy Tidal power it was always technically feasible, but at that time interest rates seemed to be a little high and it was suggested that the matter be reviewed a year or so down the road. We all know what has happened to interest rates. We all know what has happened to construction costs. They have affected James Bay. The estimate was several billion dollars, and now I think one figure is somewhere between $12 billion and $20 billion.

I find the answer of the minister difficult to understand in that in the summary of these policies, especially when eastern Canada and Atlantic Canada is so adversely affected by the increase in oil prices—and we have very few alternative sources—there was no priority given to the words "tidal power" when it is tied into research. I do not think that is a very good answer in terms of Atlantic Canada, and with respect, I think it illustrates some of the lackadaisical approaches of the government on the whole matter of energy.

Mr. Gillespie: In reply to that question I would draw the attention of the hon. member to page 29 of the summary of "An Energy Strategy for Canada" to which he was referring. There he will find a reference to tidal power under the general heading "Increased Research and Development" as follows:

> The gasification of coal on a commercial scale will only be fully realized if preceded by an adequate program of research, development and demonstration. In the longer-term search for new energy options, the promise of power from nuclear fusion should not be neglected and the feasibility of using renewable resources (represented by solar, wind, tidal, geothermal and biomass) should be fully explored—

And it continues.

Mr. Forrestall: God protect us from the minister. I should like to expand on that a little bit. The minister is indicating that there is substantial interest in the policy laid before us this afternoon and he elaborates on that by listing, amoung other things, wind power. We could rub sticks together and get energy, too. He lists biomass and tidal power somewhere in the middle, so there might be some hope for us. Unless the minister misunderstands us, we very much welcome initiatives with respect to coal, gasification of coal, and so on. I think the people of Cape Breton, particularly industrial Cape Breton, have some hope and welcome some good news: they are not totally negative about this.

However, can the minister elaborate with respect to the time parameters with regard to the extension of the Trans-Canada pipeline to the maritime provinces, so that we might at least have the comfort of the national security of our own resources? Those of us in the Atlantic provinces must now rely 100 per cent on foreign imports.

Mr. Gillespie: I cannot give the hon. member any indication of the time-frame for the extension of the Trans-Canada PipeLine system. I hope, though, that the kind of activity which is now going on in the Scotian shelf—really brought back as a result of the efforts of Petro-Canada in forming joint ventures, a program of $25 million per year over the next five years—will locate off the Scotian shelf the kind of proved oil and gas reserves which will serve not Nova Scotia but the other Atlantic provinces and perhaps central Canada as well.

Mr. Forrestall: As the minister is very well aware, the problem is the enormous impact on energy bills, particularly energy in the form of electricity, for the residents of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I know he is concerned about this and I am not attempting to suggest he is not. It is just that we find it passing strange that in the energy strategy there has not been a particular reference—not necessarily particularly to the problems we are facing now because they are under active consideration, hopefully, with some conclusion in the not too distant future—to the approach the government would tend to follow in a general way when this type of problem arises again at some point in the future. In other words, are we to believe that any approach to the resolution of our energy problems in the maritime provinces will continue to be ad hoc in nature?

Mr. Gillespie: On the contrary, I think when the hon. gentleman has had more time to review the document—and I agree that it is a very substantial document and it could not be done in the time he had available—he will be able to see that indeed there are a number of areas in which the federal government has introduced initiatives. We already discussed one this afternoon with respect to the development of potential tidal power resources; but the federal government has also made a number of moves with respect to regional interconnections, including the offer of financing one-half of the first nuclear power plant.

As far as Nova Scotia is concerned, there is a very substantial coal subsidy which runs into millions of dollars, and quite clearly the oil compensation program is of major benefit. The numbers I have seen indicate that very close to $1 billion has been paid indirectly to the consumers of Atlantic Canada as a result of the compensation program; that is, very close to $1 billion will have been paid to them by this summer. It seems to me that that is a very substantial contribution to Atlantic Canada. It is a very substantial way of assisting citizens of Atlantic Canada and eastern Canada generally, who would be paying $13 or higher if they were paying the going international price, to adjust over a period of time to a new

reality. That is to say, the days of cheap energy are now over.

Mr. Forrestall: Don't be condescending about it.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a question. Perhaps he does not know the answer; but as the minister, he should. Is the minister aware that as far back as 30 years ago or more there was a qualified consulting firm named H. G. Acres which did a thorough and complete study of Fundy tidal power? I think it was financed by the federal government. Is the minister aware that if the calculations were quickly brought up to date by a mathematician qualified in his field, and quickly computed, they would show that Fundy tidal power is not only feasible but practical and necessary? I suggest that federal governments from time immemorial, at least for the last 30 years, have been foot-dragging on Fundy tidal power. It is time the government got off its backside and did something about it. It is necessary and needed, and we in the maritime provinces are deserving of it.

Mr. Gillespie: Perhaps the hon. member does not realize that H. G. Acres are involved in the present reassessment of tidal power potential.

Mr. Jones: If that is true, we are paying twice for information which the government already has. I have that report, and I am sure the minister could use it.

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, I did not receive a copy of this document; I just borrowed one from a colleague. I hope the minister will excuse the fact that I have not had a chance to read it. Will the minister tell the House whether there has been a discussion about the decision to move Canada toward the world price, which is a monopoly price? As a result of the research done by Professor Adelman, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which was offered to the American government, it was suggested that the United States government and the Canadian government combined, rather than multinational corporations, should buy from members of the OPEC cartel and seal biddings in order not immediately to destroy the monopoly price but gradually to lower it. It is obvious that within that cartel some countries are worse off than others.

● (1600)

We are going on the assumption made recently by the vice-president of the Bank of Nova Scotia that the thing to do would be to push up the price to world levels in one jump. As he knows, this would give a great push to inflation as well as to the problems of economic growth in the country. Professor Adelman's studies show that this has been done so as to help break off that cartel gradually and not go ahead and meet what is not an American price but is a monopoly price.

I submit to the minister that we are setting a stupid precedent in trying to meet what is a monopoly price, and is continuing to be so, without any effort on the part of a large consuming nation in oil such as we are becoming. This is my first question: Have there been such discussions?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, Canada has taken the position that the most effective way of bringing counter-pressure against OPEC nations is to join with other large consuming nations who were part of the International Energy Agency. As a member of that agency, we have reached agreement on a number of different measures which we think will have the force of providing counter-pressure against the OPEC nations.

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the question. Has he considered the enormous work that has been done by professor Adelman and has been offered to the American government over a period of years? He suggests that sealed price-bidding by both Canada and the United States would quickly lower the monopoly price that we have to meet. Has that been specifically considered by the National Energy Board and the minister's department when forming policy?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I will draw the representations of the hon. member to the attention of the agencies to which he has referred. I shall also make inquiries as to whether the International Energy Agency has looked into the work of Professor Adelman.

Mr. Hogan: A final question, Mr. Speaker. Recently the minister is alleged to have stated that the federal government will pay a $25 million subsidy on oil shipped from Sarnia to Montreal. I do not know whether the minister actually said that, but it was carried by the press. Is it true, or not?

Mr. Gillespie: Who has the floor?

Mr. Hogan: Can the minister tell the House how much the government intends to pay?

Mr. Gillespie: Are you giving me the floor?

Mr. Hogan: I will give it in a minute. Can the minister tell the House how much the government intends to pay in subsidy to Nova Scotia to offset the oil price increase that will hit the economy of that province very hard if the July agreement is reached? It is evident from the minister's statement today that the price will go up considerably. I want to contest his statement made earlier. I should like him to table it in the House that it has cost, or will cost up to this sum in subsidy—$1 billion for the Atlantic region. When I discussed this in the House three weeks ago the hon. parliamentary secretary said the $1 billion estimate—although he did not show how it was worked out—was for all consumers east of the Ottawa Valley and not just for consumers in the Atlantic region.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions there. As to the Sarnia-Montreal pipeline, the federal government did take a decision that it would pay the deficiency costs in transporting the oil the additional distance from Toronto to Montreal which were not picked up in the tariff structure that then existed from Sarnia to Montreal. That, very likely, will run to something in the order of $20 million to $25 million. It is strictly temporary and will cease immediately the National Energy Board produces its findings on what the appropriate tariff should be on moving oil from Sarnia to Montreal. It is strictly a temporary measure to bridge the existing situation.

As to the price in the maritimes, if the hon. member would like to come to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works this evening, I shall appear before that committee and we will try to give the hon. member more precise numbers then.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if we could conclude the questioning with a question or two from the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my questions will be brief. First of all, I should like to refer the minister to his statement, which reads:

—to further increase exploration and development we will be introducing a mandatory, company-by-company reporting system to monitor the cash flow of the petroleum industry.

Is such a monitoring system in place now and, if so, to what extent does the minister intend to change or improve it?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, there is an informal reporting system; but as the text of my remarks makes clear, we are now making it mandatory.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In his statement the minister says there will be a role for Petro-Canada to play. I wonder if he could tell the House briefly what role the government envisages for Petro-Canada?

Mr. Gillespie: A very important role, Mr. Speaker. The exploration budget for Petro-Canada this calendar year would be in the order of $100 million, I would expect. That will place it amongst the majors in the exploration and development field. The vast majority of those funds will be devoted to the frontier areas. As the total exploration budgets last year were in the order of $350 million in the frontier regions, the hon. member will appreciate that a sum of roughly $100 million is a very significant proportion of the kind of exploration activity that we foresee for the frontier regions.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Finally, Mr. Speaker, does the minister have in mind that this $100 million will mainly be spent in the Arctic and on offshore drilling, and nothing for development in the Athabasca oil sands or any other activity such as secondary recovery?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, there is a sum of money—this is off the top of my head, and I would not want to be held to it—of something in the order of $7 million in this year's budget for participation in the polar gas project for technological research activity. There are further funds which are being sought for participation in various types of oil sands technology over and above the Syncrude project. I do not believe the additional funds have yet been authorized, but I think it is important to recognize that Petro-Canada will become the Canadian government's agent respecting Syncrude's participation, and that is in the order of better than $300 million.

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,949, 3,982, 4,144, 5,020, 5,021, 5,022, 5,113 and 5,148.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

TORONTO HARBOURFRONT PARK

Question No. 3,949—**Mr. Jelinek:**

1. What was the original estimated cost to the government for the Toronto Harbourfront Park?

2. What will be the final cost?

3. What is the scheduled date of completion?

4. What were the (a) administrative costs, (b) total overall federal expenditures in (i) 1973, (ii) 1974, (iii) 1975?

5. What committee, commission or group was in charge of the Park at inception in the fall of (a) 1972, (b) 1973, (c) 1974, (d) 1975?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. The original estimate for site acquisition cost was $36,000,000, including an anticipated expenditure of $6,000,000 for the provision of port improvements and port facilities for the Toronto Harbour Commissioners in exchange for land under their control.

2. It is anticipated that some settlements may be resolved by the Federal Court of Canada in accordance with approved provisions in the Expropriation Act. On the basis of settlements to date it is estimated that the final cost of site acquisition will be $55,000,000, including payments for port improvements and port facilities to be provided to the Toronto Harbour Commissioners.

3. Under the terms of settlement with the Toronto Harbour Commissioners it was agreed that the Government of Canada would complete the port facilities by March 31, 1981. It is anticipated that all settlements now outstanding with private owner, even if referred to the Federal Court of Canada, will be completed by at least that date or earlier.

4. In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned:

		Capital Improvements $	Operations and Maintenance $	Site Acquisition Payments including Port facilities $
(i)	1972-73	Nil	Nil	3,862
(ii)	1973-74	302,610	110,000	35,682,926
(iii)	1974-75	1,386,252	412,936	1,442,924
	1975-76 (estimated)	1,000,000	500,000	2,371,000

Order Paper Questions

5. (a), (b), (c) and (d) The Minister of Public Works filed Notice of Expropriation on October 17, 1972. No programme activities were initiated on the site during the balance of 1972-73. During 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76, the Ministry of State for Urban Affairs was responsible for the provision of programme activities on the site. The Department of Public Works has supported these programmes with related expenditures on capital improvements and site operations and maintenance. During 1973-74 and 1974-75, Urban Affairs chaired an Intergovernmental Committee that provided direction to the project team planning the development of the site. In July 1975, the Harbourfront Council was created by MSUA with the agreement of the Mayor of Toronto and the Chairman of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. This council of Toronto citizens was charged with the responsibility for directing the operation of the site and for making recommendations to the three participating levels of government on the future of the site. Their report was submitted January 30th and is under review by the three levels of government.

MEETING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MUSEUMS CANADA IN 1975

Question No. 3,982—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Did the Board of Directors of Museums Canada meet in Halifax during 1975 and, if so (a) on what dates, (b) for what purpose, (c) at what locations, and (i) in what manner, (ii) by whom were the decisions made regarding the location for each meeting?

2. In each case (a) how many persons were in attendance, (b) what was the total cost for (i) accommodation, (ii) travel expenses, (iii) food and drink, (iv) sundry expenses?

Hon. James Hugh Faulkner (Secretary of State): I am informed by the National Museums of Canada as follows: 1. Yes, (a) September 15, 16, 17, 18, 1975; (b) according to the by-laws of the National Museums Corporation the NMC Board of Trustees must meet quarterly. The Halifax meeting was a regular quarterly meeting. Board meetings are held outside the National Capital in order to give Trustees an opportunity to meet with Canadians in all regions who have been closely involved in the policies of the National Museums of Canada and to give them a first hand view of how well the programmes and policies are being implemented. In Nova Scotia, Trustees also visisted Louisburg and the Miners' Museum in Glace Bay. The latter is assisted by the NMC and is one of the best examples of the NMC cultural decentralization policy in action; (c) Halifax, Louisburg, Glace Bay; (i) in the normal manner, which is determined by the Trustees at their meetings; (ii) by decision of the Board of Trustees at their quarterly meetings.

2. (a) Twenty-six persons were in attendance; (b) (i) $1,721.17; (ii) $7,837.28; (iii) $2,872.47 (In addition to the 26 persons who were in attendance for all or part of the Board meeting, the costs include entertainment for provincial officials and leaders of the museum community from the Atlantic region); (iv) $2,371.29 (The sundry expenses covered simultaneous translation costs).

[Mr. Drury.]

CMHC—LOANS MADE TO QUEBEC HOUSING CORPORATION

Question No. 4,144—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. Does the Société d'habitation du Québec consult with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation before building (a) homes, (b) low-rent housing for senior citizens and, if so, does it submit its plans to the Corporation?

2. What is the name of the person who determines the amount of the contribution by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to a project?

3. Does an agreement exist between the two Corporations and, if so (a) what are its details, (b) as of what date?

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): I am advised as follows by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation: 1. (a) and (b) Following normal procedure for housing financed under the NHA, Quebec Housing Corporation submits plans and specifications to CMHC before loans are approved for housing for families or for senior citizens.

2. The processing of applications for loans under the NHA is an aspect of the internal administration of CMHC which is the responsibility of its President and Board of Directors, and it is not the policy to disclose details of such administration.

3. (a) and (b) An agreement between CMHC and QHC was entered into on September 12, 1974 for projects to be financed in 1974 and 1975 for housing for elderly persons under Section 15.1 of the NHA and for public housing projects under Section 43 of the NHA.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—NUMBER OF RETIRED ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL ON PENSION

Question No. 5,020—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. How many retired Armed Forces personnel are receiving pensions, including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the following brackets (a) less than $20.00 per month, (b) $20.00 to $29.99 per month, (c) $30.00 to $39.99 per month, (d) $40.00 to $49.99 per month, (e) $50.00 to $59.99 per month, (f) $60.00 to $69.99 per month, (g) $70.00 to $79.99 per month, (h) $80.00 to $89.99 per month, (i) $90.00 to $99.99 per month, (j) $100.00 to $149.99 per month, (k) $150.00 to $199.99 per month, (l) $200.00 to $249.99 per month, (m) $250.00 to $299.99 per month, (n) $300.00 per month and over?

2. How many widows of Armed Forces personnel or of retired Armed Forces personnel are receiving pensions, including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the brackets indicated in the above question?

3. What is the total number of retired Armed Forces personnel and also the number of widows of Armed Forces personnel or of retired Armed Forces personnel presently residing in each province?

4. In respect of how many orphans of Armed Forces personnel are pensions being paid and what is the average amount thereof?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. As of March 31, 1976, the number of retired Armed Forces personnel receiving monthly pensions totaled 48,018 within the following monthly brackets: (a) less than $20.00, 50; (b) $20.00 to $29.99, 64; (c) $30.00 to

$39.99, 130; (d) $40.00 to $49.99, 251; (e) $50.00 to $59.99, 239; (f) $60.00 to $69.99, 186; (g) $70.00 to $79.99, 246; (h) $80.00 to $89.99, 336; (i) $90.00 to $99.99, 474; (j) $100.00 to $149.99, 2,480; (k) $150.00 to $199.99, 5,621; (l) $200.00 to $249.99, 7,893; (m) $250.00 to $299.99, 6,935; (n) $300.00 and over, 23,113.

2. The number of widows receiving monthly pensions totaled 4,866 as follows: (a) less than $20.00, 44; (b) $20.00 to $29.99, 44; (c) $30.00 to $39.99, 37; (d) $40.00 to $49.99, 45; (e) $50.00 to $59.99, 43; (f) $60.00 to $69.99, 79; (g) $70.00 to $79.99, 102; (h) $80.00 to $89.99, 165; (i) $90.00 to $99.99, 193; (j) $100.00 to $149.99, 1,086; (k) $150.00 to $199.99, 1,101; (l) $200.00 to $249.99, 725; (m) $250.00 to $299.99, 497; (n) $300.00 and over, 705.

3. The number of Retired Armed Forces personnel and widows of Armed Forces personnel presently residing in each province is as follows:

Provinces	Personnel	Widows
Newfoundland	215	16
Prince Edward Island	413	47
Nova Scotia	4,652	422
New Brunswick	1,756	172
Quebec	4,065	516
Ontario	18,732	2,053
Manitoba	2,035	210
Saskatchewan	653	84
Alberta	4,159	346
British Columbia	10,085	831
Territories	90	6
Outside Canada	1,163	163
	48,018	4,866

4. Number of orphans, 164, Average monthly amount, $55.50

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SUPERANNUATION ACCOUNT

Question No. 5,021—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What was the total amount at credit in the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account as at (a) March 31, 1973, (b) March 31, 1974, (c) March 31, 1975?

2. What rate of interest has the government paid for the use of this money during the fiscal years ending on the dates noted above?

3. What amount of interest was credited to the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1973, (b) March 31, 1974, (c) March 31, 1975?

4. What was the total amount paid out of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1973, (b) March 31, 1974, (c) March 31, 1975?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1, 3 and 4. This information is tabled in the House of Commons annually in accordance with Revised Statutes, and also appears annually in the Public Accounts.

2. Rates of interest for: (a) 1972/73 Quarter ending June 30, 1972, 1.4601 percent; Quarter ending September 30, 1972, 1.4659 percent; Quarter ending December 31, 1972, 1,4778 percent; Quarter ending March 31, 1973, 1.4931 percent; (b) 1973/74 Quarter ending June 30, 1973, 1.5042 percent; Quarter ending September 30, 1973, 1.5252 percent; Quarter ending December 31, 1973, 1.5364 percent; Quarter ending March 31, 1974, 1.5490 percent; (c) 1974/75 Quarter ending June 30, 1974, 1.5642 percent; Quarter ending September 30, 1974, 1.59 percent; Quarter ending December 31, 1974, 1.6259 percent; Quarter ending March 31, 1975, 1.6363 percent.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PERSONNEL ON PENSION 1959-1975

Question No. 5,022—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. In each year 1959 to 1975, both inclusive (a) how many personnel of the Canadian Armed Forces have commenced drawing pensions under the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, (b) how many widows have commenced drawing pensions under the said Act?

2. In each year 1959 to 1975, both inclusive, how many pensions under the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act (a) to retired Canadian Armed Forces personnel, (b) to widows of such personnel, have been discontinued because of the death of the annuitant?

3. In each year 1946 to 1975, both inclusive, how many service personnel contributed to the pension or annuity account under the former Part V or under the provisions of the present Canadian Forces Superannuation Act?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) The number of Canadian Forces personnel from 1959 to 1975 inclusive who commenced drawing pensions under the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act (CFSA) was as follows: 1959, 752; 1960, 1,048; 1961, 1,418; 1962, 1,343; 1963, 1,623; 1964, 2,454; 1965, 3,419; 1966, 3,407; 1967, 2,983; 1968, 2,787; 1969, 4,050; 1970, 4,075; 1971, 4,267; 1972, 4,405; 1973, 3,357; 1974, 3,478; 1975, 3,459. (b) The number of widows of Canadian personnel from 1959 to 1975 inclusive who commenced drawing pensions under the CFSA was as follows: 1959, 98; 1960, 121; 1961, 166; 1962, 179; 1963, 207; 1964, 208; 1965, 283; 1966, 263; 1967, 303; 1968, 303; 1969, 371; 1970, 323; 1971, 375; 1972, 420; 1973, 441; 1974, 478.

2. (a) The number of pensions to retired Canadian Forces personnel for the years in question which were discontinued because of the death of the annuitant was as follows: 1959, 91; 1960, 103; 1961, 114; 1962, 127; 1963, 142; 1964, 169; 1965, 190; 1966, 208; 1967, 243; 1968, 295; 1969, 353; 1970, 356; 1971, 331; 1972, 323; 1973, 379; 1974, 524; 1975, 496. (b) The number of pensions to widows of Canadian Forces personnel which were discontinued because of the death of the annuitant was as follows: 1959, 9; 1960, 12; 1961, 17; 1962, 19; 1963, 26; 1964, 28; 1965, 34; 1966, 39; 1967, 45; 1968, 56; 1969, 50; 1970, 52; 1971, 24; 1972, 11; 1973, 12; 1974, 30; 1975, 39.

3. The number of contributors to the CFSA or the former Part V based on the strength of the Armed Forces as at March 31 of each year indicated, was as follows: 1946, 212,692; 1947, 36,535; 1948, 34,762; 1949, 41,676; 1950, 47,185; 1951, 68,427; 1952, 95,394; 1953, 104,427; 1954, 112,529; 1955, 118,077; 1956, 116,678; 1957, 117,092; 1958, 119,038; 1959, 120,412; 1960, 119,597; 1961, 120,055; 1962, 126,474; 1963, 123,694; 1964, 120,781; 1965, 114,164; 1966, 107,467; 1967, 105,584; 1968, 101,572; 1969, 98,340; 1970, 93,353; 1971, 89,563; 1972, 84,933; 1973, 82,402; 1974, 81,822; 1975, 79,817.

ARFAA—PAYMENTS BY PROVINCES

Question No. 5,113—**Mr. Forrestall:**

For each Atlantic province, by year since 1965, what is the government's best estimate of the payments made under the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act?

Anti-Inflation Act

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: The Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act received Royal assent on July 19, 1969 and payments under this legislation have only been made since that date. Such payments are made to carriers in relation to the movement of traffic within and westbound from the region. As such traffic originates and terminates within and/or between all provinces in the Atlantic Region it is not possible to allocate payments to a specific province. Such information could only be established by abstracting origin and destination statistics from the millions of shipping documents submitted by carriers in support of subsidy claims. No data gathering system currently exists to accomplish this purpose.

PICKERING AIRPORT EXPENDITURES

Question No. 5,148—**Mr. Stevens:**

1. What was the total amount expended, itemized to reflect the purpose of all main expenditures, by the government directly or indirectly on the Pickering Airport up to March 31, 1976?

2. As of that date, what further monies have been committed, itemized to reflect the purpose of all main expenditures, with respect to the project?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):

	Accumulated Expenditures (1) to March 31, 1976 ($000's)	1976-77 (2) Estimates ($000's)
Site	543	—
Planning Team	10,798	—
Land and Related Costs	83,586	5,604
Headquarters Charges— Loan Interest, Fringe Benefits, etc.	24,303	12,651
Total	$119,230	$18,255

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO ADD NEW DEFINITIONS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-89, An act to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, be amended in clause 11 by striking out lines 10 to 23 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) This act expires on May 1, 1977, or on such earlier date as may be fixed by proclamation or a motion taken up and considered by the House of Commons that is adopted by the House and concurred in by the Senate pursuant to subsections (8) and (9) unless, before May 1, 1977, or any earlier date fixed by proclamation or any such motion that is so adopted by the House and concurred in by the Senate, an order in council is made to the effect that this act shall continue in force for such period of time as may be set out in the order in council."

● (1610)

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of my motion I would first like to say that I hope hon. members will participate at lenght in the debate with respect to this motion and also Bill C-89. I believe that one of the most important matters before this parliament is the question of the wage and price control program inflicted on the Canadian public by the government.

Mr. Broadbent: And supported by you on second reading.

Mr. Stevens: In that connection I would say that the minister's comment earlier today in the question period, that he hoped for speedy passage of this bill, was not unfortunate, bearing in mind that at committee stage with respect to the bill the guillotine was used once more by government members to force the bill through without proper review of the clauses therein. In short, we spent three meetings at committee stage reviewing this bill.

The same mistake was made by government members as was made respecting Bill C-73, the original anti-inflation legislation. That was giving too little time for thorough review at committee stage on this important matter which, unfortunately, ended up with amendments being required as we are now dealing with in Bill C-89. I say that because at the committee stage initially with respect to Bill C-73 it was made quite clear that we felt there were not proper appeal provisions under the legislation that the government was advancing.

My motion is, in effect, a very simple one. I suggest that we should deal with motions Nos. 1 and 2 jointly because they are interrelated. Motion No. 2 is consequential upon motion No. 1 being accepted. Motion No. 1 simply proposes to change the expiration date of Bill C-73 from December 31, 1978, to a more realistic date, namely, May 1, 1977.

An hon. Member: Bill C-89.

Mr. Stevens: If I may clarify that, Mr. Speaker, the bill we are dealing with today is Bill C-89, which in turn amends Bill C-73, but the expiration provision is in Bill C-73. What I am saying is that Bill C-73 contains the expiration date of December 31, 1978. The clause which is amended in another way by the administration is now being reamended through my motion to make the expiration May 1, 1977, as opposed to December 31, 1978.

I urge members of this House to support us in our desire to ensure that the wage and price control program of the present administration be held to a minimum period. It is our view that the honeymoon period with the Anti-Inflation Board appears to be on the wane. Six months after its creation, there is little evidence that the board has helped to contain inflation. Current moderation in inflation is due in the main to a decline since October in the prices of beef, pork, poultry, fresh fruits, cereal and bakery products. None of these items, however, come under the Anti-Inflation Board's direct purview, even in principle. Wage settlements reviewed by the board have ended in average first-year increases of 16.2 per cent, well above the board's target of 8 per cent plus 2 per cent for so-called productivity. More and more it appears that the present administration established the Anti-Inflation Board for political rather that economic reasons. Jean-Luc Pepin, chairman of the board, has apparently been asked to keep a high profile to give the impression of activity so that the administration can claim credit should inflation decline.

The present administration, in their anti-inflation program, appear—as far as the cabinet members and others are concerned—to be more and more as though they were TV actors playing out a script. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), I would suggest, takes the role of Marshall Dillon, out to vanquish the imagined villains, the labouring man, the businessman, the municipalities and the provinces. He, of course, has his little entourage. Festus, in the script, appears to be the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) limping along, meaning well but always fumbling and changing his mind. Jean-Luc Pepin, the board chairman, takes the role of Doc. His role is one of physician for all our problems. He is quick to prescribe aspirin remedies, but admits that he has no idea how to cure the overall disease of inflation. I am not sure who plays the role of Kitty in the program. It may be even Mrs. Plumptre, if you can imagine that.

As much as the administration may claim they are out to vanquish the villain of inflation, in the real world inflation always ends up vanquishing controls, if they are left on a permanent basis. The economies of western democracies are strewn with dead and wounded control programs that lasted too long. Controls only work on a temporary basis. Controls in themselves will not put an end to the inflation cycle. In fact, they may cause inflation to continue longer than they otherwise would. "Doc Pepin" will never put an end to the transfers of income and wealth that inflation brings. He will never be able to end the hardships inflicted by inflation on our poor and disadvantaged. Controls may be introduced appropriately as a supplementary or incidental device which for psychological reasons, at least, might assist the economy to right itself. Such controls must be subsidiary, however, to a tighter fiscal restraint and realistic growth in our monetary system.

It was on this basis that my party first suggested the imposition of an income control policy in Canada. We did that early in 1973. We based our proposition on the sound economic premise of having restraint in government spending and in the growth of our money supply. Had our approach of restraint in spending at the federal government level and in monetary growth been followed there is no doubt we could have shaved off the top of our inflation cycle and had less inflation today. Unfortunately, however, the present administration has subjected us to their control program for political reasons, not economic reasons. The administration is using this program to project an executive image of decisiveness in response to the public outcry to do something about inflation. In addition, they realize that the controls program shifts the focus of attention away from the real culprits of inflation—the government's own agency, the Bank of Canada, and the government's own spending—toward the private sector and the struggles between business and labour to maintain their income share.

The public relations' value is difficult to overestimate. Its ideal from the present administration's standpoint to have our commentators on TV and our columnists refer to labour or business leaders as being locked in confrontations against the public interest when they try to raise prices and wages. The administration's role then shows up as the protector, as the Marshall Dillon of the public interest rather than the culprit in the inflation process.

The electronic medium is perfectly suited to handle this shift in focus. Radio and TV people have a horrendous time depicting the complex process in which an undue increase in our money supply or federal spending creates inflation, but they have a very easy time depicting conflict between management and labour or consumer and supermarket. In this type of conflict the government always looks good. It is generally assumed they have no selfish interests, so they can appear to be the defender of the public and its protectors against selfish business and labour leaders. The Prime Minister and his officials wear white hats, carry halos and come on like Marshall Dillon with hundreds of deputized enforcers.

● (1620)

We were first told that the staff of the AIB would be 200 in number. At last count it was 583, and rising. After six months the number has reached nearly 600. Will it be 1,000 by the end of the year? At the highest point of the phase two control program in the United States the organization comparable to the AIB in Canada had only 700 people on its staff.

There is a growing indication that the government sees the control program in this country as a continuing one. Speaking in Toronto last weekend, the Minister of Finance told a meeting of Ontario Liberals that the wage and price control program might have to be tightened up so as to be more effective. He said that the program was, and I quote, "in a certain sense unjust to everyone", but that it had brought the rate of inflation down to about 9 per cent. Mr. Speaker, that is nothing but direct misrepresentation. There is no evidence that the program has materially reduced inflation. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary.

Let me cite two examples. I have already referred to the fact that the main reason for the decline in the rate of inflation is the drop in food prices. In the last three months, food costs declined to the equivalent of an annual rate of a 6.5 per cent increase, while the rest of the consumer price index package soared by 10.7 per cent. In the six months before the imposition of controls, the cost of living rose at an annual rate of 10.4 per cent. In other words, if you exclude the food component there is more inflation

today than existed prior to the commencement of the program.

My second example is this. Increasingly there is a tendency for wage settlements to be more generous than they might otherwise have been, since employers contemplate the AIB knocking down settlement levels anyway. There appears to be a shifting of responsibility from employers to the AIB in the blind assumption that the board will insist that its own guidelines should not be violated. However, we find that recent settlements approved by the board have on average been 50 per cent higher than permissible under the board's own guidelines.

Most alarmingly, there is increasing evidence that the government intends to continue the control program indefinitely, at least in part. Mr. Pepin speaks about the program having a gradual character and states, "It's only a dream if people start thinking of getting out of controls in 12 months or 18 months." The Minister of Finance has admitted to the committee that it is going to take a number of years to get inflation down to a level which in the government's view would justify dismantling the control program. The longer the controls continue, the more they will distort the economy. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have moved, on behalf of the official opposition, that the anti-inflation program should expire on May 1 of next year rather than continue beyond that date.

Inflation in the United States is running this year at 6 per cent, compared to our own rate of 9 per cent. William Simons, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, has forecast that inflation in that country will be down to 2 per cent in a couple of years. In Canada, on the other hand, the government talks about 8 per cent inflation this year, 6 per cent next year and 4 per cent thereafter—figures substantially above the American level.

The AIB has introduced a high degree of confusion into the marketplace. There is presently a backlog of 3,000 applications for price or wage review. According to the findings of a Gallup poll released last weekend, 67 per cent of those questioned thought the program was unfair with regard to prices, and 65 per cent felt it was unfair with regard to incomes. In the absence of public confidence there is little chance the board will be able to function effectively.

Speaking of confusion, in the course of the question period today I asked the minister at least to clarify the unfortunate inclusion of charitable donations under the restricted expense definition found in the Anti-Inflation Act regulations. His reply confirmed my worst impressions. Charitable donations, as an item included under restricted expenses, are now put into such a category that businessmen, acting in complete sincerity, may find it difficult to maintain their programs of charitable donations. I say this because what the minister has chosen to do by way of these regulations is to lump a large variety of expenses together under the heading of "restricted expenses." He has lumped advertising, promotion and public relations, plant and office rearrangement, moving, landscaping and decorating expenses, with expenses incurred in research and development, management fees, including administration fees, technical assistance charges and accounting service fees paid to any person with certain exceptions. To all these things he has linked charitable donations and, finally, training and retraining expenses.

The unfortunate consequences are these. As a company carries on its business it may find that through no fault of its own advertising costs have increased. The cost of research and development might go up because the company feels it needs to spend more money in these areas in order to increase its productivity. Yet under the existing regulations the extra money needed will have to be found in one or other of the categories to which I have referred. For example, if a company wishes to increase its research and development program it might well feel it has no alternative but to lower its charitable donations in the current year. When we consider that more than 50 per cent of the money received by charitable organizations comes from business and commercial undertakings, I think it is particularly unfortunate that the regulations should be drafted in such a manner, the consequence of which might well be a substantial shortfall in donations to charitable donations such as the United Way in the current as well as subsequent years.

Initially, as I have pointed out, the administration stated that the board would have no more than 200 employees. As late as last November, Mr. Pepin is on record as saying, "The members of the board have a strong preference for a small agency, thus keeping the bureaucracy to a minimum." Last week, however, when appearing before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, he stated:

> The original plan which called for a total of 200 officials was nonsense. It was simply a concept in the mind of one individual with no analysis of the situation at all.

It was then revealed that as of last month the board had built up a bureaucracy numbering 583 persons—and that figure is likely to be over the 600 mark by now. Besides the staff to which I have referred in the AIB itself, there is, of course, a staff in the administrator's office, in the office of the appeals tribunal and in other departments of government such as national revenue. In addition there is, of course, the provincial involvement. Speaking about staff, I think hon. members would be interested in an article that appears in the current, April edition of *Executive* magazine. It refers to the chaos existing at the AIB. The article has this to say:

● (1630)

> Under the best of circumstances, the pace of expansion would have led to rather severe growing pains. But the differences among the board members and the lack of even minimal controls over the purse-strings have seriously compounded the problem. The growth has not been well orchestrated, internal co-ordination has been almost totally lacking, and personal empires are well under construction. In other words, the AIB's management is chaotic.
>
> One sign of this is the high rate of turnover among the senior staff in almost every branch of the board.
>
> Prices and profits: John Hague, the present director-general, is the second person to occupy the post. Hugh Bardon, his predecessor, walked out after a few weeks. But Hague himself is only temporary and he is expected to return soon to his regular job at the Canada Development Corp.
>
> Compensation: James King already has returned to his consulting business in Toronto. He was succeeded by William Nelson as director-general at the start of March.

Communications: Michael McCabe resigned in February, being replaced as director-general on an acting basis by Kenn Prittie. A permanent replacement has yet to be appointed.

Administration: Ralph Blackwell, the present director-general, is the second person in the job.

Economic research: David Dodge is at least the second director-general; nobody can remember how many others have preceded him.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, can you blame the official opposition for saying that we should ensure that this unfortunate program should come to an end no later than May 1, 1977? The Americans, in their phase two program which ran from November 15, 1971, to January 11, 1973—about a 13-month period—took a much different approach from that which has been taken in Canada. Their program had three tiers of controls. The first tier, which involved 1,100 firms with $100 million or more in sales, covered 55 per cent of the gross sales in that country. Tier No. 2 covered another 1,500 firms which had sales of from $50 million to $100 million. This level caught 11 per cent of gross sales in the United States. The third tier, which applied to firms with sales under $50 million, involved only selected companies. In total, the United States did not attempt to control more than about 3,000 firms—a far cry from our approach.

In the American program, however, Mr. Speaker, they did attempt to control rents, with the result that 57 per cent of their field force was devoted to that field where they received 80 per cent of their complaints. We in Canada have passed rent control over to the provinces, yet our AIB staff is even larger than that in the United States if we look at the composite picture.

To date, the administration appears to have made three important mistakes in setting up their Anti-Inflation Board and the anti-inflation program itself. First, they did not provide for a total freeze during an initial 90-day period to allow for the forming of definitive rules which could be more easily understood. Secondly, they are allowing a highly discretionary approach to be taken in their decisions, with little consistency. Some wage and price decisions appear to be excessive, while others are unduly low. Thirdly, unlike the American approach, where about 3,000 firms were involved, the board has kept expanding their jurisdiction so that they are now reviewing over 100,000 concerns in this country. The workload and frustration that that will entail will become impossible. The administrative cost to businesses of complying with the controls will run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

In this connection, the United States has estimated that its control program may have reduced the rate of price and wage increases by no more than about 1 per cent, and that the main impact was at the beginning of their program. Against this one must consider the statement of John Dunlap, executive director of the cost of living council, when he appeared before the United States Senate committee on banking, housing and urban affairs on February 6, 1974. At that time Mr. Dunlap had this to say:

One must consider the direct and indirect costs of the controls program. The direct costs consist of the administration necessary for the government and private sector to operate controls. The outlays of the federal government for implementing controls were $108 million for Phase II—

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the outlay for our program in Ottawa is running close to $20 million per year.

Estimates on the administrative costs to business for complying with the controls regulation cover a range of from $0.7 to $2 billion, with the more realistic estimates at the lower end of the scale.

With 30 times the number of firms involved in Canada's control program already, the relative costs to Canadian companies may be truly staggering. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members should at least peruse the latest publication from the C.D. Howe Research Institute in a booklet "HRI Observations", which carries an article entitled "The Anti-Inflation Guidelines: Linking Wages to Productivity". I think this booklet sets forth some interesting perspectives and comments concerning this controls program, and on page 3 the following interesting statement is to be found:

—without an exceptional boost in productivity growth during the current recovery period, the guidelines will prolong the process of winding down the rate of inflation.

I think that the factual information given in this brochure should give everybody cause to be alarmed. Their view is that the 2 per cent productivity assumption that is built into the anti-inflation guidelines is not realistic in relation to productivity increases in this country. When the minister comments on my motion I should like to hear him deal with this question of productivity precisely.

Again on the question of confusion, I think it is interesting to note that not only did the government request the Anti-Inflation Board to comment on bringing various companies under the general regulation of the program—I am referring to the recent order in council directed at construction companies right down to the one-man company level, trucking companies, grain handling companies and shipping and longshoring establishments—but it has chosen to throw its net around the general insurance companies as well.

This is truly remarkable, Mr. Speaker. If you read the Anti-Inflation Board's recommendations regarding the inclusion of general insurance companies within the program, in effect the board stated that those that had automatically fallen within the guidelines—those with over 500 employees—did not dominate the industry sufficiently because there were so many other companies in the industry competing that the board could not effectively deal with that industry if the program were restricted to a relatively small number of companies.

The fact is that there are over 400 insurance companies doing business in Canada. What the government had failed to recognize is that the board was really basing its recommendation on the fact that they had found that most of those 400 companies were truly very competitive, and that unless they could control all insurance companies they felt they would be unable materially to alter the general carriage of business in the insurance industry of this country since the controls affected only a few of the big companies which, in percentage terms, represented only a small portion of the general insurance field. I would suggest that is a complete distortion. Reading it another way, the board should have said this is an industry that is truly competitive and does not need the control we are being asked to extend over it. To confirm this, I think it is interesting to note the statement by Mr. Humphrys, Superintendent of Insurance, before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs just this morning. I should like to quote what Mr. Humphrys said as follows:

● (1640)

The recent and current economic situation has strained companies' resources.

He was referring to companies active in the general insurance business. He continued:

Rising claims costs due to inflation and the resulting underwriting losses suffered have made it impossible to restore margins from retained earnings; at the same time the competition for capital and the poor profit performance have made it difficult to raise additional capital funds. This has caused some companies to withdraw from Canada and some others have had to impose restraints on the volume of new business.

Incidentally, on questioning Mr. Humphrys he stated that 27 companies to date have had to withdraw from Canada because the insurance business is so competitive they no longer felt they could continue to make money here carrying on with the general insurance business. Mr. Humphrys went on to state:

The situation has required, and is requiring, sustained attention by the department to see that unsatisfactory asset positions and operating losses are recognized and corrected within time limits imposed, in order to ensure that companies remain in a position where they are able to discharge their financial obligations to the public. We are re-examining the statutory requirements for reserves and surplus margins to be sure that they do not unnecessarily impede companies in providing insurance that the public needs.

Those are alarming words coming from the Superintendent of Insurance. He is stating that the losses sustained by these companies were something over $200 million in 1974, and almost $200 million in 1975, have resulted in these companies being extremely strained as far as their capital resources are concerned. To suggest that they be subjected to still more harassing control and regulation shows the ineptitude of the government's handling of this entire anti-inflation program.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stevens: My friends to the left, in typical fashion, hoot and holler when I refer to the insurance industry. I only wish they would read into *Hansard* what happened to the British Columbia Insurance Company which tried to get into the insurance business and compete with private institutions operating in that province.

In conclusion, I hope that hon. members will support my motion. I feel that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Trudel) will undoubtedly understand the reference I am making to the United States experience in phase two of its anti-inflation program. The parliamentary secretary, with myself, attended a seminar in Washington in January, 1975. At that time we heard most of the officials who had been involved in the United States anti-inflation program and I think the parliamentary secretary will agree that if we are thinking of getting into a controls program in the foreseeable future, we should not. They said we should not get into such a program, but if we did we should make sure we have the co-operation of labour before doing so. What I find most remarkable, Mr. Speaker, is the way—

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member, following his thoughtful speech, would answer a question before sitting down?

[Mr. Stevens.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Will the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) accept a question?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be willing to accept a question from the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). I am just finishing my remarks.

Specifically, what I am saying is that I hope the parliamentary secretary will pass on to the Minister of Finance the very good information we obtained in Washington about the handling of an anti-inflation program, with the earnest desire that the minister will wisen up and perhaps be able to handle this program in a more satisfactory way than to date. Above all, I wish to emphasize that the program should not continue longer than 18 months and should terminate on or about May 1, 1977.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, in the hon. member's speech of some 40 minutes he listed the many objections he has to the program, suggesting it was not working in terms of prices and was unfair in terms of wages. He mentioned that the insurance industry was upset, and so on. For 40 minutes I heard nothing but criticism of the program. I should like to ask the hon. member why, in heaven's name, he wants it extended for another year?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, through no fault of the hon. member, he is not a member of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. This question was discussed at that standing committee and I tried the minister out on his willingness to accept various termination dates. I felt the only one we could possibly win on was May 1, 1977. The thought was that we should be thankful for small mercies if that was the chosen date for the program to terminate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I believe it has been suggested by the hon. member for York-Simcoe that motions Nos. 1 and 2 be debated together. If this is the wish of the House, the Chair has no objection to the suggestion. A separate vote should be taken on each motion. However, it seems to the Chair that motions Nos. 2 and 3 contain contradictory propositions. Perhaps the hon. member would like to comment on that, as it would seem to the Chair that if motion No. 2 is adopted, that would automatically dispose of motion No. 3.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that one vote be held on motions Nos. 1 and 2 in that, as I have indicated, motion No. 2 is simply consequential on motion No. 1, and in the event that it is defeated we should then have a vote on motion No. 3. If motion No. 3 carries, I would suggest that this is an entirely separate matter from motions Nos. 1 and 2.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I believe the hon. member suggests that the House should debate motion No. 1 and motion No. 2 together, then vote on No. 1, which would dispose of motion No. 2 and No. 3 would be a separate vote. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In view of the fact that motion No. 2 is now included, I will read the motion. It is moved by Mr. Stevens, seconded by Mr. Paproski:

That Bill C-89, an act to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, be amended in clause 11 by striking out lines 27 to 38 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(6) Where, at any time after August 31, 1976 and before January 1, 1977, a motion for the consideration of the House of Commons, signed by not less than 50 members of the House, is filed with the Speaker to the effect that this act shall expire on a date before May 1, 1977, that is specified in the motion, the House of Commons shall within the first fifteen days next after the motion is filed that the House is sitting, in accordance with the rules of the House, take up and consider the motion."

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you provided the theme for my response to the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) when you referred to him as having been completely contradictory in his motions. Indeed, he was contradictory to himself, to his colleagues and to his former leader throughout his speech. At the very start he got up to oppose the speedy passage of this measure. Indeed, he was only consistent, at least with himself, in the fact that he has been active in trying to prevent this particular bill from becoming law. He has taken every step possible to try to prolong debate on this matter, to prolong the committee hearings and in fact to prevent it from being carried out.

However, the hon. member has totally rejected the viewpoint of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), his former leader, or perhaps has revealed that that hon. gentleman was not genuinely expressing his party's viewpoint. Hon. members will recall the righteous indignation of the hon. member for Halifax, the former leader of the opposition, when he complained about the fact that the workingman in Canada did not have the right of appeal under this bill, or the anti-inflation law, and wanted that right of appeal established as soon as possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1650)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this bill proposes. The hon. member for York-Simcoe, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), and other members have prolonged the debate to prevent the representatives of the workingman, such as the unions and other representatives, from getting the right of appeal which the former leader of the opposition once said he, at least, was interested in.

In dealing with the substance of the argument, as I have said many times before we have set out to put into play a planned and deliberate reduction in the rate of inflation in Canada and to take account of the fact that some people in the working force have not had the opportunity to catch up with the rate of inflation in the past; in other words, to try to reduce the rate of inflation in Canada by a deliberate program over a three-year period. We have sought to soften the impact of the program on the workingman in Canada by extending the period of time in which it would operate. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues would like to see a much steeper rate of reduction in Canada and much harsher measures taken to bring down the rate of inflation.

Once again, the hon. member for York-Simcoe in his participation in the debate this afternoon advocated a policy which would ensure a very high rate of unemployment in this country and would bring about a very great risk of the Canadian economy being forced into recession. The hon. member has often quoted with admiration the American situation and the fact that the rate of inflation in the United States at the present time is about three percentage points below the rate in Canada. I think we should recall that the United States has experienced a rate of unemployment of up to 10 per cent during the past 18 months and, unlike the Canadian economy which was reduced to a very slow rate of growth, but a rate of growth, over the past six months, the United States suffered no less than a 6 per cent recession during the past 18 months.

For my part—and I am sure members on this side of the House agree—it would not be our purpose to fight inflation by bringing about high levels of unemployment and recessionary conditions in Canada as one way of bringing about a reduction in our rate of inflation. That is why we reject the tight money policies, the restrictive fiscal and monetary policies which the hon. gentleman opposite advocates as the means to reduce inflation in Canada.

Mr. Stevens: Then we do not have restraint.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We do indeed have restraint. The question is, are we to tighten up the economy and throw more people out of work? The hon. member for York-Simcoe would say, by all means do this and it is too bad for the workingman. He would say that we should tighten it up. That is not our viewpoint.

The hon. member used figures, again, concerning the number of staff in this particular organization and the number in the United States. During the course of the committee hearings he repeatedly produced figures and asserted that these were the numbers. He repeated the figure 700 as the number of United States employees involved in the program in that country. Of course, as was pointed out to him in the committee, he had—I am sure accidentally—only drawn the staff from one of the four United States' organizations responsible for running the American anti-inflation program. Indeed, at one point he picked out the number of employees from the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as 250 and my colleague from Windsor pointed out that that was with regard to only one part of a departmental program which had very many more employees than that.

The fact is that there were many more persons involved in the United States. In the several agencies involved there were 1,000 persons under the anti-inflation program alone and three thousand more in the context of the internal revenue service. The interesting thing is that hon. members opposite are unhappy with this government for having adopted a selective incomes and prices control system. We have not adopted the type of comprehensive program of wage and price controls which hon. members advocated during the election campaign. They were going to control the whole economy.

Mr. Stevens: For 90 days.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member says, "For 90 days". The hon. member for Edmonton Centre and the hon. member for York-Simcoe are therefore going against the former leader of the opposition, because during the election campaign he was talking about 22 months. Who is telling the truth? Members of the official opposition who proposed a comprehensive set of controls over the entire

economy are now complaining about the size of the Anti-Inflation Board staff with relation to only a selective set of controls.

Mr. Speaker, there was a reference to the average rate of settlements decided by the Anti-Inflation Board, a reference made by the hon. gentleman. I just want to point out that he, perhaps inadvertently, was referring not to the total of the settlements covered by the Anti-Inflation Board, or income settlements covered by the Anti-Inflation Board, but to those cases only in which the question of the historical relationship arose. I will have something to say about the question of the historical relationship and the way the hon. member for York-Simcoe repudiated the stand taken by his colleagues from Vancouver South and Churchill earlier in the question period today.

First, I think one should note that with approximately half of the compensation returns in, we are covering about two-thirds of the workers under the anti-inflation program. About half of those compensation returns indicate settlements which are at or below the guidelines. It is true, with regard to the highly-publicized settlements such as in respect of the Toronto high school teachers and the pulp and paper workers, where the question of the historical relationship was raised, there have indeed been higher levels of settlement. The last people to complain about this should be the members of the official opposition. After all, they were the people who said during the question period this afternoon that the program was unjust because in respect of the workers in Thompson, Manitoba, the historical relationship had not been recognized. They cannot have it both ways. If they agree with us that there will be some transitional situations which occur, for example, in respect of those in the pulp and paper industry, then indeed there should be recognition of the historical relationship and in some of these transitional settlements it is appropriate to have some recognition of settlements above the guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could call it five o'clock and return to this matter later in the day.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Transport—Atlantic region—Meeting with provincial ministers on highway program—trans-Newfoundland corridor study—government position; the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams)—Administration of Justice—Suggested reference of gun control measure to Supreme Court to determine whether jurisdiction federal or provincial; the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Finance—Suggested changes in equalization formula as result of increased energy costs—Request for report.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

It being five o'clock, pursuant to the order made on Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Shall order No. 34, in the name of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Shall order No. 4, in the name of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Shall order No. 10, in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan), stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Shall order No. 24, in the name of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government.

● (1700)

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it has been agreed to stand all the other bills and call Bill C-247.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) is ready to speak on that bill.

* * *

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

PROVISION FOR ABATEMENT OF NOISE LEVELS IN FACTORIES

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Toronto-Lakeshore) moved that Bill C-247, an act respecting noise in factories, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as spelled out in the explanatory note attached to it, is to combat a major health hazard in industry by requiring that the

noise levels in establishments having contracts with the government of Canada shall be a maximum of 85 decibels. The noise volume at 85 decibels is said by health experts to be "when you can hardly hear yourself talk".

Noise control has been a very complicated and controversial issue due to the complex nature of noise itself and its effects. Noise has been defined as any sound that is regarded or treated as a nuisance. But the degree of annoyance is not necessarily related to the intensity of sound. What may be music to one person is noise to another. Certainly, attitude of mind and environment are of major importance. This factor and others further complicate the debate raging on the best means of measuring noise, the most effective and feasible manner of protecting workers and the health effects of noise.

I have neither the expertise nor the inclination to become involved in that kind of discussion which brings in countless variables and employs scientific and technical jargon. I believe that kind of debate is too often used to slow down or halt noise abatement efforts rather than seriously attempting to find ways of controlling unwanted and excessive sounds. This "talk but don't act" mentality has resulted in slower progress in changing the law than technology's capacity to make more noise.

There can be no question of a man's right to work in an environment which will not harm him, and there is no doubt that noise which is loud enough and consistent enough will harm him. The degree of this harm and the scope of the health effects caused by noise—for which a wide variety of physiological and psychological effects have been postulated—is at present uncertain. However, one area where there is unanimous agreement is that noise can, and does, cause hearing loss whether it is temporary hearing loss or permanent hearing loss, or permanent injury to the inner ear. These effects are an established fact of living and working in an industrial society; there is no controversy over this point.

Another point that is not very controversial is how hearing loss occurs. The most common kind of industrial hearing problem develops when the tiny hair cells in the inner ear, which transmit sound pressure along nerves to the brain, are damaged. Exposure to high noise levels can cause these cells to become fatigued, resulting in temporary loss of hearing ability. The ear can usually recover, once the noise is removed, in a period ranging from minutes to days. However, if the noise is loud enough and long enough over months or years, the cells are destroyed and the damage is permanent.

At what level, then, does hearing loss begin? This point varies widely with individuals and it is often difficult to separate work-induced hearing loss from contributing noise factors off the job. However, in the summer of 1975 the U.S. occupational safety and health administration held 4½ weeks of hearings which included 139 presentations of testimony. During the hearings the occupational safety and health administration presented estimates based on a sample of 19 major U.S. industries employing about 14.5 million workers. With this group it was found that a strictly enforced—I repeat, strictly enforced—90-decibel limit of noise for an eight-hour work day would keep 463,000 workers, or 3.2 per cent of the work force, from suffering hearing loss after 40 years of exposure, still leaving 130,000 at risk of hearing impairment. Lowering that limit to 85 decibels, according to OSHA, would prevent hearing loss for another 73,000 workers, or 0.5 per cent of the work force. The U.S. national institute for occupational safety and health estimate that as many as 10 per cent to 15 per cent more workers might suffer hearing loss if exposed to 90 decibels, instead of 85 decibels, over a working lifetime.

As I stated earlier, health problems may not be the only result of high noise levels. A number of experts have suggested that by acting on the nervous system, noise increases the pulse rate and may raise the chances of high blood pressure and the occurrence of stress, which could have measurable effects. However, while many noise abatement proposals mentioned non-auditory effects of noise, most are aimed only at preventing hearing loss since research on these other possible effects is still inconclusive.

Although Canada does not have specific legislation dealing with noise control in industry at either the federal or provincial level, there are protective legislative provisions at both levels of government as part of other statutes. Federal legislation for noise control, found under the Canada Labour Code as the Canada noise control regulations, exist as statutory orders and regulations. The regulations affect noise control and hearing conservation in federal works undertakings and businesses. The regulations state that where reasonably practicable, employers must not permit employees to work where the sound level is 90 decibels or more. Otherwise, permissible noise exposure is scaled from eight hours per work day at more than 87, but not more than 90 decibels, to zero hours at more than 115 decibels. A worker may be permitted exposure to 90 decibels or more where a suitable hearing protector is worn which reduces the sound level to less than 90 decibels, or where a hearing test establishes no hearing impairment for employees exposed to 90 to 95 decibels and regular tests are made.

The United States has a 90-decibels standard for an eight-hour work day, similar to that adopted under the Canada Labour Code and by several provinces. However, the currently developing goal in the United States for maximum industrial noise exposure is 85 decibels for an eight-hour work day. This standard is being considered for adoption by the occupational safety and health administration in Washington. It would appear that this level might very possibly be adopted, at least as a goal for the near future. In addition, the Soviet Union, Australia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Sweden, East and West Germany, and South Africa have adopted the 85-decibel industrial noise limit.

It is clear that industrial noise control in Canada lags seriously behind that of a number of other countries, including the United States. The cost of inadequate noise control is high, not only in terms of health damage but also in the context of compensation payments. For example, between 1971 and 1974 the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario paid out more than $2.5 million to people who had significant hearing loss from noise damage. It appears, as Robert Baron says in his book "The Tyranny of Noise", that—

Society seems to look upon any degree of excessive noise as it now regards pornography—if it contains a modicum of social value, it is not obscene.

However, perhaps it is somewhat unfair to blame all of society for the lack of effective controls on noise pollution, for the bulk of the blame must lie with governments and corporations. Too often, noise abatement is presented not as an essential but as a luxury. But who considers the ability to hear a luxury? We have to stop weighing economic considerations against public health and welfare. Indeed, it sometimes appears that more emphasis is placed on reducing noise complaints instead of noise.

As I indicated earlier, there is considerable debate about the present noise limit of 90 decibels for an eight-hour work day versus the proposed 85 decibels limit. In the United States, a number of organizations including the environmental protection agency and the national institute for occupational safety and health are supporting the adoption of the 85 decibels limit. Most major labour unions are also supporting this standard. Industry, by and large, is opposed to the establishment of the 85-decibel standard, especially in older plants, on the understandable grounds that the program will be prohibitively expensive. Industry's spokesmen argue, instead, for the use of hearing protection devices such as ear-plugs and ear-muffs. Labour groups argue against the use of these devices on the grounds that they are often improperly worn and thus give insufficient protection. In other cases, because the devices are hot and uncomfortable over long periods, workers frequently refuse to wear them at all unless they are directly supervised.

● (1710)

It may seem much more practical to have workers wear ear-plugs or ear-muffs rather than spending millions of dollars to convert machinery so that it meets the minimum noise standards. While in the short run this may be the only alternative, I believe industry must begin to place emphasis on designing machinery which will be much quieter. I really do not believe industry will take this initiative until it is forced to do so. Corporations have always argued against pollution controls—and let us make no mistake that noise is a form of pollution—on the ground that such controls were economically not feasible. However, environmental studies have generally shown that without such controls the cost will be much higher. In an article by George Clack entitled "The Noise Control Controversy" he refers to a recent long-range study which shows the same is true for noise controls. He said:

Dr. Nicholas Ashford, from the center for policy alternatives at MIT, analysed the costs and benefits of compliance over various periods of time for both 90 decibels and 85 decibels limits. By placing a dollar value on the benefits of less worker's compensation, absenteeism, and mental annoyance, he discovered that after 40 years an 85 decibels limit would actually be cheaper than a 90 decibels limit.

In conclusion, I hope hon. members will see fit to send Bill C-247 to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for further study or, at the very least, the subject matter of this bill. If we fail to take some action on this matter, we may very well be condemning an untold number of workers to partial or complete deafness.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) on the introduction of this bill which, if passed, would be entitled "An act respecting noise in factories". The hon. member has made a good case for a proposition which we all support, namely, that in too many places there is too much noise pollution. One might say that at times it is not only in work places. I have seen places of entertainment and I have dropped in on parties which have taken place on this hill around the middle of December where I am sure the noise level was much higher than 85 decibels. There may be times during the question period in the House of Commons when the level gets fairly high as well.

[Mr. Robinson.]

At any rate, to be serious, I think the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore has done a service in bringing this subject before the House and I hope the House will be willing in this private members' hour to agree to this bill and send it to the standing committee. I think it is appropriate that it should go to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration because it does relate to noise in work places.

If I have some misgivings about the bill, they relate to the narrowness of its application and to the lack of any provisions for its enforcement. I remind the House that we already have in the Canada Labour Code a part which deals with safety. Back in earlier days we had two or three separate federal labour codes and one of them dealt entirely with safety. That particular act has now been incorporated into the Canada Labour Code as a whole and it lays down conditions with respect to the atmosphere, temperature, noise and any conditions which affect the health of our workers. I can say from some experience that when that legislation was first brought before this House a number of years ago we were urged to get it through in a hurry because the Department of Labour wanted to get moving on it, and despite that, these many years later there are still factories in this country where there are health hazards of various kinds because the Department of Labour has found it difficult to enforce the provisions of that act.

But this particular bill which is now before us does not provide for any enforcement provisions at all. It is limited in that it refers only to those factories which get federal government contracts, and I think we should go much further. That is not to be taken as a stand against the bill. I think the idea in it is a commendable one and I want to see the bill go to committee. However, I hope that in committee we might find ways of incorporating this into the Canada Labour Code so that the attempt to avoid noise pollution will be made not just in those factories which get government contracts but in all work places which come under federal labour jurisdiction.

I was critical a few moments ago with respect to the tardiness of the Department of Labour in putting into effect the provisions regarding safety which are in the Canada Labour Code. On the other hand, I know that genuine efforts have been made by the federal Department of Labour in co-operation with the various provincial departments of labour to get safety accepted and practised in all work places. I have the feeling that this little bill, standing by itself with no provisions for enforcement, will not do the job. What we need to do is put into the Canada Labour Code itself these provisions regarding 85 decibels

over an eight-hour period, being all workers should be asked to experience, and I hope that if we could get it into the labour code with provisions for enforcement, the excellent proposals of the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore could be implemented.

So I commend my hon. friend across the way for bringing in another useful bill. He will be running up something of a record if he gets this bill through today. He got one through a short while ago. All power to him. We on this side of the House do not have that experience very often. However, it is high time we did something about noise pollution in Canada in all kinds of places. Because this is a small beginning in that direction, we are glad to give our support to Bill C-247.

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the preceding two speakers and to say in a few words how this bill relates to the federal Department of the Environment. Under the Government Organization Act, 1970, the Minister of the Environment is charged with the responsibility to initiate, recommend and undertake programs and co-ordinate programs of the government of Canada which are designed to promote the establishment or adoption of objectives or standards relating to environmental quality, or to control pollution and promote and encourage the institution of practices and conduct leading to better protection and enhancement of environmental quality.

Consistent with this mandate, between November, 1972, and January, 1973, departmental staff conducted a series of bilateral meetings with all provinces on the subject of environmental noise control. These meetings led to arrangement of a conference of federal and provincial officials in Ottawa on May 1, 2 and 3 of 1973. With the exception of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, all the provinces were represented. At the federal, level, the Department of the Environment, the Ministry of Transport, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Privy Council Office were represented. The provincial representatives were unanimous in requesting the permanent establishment of a federal-provincial committee on noise to act as a forum for the exchange of technical and other information on noise and to assist in the development of proposals to improve the collective capability to manage noise problems in Canada.

At the meeting of federal and provincial ministers of the environment on May 8 and 9, 1973, several provincial ministers strongly endorsed the formalization of the federal-provincial committee on noise. Formal appointments to the committee were made during the summer of 1973 and the first meeting was convened in April, 1974. Two technical subcommittees have been formed, one dealing with general aspects of community noise and the other with specific noise sources.

● (1720)

We consider such federal-provincial interaction to be essential in developing an effective and nationally integrated approach to noise control, particularly since we are dealing in an area of mixed or overlapping jurisdiction. We believe that our program proposal provides for an effective approach to promoting and stimulating efforts in this area and in bringing together the various agencies, both federal and provincial, having responsibility and authority to effect the desired control measures.

Of course, Environment Canada's primary interest in the noise control field is directed to what may be termed "environmental noise". Environmental noise may be considered as noise which may be perceived over a relatively wide area and is harmful or disturbing to individuals or to local ecosystems. Bill C-247, on the other hand, appears to be directed to the control of "occupational noise". Environment Canada's interest, then, is somewhat peripheral, recognizing that occupational health and safety are a more direct responsibility of the departments of labour and national health and welfare and that provincial jurisdiction is also involved. However, it must also be recognized that reduced noise exposure levels in the work place may in some instances also result in reductions in noise in the environment surrounding a particular industrial activity.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but I shall not, to describe many other activities of the Department of the Environment and the requirements and procedures that have to be followed and that are established relative to noise pollution specifically. I could talk about the environmental protection agency and all that, but I shall conclude my remarks simply in an effort to accommodate the hon. gentleman who introduced this bill because I am in perfect agreement with the general thrust of the bill itself. Therefore, I shall not prolong the debate. I will simply say that it should be noted that much of the legislative jurisdiction over occupational noise rests with the provinces. That is going to be a problem.

Bill C-247 proposes limits for noise in industrial establishments working on government contracts. Noise control of the type considered could be introduced through requirements written into the contracts rather than through a new federal act. It is specified in clause 3 of the bill that subject to section 4, noise levels shall not exceed 85 decibels. There are various types of decibel representation of sound and the type of decibel should be clearly indicated in a noise specification of this type. Also, the effects of noise depend, among other things, on the duration of exposure to the noise. A proposed noise limit such as this one should indicate the duration of the noise exposure, as is done, for instance, in the Canada noise control regulations of the Canada Labour Code. It may have been intended that the decibels in clause 3 of the bill be A-weighted. A short exposure to 85 A-weighted decibels of noise would not have deleterious effects on human beings, and in fact such short exposures often occur in harmless occupational and non-occupational situations.

Officials of the Department of the Environment will continue to work toward the implementation of an effective national program in environmental noise control, and will work in close co-operation with officials of the Department of Labour and the Department of National Health and Welfare in overlapping areas of interest related to occupational noise and to the direct and indirect effects of noise exposure on human health.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words

to say on Bill C-247 introduced by our colleague for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), an Act respecting noise in factories.

I want to mention that there is already a regulation known as SOR 71-584 of the Canada Labour Code on noise control. That regulation relates to noise control and hearing conservation in federal works, undertakings and businesses. Of course, it would be interesting if that regulation were extended and enforced also in all provinces so this problem of outmost importance could be solved.

The schedule refers to the sound level in decibels and the maximum time of exposure. Well, the bill introduced by our colleague is very interesting of course, but perhaps not as complete as it could be, as one of the hon. members who spoke before me suggested. It is for that reason that we agree to have it sent to the Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration so it can be considered more in depth and its full scope examined. In this way, we could see whether it would be possible after hearing witnesses on the subject to prepare a report allowing us to give this bill a new orientation and make it more complete.

Therefore, I think that all parties agreed to send the bill to the standing committee. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call it six o'clock.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is as follows: Mr. Robinson moved:

That Bill C-247, an act respecting noise in factories, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Order. It should go to the Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct; it is the committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration that is the recommendation with regard to the bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Have we unanimous consent for the change?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The motion is that Bill C-247, an act respecting noise in factories, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

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

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent).]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 5.30 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO ADD NEW DEFINITIONS

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, before five o'clock I had referred to the very obvious difference of opinion between the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) on the one hand, who is critical of the Anti-Inflation Board because it exercised its judgment, to quote his phrase, in a highly discretionary way with little consistency—those are his words—with respect to the historical relationship of certain of the collective bargaining units that had come before its attention, and the viewpoint expressed by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) and the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) earlier today not because the Board had not exceeded the guidelines, but had not exceeded them by enough. They felt the Anti-Inflation Board had not gone far enough beyond the guidelines.

I think the answer was given by himself, although he obviously did not understand it, to the hon. member for Vancouver South in the very question he asked, in which he said, "But what if you are not to allow it to Thompson, are you not going to allow it to Snow Lake, Lynn Lake and a number of other mining communities in northern Manitoba?" That is the exact point. If one has to repeat it again and again throughout the work force, where is the restraint? Where are we going to have restraint on incomes in the work force? If you have a continual pyramiding of labour costs in our community, let us not kid ourselves, people will have to pay for it and it will add to the level of inflation in Canada.

His question involved another contradiction. Again the hon. member for Vancouver South obviously did not understand it. He said he was concerned about the work force leaving Thompson and going somewhere else. Where else—Snow Lake, Lynn Lake, or the other communities? If all those communities are restrained in the same way, to what avail is it to leave one for the other? That is the exact point of applying a general system of this kind to restrain incomes throughout the community.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe made some reference to the American anti-inflation program. He has come back

from there and apparently is an expert on this question. I think it is fair to point out to him that that program was in effect for nearly three years, August 1971 to April 1974. It included a whole range of remedies, including not one but two freezes, and various kinds of selective controls in that period of time. Therefore there is obviously no single answer involved in how to bring about an effective mandatory controls program of this kind except to point out that, whatever one may say about the American experience, it lasted generally as long as the period of time contemplated under this particular program.

The hon. member made some reference to the fact that there are 100,000 firms now covered by the provisions of the controls. Perhaps he was being a little disingenuous in that. He referred to the fact that the vast majority of firms had been added as a result of the judgments of the Anti-Inflation Board with regard to association bargaining situations, the situation where a group of employers and firms are associated to bargain as a group with a group of employees, with a collective bargaining representative on their side.

The important fact to bear in mind is that those involved in this association bargaining process, firms, and in many cases the employees themselves, wanted the anti-inflation program to be extended to them as well so that it would not break up what in their viewpoint had been regarded as an advantageous way of dealing with labour relations. Therefore when the hon. member refers to 100,000 firms, he is obviously exaggerating. To be more honest, he should refer to about 143 associations which bargain collectively with their employees for the purpose of determining their wage levels.

The final point he made was with regard to his question during the Question Period about charitable donations. As I pointed out at that time, the government has indicated a certain level of restricted expenses so as to get around the situation where a firm could decide to increase its prices, with the consequent cost which would have to be borne by the consumer, and at the same time escape the profit restrictions of the anti-inflation program for the years of the application of the program by increasing its expenses a certain amount. This could be done, for example, by advertising promotion, expenditure on research and development, charitable donations, and action in a number of other areas. Clearly, restraint provisions inherent in the profit controls under the anti-inflation program would not be effective in holding prices down if firms could increase their prices and escape the profit control by that kind of practice. It is for that reason the guidelines provide that the over-all category of these restricted expenses may not be increased in any one year at any greater rate than the increase in the total returns to the firm.

● (2010)

The hon. member laid some store on the argument that it was regrettable that charitable contributions or expenses incurred on research and development might be reduced. Well, I suppose that if a firm were to decide to cut down its charitable contributions and increase its advertising promotion or its expenses on public relations, or if it wanted to increase its expenses on landscaping or decorating, which is another area of restricted expenses, or its expenses in connection with conventions for so-called educational purposes, it could do so. But let it not do so with a high moral tone pretending that the anti-inflation program was curtailing it in that regard. It is the firm's own priorities which determines whether money is put into landscaping, for example, rather than into charitable contributions. Hon. members should bear in mind that if a firm feels constrained to curtail charitable donations because it has to increase expenditures in other areas, this is an indication of the firm's own priorities.

The bill before us will extend the benefits of the appeal provisions to certain people affected by decisions of the Anti-Inflation Board and will provide certain additional legal measures to make the present anti-inflation program more effective. This measure has been outstanding for some time now, during which period the rights of appeal of certain groups have been abridged. I will terminate my remarks at this stage in the hope that we may secure early passage of the legislation in order that those rights might be available to persons affected by the Board's decisions.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the New Democratic Party's support for the bill before us. I do so at least in part for the reason that we can claim to have had something to do with the origin of the bill in the first place.

The House will recall that about two months ago, as a result of the settlement in the Irving case, we moved a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 26 calling for an emergency debate on precisely this issue, the case of workers in Canada not having any right of appeal at all. Certainly they had no effective right under the existing legislation. An emergency debate was permitted by Mr. Speaker at that time. Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the amendments to the bill which are before us. But before doing so I must say I have never listened in all my life to such a contradictory speech as that presented today by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), who used his full 40 minutes castigating the whole anti-inflation program. There was nothing good about it, in his view.

The hon. member listed objections which have arisen because of the lack of efficacy of the price control program; he listed objections based on inequities in terms of the effects on wages and salaries of Canadians from coast to coast; he complained about the effect on the corporate sector. In short, he said nothing good about the whole measure. He then presented an amendment which would have the effect of extending the life of the bill, permitting this measure to remain as part of the law of Canada, for fully another year. I would presume, Mr. Speaker, that only a member of the Conservative party could adopt such a contradictory position on a measure of this nature. He cannot have it both ways. Either the anti-inflation program embodied in the law of Canada at the present time is on balance a good program and acceptable to a party or to a member of the House of Commons and is therefore supportable or, on balance, the program is bad for whatever variety of reasons, in which case a logical mind or logical part would reject it.

I repeat, the spokesman for the Conservative party rose in his seat and spoke for 40 minutes against the bill, then made a proposal which would lead to its maintenance on

the law books of Canada for fully another year. If any speech was attempting to have things both ways, then surely the one we heard from the hon. member was doing so. I hear an hon. member to my right protesting; he is shaking his head and presumably he agrees with the hon. member for York-Simcoe. He asks, "why not have it for a year?" I say to him that if a kick in the head is bad twice, it is no reason for him to accept being kicked in the head once. The Conservative member again insists that it is good to have one kick in the head. Well, that may be true for the Conservative Party of Canada, Mr. Speaker, but it is not true for the New Democratic Party. We said when this measure was first announced last Thanksgiving, that it was bad in principle. We said so when the bill was introduced shortly afterward, and we say so again tonight. What is bad for two, three or four years is, for us, equally bad for one year. You cannot have it both ways.

Because I intend to move a sub-amendment which I hope will be consistent with what I have to say, and one which goes to the principle of the legislation which is embodied in the proposal put before us by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, I want to say something very briefly about the existing legislation and its effects on the people of Canada.

It is, I think, worth noting, that the Gallup poll seeking the opinion of the people of Canada on this legislation recently revealed the conclusion that 65 per cent of Canadians think the program is unfair in terms of wages and salaries. Second, 67 per cent of Canadians think the program is unfair in terms of its effect on prices in Canada. This may well have been the reason why the hon. member for York-Simcoe made the kind of speech he did. He is now catching up to the people of Canada. They are feeling its effects. If they were here tonight they would obviously be voting against it. Certainly they would not commit the absurdity of speaking for 40 minutes against a measure and then, in effect, voting for its continuance.

The people of Canada now realize the program is unfair in its impact on wages and salaries. The rulings of the board in this area have been remarkable for their inconsistency. One has only to name a few categories of workers in highly disparate occupations and the facts speak out to support my statements. We think of the librarians in Toronto, and of the miners in Thompson. Just in the last few days we have been talking about the miners. The minister a few minutes ago scoffed at the suggestion that the workers in Thompson might leave Thompson because of the grossly unfair wage settlement which was imposed by the Board. The Minister of Finance asked, "Where are are they going to go?" He listed a whole number of places to which they might move and implied they weren't going anywhere.

Just for the minister's information, in case he is not aware of them, here are some figures with respect to the rate of labour mobility in Thompson, Manitoba, in the very company affected by the decision. In 1970 that company had a 124 per cent turnover in its labour force, in 1971 it was 112 per cent, in 1972 it was 101 per cent, in 1973 it was 84 per cent, in 1974 it was 130 per cent, and in 1975 it was 118 per cent. These figures are significant. They illustrate that Thompson is an isolated community, one to which most working people do not readily go. One of the major reasons for considering a move to that difficult northern environment is that at least the wage or salary offered will afford some kind of compensation for such a move.

● (2020)

I also want to put on the record the comparison with other workers in the same industry who live in Sudbury, Ontario. These workers are getting a higher rate of pay. It is with this group of workers that the Thompson workers should have been compared for historical reasons, and the board should have reached the same settlement and given them the same rate of pay. There is not the same isolation problem in Sudbury. Workers in that community in 1975 had a labour turnover of only 6.7 per cent. Compare that with the turnover in Thompson, Manitoba, for the same year of 118 per cent. Surely even the Minister of Finance can see the significance of these two different sets of figures. In the one case it is unpleasant and difficult to work in terms of accessibility to other populations living in reasonable climatic conditions; in the other case such problems do not exist.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if that AIB had an ounce of intelligence in terms of dealing equitably with this group of workers, it would have assured that in its decision of recent days the Thompson workers in Manitoba would have been given an increase fully commensurate with and equal to the remuneration received by their fellow workers in Sudbury who are doing the same kind of job. That is only one glaring and unfortunate illustration of the kind of inequitable decisions we have been getting from the Anti-Inflation Board.

Another vivid example is a decision announced the same day affecting the uranium workers in the Elliott Lake region of Ontario. These workers are susceptible to cancer and silicosis to a degree way out of proportion to almost every other category of worker in Canada. There is every reason to believe, now that it is common knowledge among the people of Canada, as it should have been a long time ago, that the pension plan that was negotiated by the steelworkers union in Elliot Lake on behalf of its workers, as part of the package considered by the AIB, was an essential feature so far as the work force was concerned. This was a provision for early retirement for the workers in the uranium industry. To put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, early retirement is essential to many of these workers if they are to avoid getting cancer or silicosis.

Be that as it may, in making its ruling on the package settlement for the workers in the uranium industry the Anti-Inflation Board did not consider this fact, even though it knew full well that in considering financial benefits one includes pension plans as well as hourly pay rates. If the board gives a much lower settlement than is fair and equitable, inevitably it will mean that the pension plan will be affected and that workers in those circumstances will suffer a deterioration in their health, resulting—and I say this bluntly—in premature death for a number of them. This illustrates how serious is the Anti-Inflation Board's decision, yet the government had done nothing about it, saying benignly that it will leave it to the board and hope for the best.

I am not going to take the time to go over the whole range of decisions that have been made in past months; I

cite here but two glaring and unfortunate examples. The general point that I want to make is that at the outset of this program, in view of the way it is set up and in view of the legislative provisions, the New Democratic Party said that the people who would be most seriously and adversely affected by it would be the working Canadians, the ordinary people on wages and salaries, the majority of whom are not even members of a trade union, like the steelworkers who at least are able to go to bat and fight against the board, as in the case of the unfair decisions affecting the workers in Thompson and Elliot Lake. Most ordinary Canadians do not even have a union to do this kind of work for them.

There are now over 5,000 decisions which have to be made by the board. In the meantime hundreds of thousands of workers across Canada are waiting for a decision to see how their income and livelihood will be affected. A more monstrous bureaucracy one can hardly imagine, Mr. Speaker.

What about prices? The whole thrust of the program was geared toward bringing down prices in Canada, but what is the record after the legislation has been on the law books of Canada for six months? The fact is that the very prices the board was set up to control or bring down have gone up. Discounting the effect of food prices from the recent cost of living figures which were published in the past two weeks, which you must, Mr. Speaker, because the program does not control prices of food at the farm gate, you will discover that the very items the board was set up to control have led at this point in our history to a greater increase in the rate of inflation than the increase last year when we had no such program. Could a more damning comment than that be made about the efficacy of this program? The fact is that the very items this program was set up to control, those that affect the cost of living, are now increasing at a more rapid rate than they were in 1975.

The only prices ordered rolled back in the more than six months of existence of the board have been the price of beer sold by one brewer in the province of Quebec, and secondly—and this one almost brought tears to my eyes—Imperial Oil, that poor petroleum corporation, was not allowed to increase the price of a gallon of gasoline recently by 1½ cents but was only permitted an increase of one cent a gallon by the board. That was really touching.

The reality of the situation is that the government is committed in principle to allowing this same petroleum corporation, Esso, and all the others, to increase the price of oil at the wellhead up to the world price level. Within the next two weeks there will be an announcement by the government that oil companies in Canada will be able to increase their prices by $1.50 to $2 a barrel, I predict, and this increase will be passed on to the consumer. As a result poor old Esso, which got an increase of only one cent of a gallon in the recent decision of the AIB, will be permitted within a couple of weeks to increase more than a hundred fold the price of oil which every consumer will pay for, whether he pays for it by driving his car, heating his home, or by buying products made by industries that are dependent upon oil for their energy.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, in more than six months of existence only two price rollbacks have been ordered by the AIB. One rollback was in the price of beer in the province of Quebec, and the second was a half cent reduction in the increase in the price of oil by the Esso Corporation.

● (2030)

I noted with interest, that Mr. Pepin, the Chairman of the AIB, recently said that we could expect an escalation in prices during the latter half of 1976. The reason, he said, is that the corporations will by that time understand the law and its complexities much better than they do now. Is that not again moving? They are going to come to a better understanding of the law of Canada during the next few months, and therefore they will be more able to increase prices, and more able in many if not all cases to gouge the people of Canada because their lawyers and accountants will have a more thorough grasp of the legislation that is on the books! The forecast then is that the situation is going to get worse and not better in terms of prices for Canadians.

I have simply reiterated our opposition to the legislation. It was unfair and unworkable when it was brought forward in the fall. It has turned out to be unfair and unworkable ever since it has been on the books. It is something the Canadian population, in terms of the most recent Gallup poll, has seen to be unfair and unworkable. It is not something we in this party can put up with any longer. Therefore I should like to move an amendment to the motion we are debating, as follows:

That Motion No. 1 be amended in line 1 of the proposed new subclause (2) by changing "1977" to "1976" and by deleting all the words thereafter.

This amendment is seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Just before I sit down let me say I have no hope at all of the government ever changing its mind. A Liberal never does that unless he is going to lose a vote over something. I do appeal to the Conservative party for once in its history to show consistency. I urge in particular the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) to re-read his speech and follow the logical conclusion. If he reads his speech and reaches the logical conclusion he will end up favouring this amendment, because if it passes it would mean at the end of this week, symbolically on May Day, this unfair and unworkable law presently with us in Canada would be no longer in existence.

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the motions but down by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) I propose to address my remarks to the manner in which the Anti-Inflation Board has managed to become a bureaucracy of confusion, not only to those whom it attempts to regulate, but also to itself. This unfortunate situation is not surprising to many of us, especially in light of the circumstances surrounding the creation of the board.

In July, 1974, the present government, while allowing the Canadian economy to deteriorate to a position where drastic action was required, won itself an election by grandly denying that an economic problem existed. Leading up to that federal election we had a minority government and Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was forced to go to the polls by the opposition. The major issue was inflation, and the major proposal put forward by the then Leader of the

Opposition was a 90-day freeze followed by selective temporary wage and price controls, and coupled with major economic policy initiatives designed to attack the root causes of our economic problems.

The Prime Minister was at his best, however, as he forayed back and forth across the country attacking, belittling, and ridiculing. Again and again he used the same catch words about these controls—hocus-pocus, baloney, and simplistic. He told the voters controls would never work. They failed in the United States and Britain, he said. You cannot control food prices, interest rates, housing costs, energy prices, dividends or the cost of imports. The only controllable area is that of wages, he told the people, and no self-respecting Canadian wants to see that.

As a result of this performance the Prime Minister returned to office with a majority and a mandate to refuse the imposition of controls. A scant 15 months later the Prime Minister came full circle and informed Canadians that his program of wage and price controls was the cure to the country's economic ills, economic ills which the Prime Minister found impossible to continue ignoring.

It was at this stage that the Anti-Inflation Board was created to regulate the economy single-handedly and slay the dragon of inflation. This Anti-Inflation Board was denied the advantage that a 90-day freeze had offered, and it was thrown into the task at hand to the sounds of confrontation from both labour and business as the Prime Minister threatened the nation with imprisonment for failure to comply with his ill-conceived and hastily prepared program. With a birth like that it is a wonder the board has even survived. That birth, again considering the haste with which the program was formulated, has resulted in the growth of a bureaucracy whose standards are double, whose rules are incomprehensible, and whose internal workings are chaotic.

It was said by the Prime Minister that all Canadians would have to tighten their belts and fight inflation together. Unfortunately the Anti-Inflation Board evidently failed to get this message, for it has been allowing far more generous pay increases in the public sector than in private industry.

A *Financial Times* survey of 104 wage decisions made by the board shows this divergence clearly. The survey showed 69 per cent of workers in the public sector have been allowed increases of 20 per cent or more, while raises for 79 per cent of employees in the private sector have been held to 15 per cent or less. In fact most decisions handed down from Ottawa have been in line with the pace of wage settlements before last October when the board was created.

This situation is particularly true for public sector employees who in several recent cases have won pay increases of 20 per cent or more, even through the guidelines the board is supposed to enforce allow first-year pay raises of little more than 10 per cent. The *Times* goes on to say that during the whole of 1975 wage settlements averaged 19 per cent for government employees and 14.2 per cent in the private sector. This is the situation the Anti-Inflation Board was brought in to control last October, with the wage ceiling set at a maximum 10 per cent for this year.

[Mr. Balfour.]

An analysis of 104 cases involving 57,000 workers meriting special consideration shows that in the case of first-year wage settlements the board has approved: Firstly, wage increases of 20 per cent or more for 15,000 public servants, most of them employees of Ontario school boards; and, secondly, wage rises of 15 per cent or more for 7,500 private sector workers; and pay hikes in about the same range as last year's settlements, 10 per cent to 15 per cent, for another 27,000 employees in private sector cases. A mere 1,000 private sector workers and only 500 government workers have been held to the government's intended guideline of a 10 per cent salary advance. Although the government is claiming that the board is achieving considerable results, it might pay to look more closely at these results.

Were it not for the drastic drop in food costs there would have been little or no improvement, and the minister and his colleagues would do well to resist the temptation to assume that the battle against inflation is half won. Although food prices at the farm gate are not controlled, the Anti-Inflation Board still claims some of the credit. It says controls on the profits of food processors and supermarkets helped keep prices down. That is possible, but I suggest the key element in the reduction of food costs has been a drastic drop in beef prices at the farm gate because of excess of supply.

I will come to the matter of confusion surrounding the Anti-Inflation Board rules in a moment, but first I think something should be said about the confusing bureaucracy from which these rules emanate.

In October last the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) declared the board's staff would total less than 200. Today the board's staff stands at 600 and appears to be still growing. Board officials maintain that this merely reflects problems of the start-up period and that this figure will in fact drop sometime in the future, but no one knows when. In the interim they insist that the board is not now operating in excess of the 398 man-years it was allowed because some 200 employees are on loan from other departments. That comment is rather lame, however, since the salaries of those borrowed employees must be paid by the Anti-Inflation Board.

So far as accomplishment is concerned, the latest figures show that the board has processed 2,304 of the 6,139 cases submitted to it. The backlog of 3,845 cases is growing at the rate of an additional 150 a week. These figures are for the wage side of the business. On the prices side of things, only 179 of 1,040 compliance forms received have been processed.

● (2040)

What would be amusing, if it weren't so sad, is the fact that the board's present workload and backlog do not yet include the impact of the additional 41,000 companies which the government recently brought under the controls. With figures such as these in mind it would be hoped that the board would present a cohesive and efficient organization to handle the responsibilities which have been so casually imposed on it. This, unfortunately, does not seem to be the case. For example, in the April 26 *Financial Times* it is reported:

There has . . . been considerable turnover at the most senior administrative levels and some insiders say the organization is far from crisp.

'We're constantly flying by the seat of our pants', says one official. 'Everything is improvisation, which is inevitable because we had to start from scratch with the vaguest of guidelines. But under pressure the decision-making sometimes gets so slap-dash that it's frightening.'

Another official stated, 'The organization is still pretty hectic. People come and go, bringing their own ideas and approaches. That means things still tend to change from day to day.'

As a result of this situation and the increase in the number of the employees of the AIB, the Public Service Commission now is looking to its executive interchange program to find 60 or 70 professional accountants whose employers might be willing to loan them for a year.

As an illustration of the way business feels about the regulations they have been handed, I quote this excerpt from an article in *Executive Magazine* entitled "Chaos Rules at the Anti-Inflation Board":

Employers already have spent enough time studying the regulations to realize that the rules at best are unclear, and, at worst, are totally incomprehensible. To take just one example, manufacturers are faced with three different rules in figuring out the maximum profit they will be allowed. The problem is in determining the appropriate rule to apply in each part of their business. The regulations provide a process of elimination, based on the extent to which the company can allocate its costs to separate items of production. If you can allocate costs to individual products, then you use one rule. If you can't do this but you can allocate costs to individual classes or lines of products, then you use another rule, and so on. The trouble is that this selection procedure is a concoction of economic theory and bears little relation to normal business practices—the test is not whether a company actually does allocate its costs in the specified ways, but whether it can do so.

And every single manufacturer in Canada meets that requirement—it can allocate its costs to every individual product, even though the method of doing so might be crude or unrealistic. To take the regulations literally, all the other rules of profit calculation would be irrelevant. The next step is to start digging through the Anti-Inflation Board's interpretation bulletins for clarification, on the assumption that the government must have had some reason for including those other two rules. This isn't the place to discuss in detail what the relevant bulletin has to say. But it has the effect of making it almost impossible for a company to use the first rule. At this stage the bemused company abandons the written rules and turns to the Anti-Inflation Board staff for help. The fact that even the accounting and legal experts are having such difficulties in making sense of the regulations should help to identify the most serious and possibly fatal flaw in the entire anti-inflation program. The government forgot that it was not writing a new Income Tax Act. To design its new system, it hired people in the business of either finding or closing loopholes in the tax system—in other words, tax experts from both inside and outside government. These wizards drew on their wealth of experience and concocted the predictable brew: a maze to beat all mazes, a monstrosity guaranteed to remain undeciphered for years after the anti-inflation program goes out of existence.

Of course the Anti-Inflation Board cannot hope to be the complete answer to Canada's economic ills. The government has continually refused to recognize that different monetary and fiscal policies must also be adopted, as well as an improved viewpoint on the part of government itself.

Government is the single greatest contributor to Canada's domestic inflation. Rather than control its own skyrocketing spending and growth patterns, it continues to drain money away from the investor and the saver—private and corporate—to pay for its own extravagance. I do not intend to go into this aspect of the problem in any detail, Mr. Speaker, but I think that certain brief points must be made.

Canada is a capital intensive country. That means that the creation of more jobs and expanded business relies heavily on the infusion of new capital in the expansion of existing commercial facilities and the creation of new ones. If this money, through severe corporate and private income tax policies, is kept from being re-invested, then Canada's inflation and unemployment problems can in the long run be expected to become worse.

In conclusion I think it must be recognized that government, especially this government, has not even attempted to attack the root causes of inflation. An over-supply of money, badly conceived tax laws, and government growth are all matters that the government has refused to act upon. The Anti-Inflation Board, with all of its own inadequacies, cannot hope and should not be expected to solve the problem. At the same time the Anti-Inflation Board is the only possible means by which Canada can establish a more sensible framework for wage and price decision making. It must set targets for behaviour that can be used as a replacement for the discipline and mutual trust that only spring from the adversary system. In other words, the board is not in itself a cure for inflation. It is simply a way of cooling expectations and a means of buying time until some of the fundamental causes of inflation can be corrected.

The government has chosen to introduce a system of complex controls and to impose them for the relatively long period of three years. Both their complexity and duration are unnecessary, but the key problem facing the government is to make the program work. The Anti-Inflation Board will have to overcome some serious handicaps. It was introduced hurriedly and without a temporary freeze on prices and incomes. The result was that neither the government nor the board had the opportunity to develop a philosophical and economical framework for what it must do.

The board's first decisions have created confusion about the way in which historical wage relationships will be allowed to influence wage increases. In short, the board has failed to establish its own credibility by making decisions that are perceived as being fair and consistent. The challenge to the board must be to apply the guidelines in a way that maintains the spirit of equity. The use of mandatory wage and price controls is a new experience for Canada and we must resist the tendency to expect the controls to solve the inflation problem.

The final cure for inflation will ultimately lie in the way the government conducts its stabilization policies—monetary policy, energy policy and fiscal policy. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge the House to consider favourably the amendments presented by the hon. member for York-Simcoe.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on the amendments presented by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). This gives us a chance to discuss the Anti-Inflation Board and its activities so far. One very sobering result that has come to light is the obviously great difficulty the Anti-Inflation Board has in attempting to monitor wage rollbacks in various parts of the country and also to establish historical wage rates in various parts of the country. Of course in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic

Affairs all things were honey and roses with the AIB officials, but certainly potential troubles loom high on the horizon.

● (2050)

The staff of AIB has already been tripled and one meets people working for AIB in the most unexpected places. There is a large backlog of unresolved cases, and the ad hoc nature of the whole operation results in increased difficulties because no one knows where the Board is going. This has a damaging effect on all the decisions being made on what individuals and companies, employees and employers, should do to meet AIB regulations. Indeed my own observation is that it is likely that many if not most professionals will have to curtail their workload this year in order to stay within the guidelines or at least not get into trouble with the Board by producing too much.

Mr. Benjamin: No more house calls.

Mr. Ritchie: That is right, no more house calls in the middle of the night.

Mr. Benjamin: You don't make them anyway.

Mr. Ritchie: There has been some improvement in the cost of living index, but as has been stated before this is only evident in the price of food, and if there were no drastic drop in the food component of the cost of living index there would have been little or no improvement in the index. One of the key elements, even in food costs, has been the drastic drop of beef prices at the farm gate. This has come about only because the beef industry is now in a state of liquidation and the herds in North America are being scaled down to a level consistent with the market, which has put many beef producers out of business. Most experts in the cattle industry feel that the price of beef should be nearly 50 per cent higher to make it once more profitable. Therefore in the long run so far as beef is concerned the present drop in the price is unlikely to remain down for many months.

Public acceptance of AIB actions has by no means been unanimous. Obviously unionized labour, as has been well documented, has taken an antagonistic view and has withdrawn from the Canada Relations Council, the body on which the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) put so much emphasis as a means of preventing disruptive strikes.

Professionals are also finding it difficult to comply with the regulations, and while there will be no organized confrontation with the government there is no doubt that their productivity will fall to a certain extent. Although we may decry what organized labour is doing, we have to realize that it represents a very important segment of our community, a segment which is vital to our national economy. They represent the mining and transportation industries, to name but a few, and they are necessary to produce the goods that Canada needs to export to preserve its standard of living. There seems to be no doubt that AIB regulations will dampen the productivity of many Canadians, particularly in the vital goods segments of our economy.

It has been increasingly recognized that there is not much point in curtailing wages and prices if it is going to result in decreased productivity in our industrial and export segment. People in the Economic Council of Canada who have studied the Canadian labour market have found significant indications of where the increases in wages have concentrated in our economy. Between 1961 and 1974 substantial modernization and productivity gains occurred in agriculture, forestry, and mining. Real plant and equipment per person employed increased by over 80 per cent in all three industries, compared with 30 per cent in manufacturing and less than 5 per cent in the wholesale and retail trades. This process involved the substitution of machines for manpower. As a result, by 1974 average hourly earnings in forestry and mining were 180 per cent and 150 per cent higher respectively than in 1961.

The construction industry recorded equally substantial wage gains. By contrast, money wage gains in the services sector by 1974 amounted to less that 120 per cent of the 1961 level. This indicates that the supply of blue-collar workers and unskilled labour to the logging camps, mines and construction sites from rural towns and farms or from abroad has shrunk measurably. In 1974, for example, weekly earnings among service workers averaged roughly 50 per cent of the earnings in construction, compared with 67 per cent in 1961. This is an important thing to consider when dealing with the Anti-Inflation Board's decisions which seem to be concentrated on rolling back wage increases in the productive goods section of our economy.

Since 1974 we have seen the loss of exports of highly manufactured goods chiefly because of the Canada-U.S. auto pact deficit and the end of the defence production sharing agreement. Export flows are now dominated by food and industrial materials. Mr. George Post, vice-chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, has said that much of the growth of exports has involved raw materials, or products in which raw materials were a significant part of the total value.

Canada also seems to be rushing headlong into the establishment of the so called post industrial society, with a majority of its work force employed in the services sector and a diminishing minority of its workers in the goods producing sector. This aspect of the change in our economy seems to be evident in the problems the AIB is having. It has been especially counterproductive in its decisions concerning wage settlements affecting the goods producing segment of our economy, such as in the now famous Irving case where the wages of workers in the pulp and paper industry were rolled back considerably. It seems to be an over-reaction by the board and, whatever its outcome, it can only damage an already hard pressed industry.

Also there has been a rollback in the wage increase by Denison and Rio Algom. The increase exceeded the guidelines but it was in line with earlier settlements reached by International Nickel and by Falconbridge. With the rollback order some workers have already began to switch to INCO and Falconbridge where they can earn $2,000 more if the rollback remains effective. This is what happened to the Wartime Prices and Incomes Board, that is, workers moved laterally in order to increase their income. Even if the AIB is supposed to observe historical wage relationships, apparently it does not recognize the importance to Denison and Rio Algom of paying competitive wages. In fact it seems obvious that AIB will have to have a much

greater knowledge about a whole lot of things of which it is seemingly unaware.

A further increase in AIB's personnel does not seem to be the answer. It is too much to expect that officials, given the complexities of today's business activity, can rule on the many problems with any degree of consistency or accuracy. In effect the AIB, through its government appointed administrators, is substituting for the judgments made in market place. Certainly market place judgments may not always be perfect, but they are still better than judgments made away from the market place by civil servants and by people unaware of all the circumstances of the case.

Consider the case of the Thompson mines at present. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) asked where they would go. I can tell him that they are already going to Fort McMurray. Some workers have gone to Sudbury, and many are leaving the mines to return to farming. The action of the AIB in instituting the rollback of the settlement can only cause great consternation. Even Premier Schreyer, who has not seen the light as his federal leader would want him to do, and who is an ardent supporter of controls by government, has suggested that the AIB erred. Telegrams to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and the possibility of a massive group of workers descending on Ottawa to present their case indicate the workers' dismay at this ruling by AIB.

The Thompson complex contributes around 5 per cent of the total economic activity in the province of Manitoba. If the workings of this complex are seriously compromised, it can only be described as disastrous for the economy of Manitoba and the economy of Canada in the long run. The AIB again failed to take into account the historical relationship of INCO of Manitoba with Sudbury, and already INCO of Manitoba is losing some of its workers to INCO in Sudbury.

● (2100)

One of the most disturbing features of the AIB actions has been its tendencies to exert its powers to control wages in that segment of our economy which produces the goods to fuel the progress of our economy, particularly exports.

In an article in the *Financial Times* of Canada of April 26 statistics were produced to show that the AIB has been far more generous in increases for the public sector than in the private sector. They made a survey of 104 wage decisions reached by the board. It indicates that 69 per cent of public sector workers had been allowed increases of 20 per cent or more, while raises for 79 per cent of employees in the private sector have been held to 15 per cent or more.

Furthermore, the survey raises the question of whether the board is able to influence wage settlements as the awards handed down from Ottawa have been in line with the pace of wage settlements before last October when the board was created. A notable example which I mentioned previously was pointed out. The wage contract of Denmison Mines was cut from 16.8 per cent to 10.9 per cent, although the historical relationship with other workers was acknowledged and the firms were known to hold and contract skilled employees. On the same day the board announced an approval of a 16 per cent salary raise for employees of the Dryden board of education. Indeed it is becoming increasingly doubtful whether the board is in any way reducing inflation. In fact, it may be making it more likely.

When the government has aimed for an inflationary target of 8 per cent, the board has allowed raises in excess of 10 per cent, and in over half the cases raises of over 15 per cent. The board seems to be rolling back wages in the goods producing sector, upon which we rely, in favour of the service sector. It is felt generally at the present time that our goods producing sector is not functioning as well as it should.

I should like to speak for a moment about the problems of professionals. No matter what way the attempt is made to control professionals, it seems to me that it will be at best a very indiscriminate operation. Most professionals will obey the AIB guidelines, but they will obey them by reducing the amount of productivity they could attain. It is better to take a month off than run the risk of having not only the results of all the extra effort confiscated, but to find that there is a severe penalty for that extra productivity. Obviously in many instances professionals will have increased their incomes by more than $2,400, and this would include those who have stayed rigidly within the guidelines or who work in schedules set by the provincial governments.

Some of the problems professionals will run into are becoming obvious. Let us consider the example of a professional in my province of Manitoba. The AIB ruled that professionals who practise under the various government schemes and who, for example, are not opted out physicians, will come under the safe haven rule, and they will have minimum compliance regulations with perhaps a nominal reporting record. However, for those physicians who may have opted out of the provincial scheme although there may not be any greater charge than the provincial paying agency is making, the AIB has indicated that it intends to throw the book at them and pursue them energetically in order to make sure that they do not overstep the income guidelines. In doing this the board is following the advice of the government of Manitoba which does not like opted out physicians and other like professionals. I think that is an indication that those who are in practice outside, or those who are on their own, will fare much worse than those who have remained within the government fold.

Much depends on the forms which will be issued to professionals. Almost certainly they will be so complicated that the AIB officials will be able to convict or find a professional guilty under almost any circumstance. By and large, professionals will be at a considerable disadvantage because they will not be able to afford the large battery of accountants and legal advisors which large concerns are able to have at their command. To a large extent the individual professional will be controlled by the corresponding officials in the AIB who will, in many cases, have to make a fairly arbitrary decision because it seems obvious that it would be almost impossible to break down the income and arrive at a fair assessment. I would not blame the offical for this, but this is just the nature of the problem.

The limit of $2,400 may seem to be fair and equitable because professionals on the whole do make good incomes,

but on closer examination it will probably be counter productive. In the province of Manitoba, which has the highest income tax in Canada, an individual making over $28,000 per year retains only 37 per cent of his extra income, so that out of a $2,400 increase he will, in effect, retain a little over $900. If he had an income gross before tax of $30,000 with a net take home pay of perhaps $16,000, with only a $900 per year increase he has lost considerably in his actual income. There certainly would be no point in his continuing to increase his productivity, and he would have to organize himself so that his income would fall below the $2,400 increase, or at least not above it. The balance of his efforts would be directed into other fields such as more holidays, more hobby work, more time spent for his own personal enjoyment. This might be a good thing for the individual concerned, but I doubt if it is very valuable for the economy of the country.

I believe this legislation will be a disaster when the final assessment is made. It certainly seems to discourage productivity, and we have a problem of Canadians investing outside Canada. There has been a trend in the last few years toward greater investment outside Canada by Canadians, particularly in the United States. I support very strongly the idea that this legislation should be reviewed in 18 months, with the possibility that it be terminated, Certainly 18 months is long enough for this legislation to be in effect before it is reassessed.

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to participate in the debate on the amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). I sat in this House and listened to the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) with great interest. He is a man of many words, and I leave it to the Canadian people to determine whether he ever says anything. However, he made reference to the inconsistency, or the alleged inconsistency, of the position taken by the hon. member for York-Simcoe vis-à-vis the amendment.

Mr. Broadbent: You were right the first time.

Mr. Whiteway: His reasoning is as follows: how could the hon. member for York-Simcoe, representing our party, stand in his place in this House and debate for 40 minutes against the program and then bring in an amendment which in effect allows it to live for a year?

Mr. Broadbent: Right.

Mr. Benjamin: Explain it.

Mr. Whiteway: To the Leader of the New Democratic Party that is an inconsistent position. Well, that is the ostrich approach. The fact is that we have the program, and in reality Bill C-89 will pass in this House in the same way Bill C-73 passed because of the Liberal majority.

In his speech the Leader of the New Democratic Party made reference to kicks in the head and that we do not want any kicks in the head, but we will take one if we must. That is the point. We have the program. We have to take our kicks because of the government, not because of our decision, so it is better to restrict the kicks in the head than to leave it open-ended.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

• (2110)

I hear a friend on the government benches say we are bickering among ourselves. Mr. Speaker, the positions taken by the New Democratic Party from 1972 until the present time seem to affect the decisions of the government more than the positions taken by my party. The government and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) ought not to make bad friends with the New Democrats; they never know when they may need them again.

Mr. Paproski: They will get in bed together again.

Mr. Whiteway: When considering Bill C-89 I cannot help but think that the Minister of Finance is similar to old Christopher Columbus. He set out to explore new worlds and new concepts, plotting a new course. I would say the Minister of Finance is our Christopher Columbus, plotting a new course for Canada. When old Chris set out he did not know where he was going, and when he got back he did not know where he had been—and he did it all on the people's money!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiteway: I would ask the Minister of Finance to take a sober second look—perhaps a sober first look would be more accurate.

Mr. Paproski: Macdonald for Senator.

Mr. Whiteway: I cannot imagine any man in the position of the Minister of Finance, or anyone on the Treasury benches, setting out upon a program without taking stock. I realize the minister had problems back last October when he was in a kafuffle and did not know where he was going or what form the program would take. They hustled it through the House and through committee. Had they at least taken stock at committee stage last fall and listened to some of the suggestions of members of the official opposition we would not be back in the House tonight debating Bill C-89.

I ask the minister, instead of hustling this bill through tonight, instead of hustling the amendment through, would he not now stop and take stock? I can assure him that the affairs of this nation are of interest to the opposition parties as well as to the government. We will help. We will give the kind of concrete and sensible suggestions and amendments that will make the program work.

When we pause to take stock of where we are today we find there has been no progress, no improvement in economic conditions in Canada. I shall not speak on the effects on labour as I think the position of labour and the rough justice meted out to it have been well expounded already.

So far there have been only three rulings by the Anti-Inflation Board in regard to prices. How can we talk about the success, or the appearance of success of the program when in fact there have only been three rulings? The Leader of the New Democratic party pointed them out—indeed I believe he only pointed out two, Esso and beer. Being a man of abstinence and not consuming alcoholic beverages, that latter one does not concern me. We would have to say, however, that there has not been any progress so far as restraining prices is concerned.

In the election back in the spring of 1974 the prices and incomes policy that this party suggested was to be for only 18 months and was to begin with a 90 day freeze, a period that would allow the government to put into place a program to fight inflation. I think it is agreed by most economists and most members of this House that the government's price and wage control program, or anti-inflation program, does not in itself have any effect on the causes of inflation. But the causes themselves must be attacked, Mr. Speaker. In taking stock surely the minister must have in mind programs that would get to the root causes of inflation.

The whole area of money supply has been discussed in this House previously. As a concrete suggestion I urge the minister to take some time to consider the position of Milton Friedman who suggests that inflation is always a special and monetary phenomenon. He stresses the impact of an abnormally high growth in the money supply and translates that into the effect on falling trade and the surplus of Canadian funds outside Canada, particularly in a time when there is an unfavourable balance of trade. We are facing a trade deficit of around $5 billion this year. Milton Friedman has a great deal more to say about this matter and I wish the minister would take heed of it.

I believe we need a responsible and realistic policy on money supply. I am not advocating zero growth in money supply, Mr. Speaker. I realize that a growth of 7 per cent or 8 per cent is necessary, and I realize what follows a tight money supply but surely the minister understands what follows if you have an accelerated or abnormally high rate growth of money supply such as we are having now, of 16 per cent or 18 per cent.

If we are to get at the roots of inflation I should think the minister would want to take stock of his fiscal policy. I know that speeches are often made in this Chamber that are frankly political in nature. On this side of the House at least we do not participate in that kind of political partisanship, but nevertheless it sometimes appears in the House. Notwithstanding that, it seems to me that a fiscal policy ought to be at least consistent with the kind of restraint that the government expects from the Canadian people.

I think it is wrong that the government expects the wage earner to restrain his income to increases of 8 per cent, 10 per cent or 12 per cent, depending on whether the historical relationship clause applies, while on the other hand it allows government expenditures to rise to 16 per cent, without the effect of supplementary estimates.

I have some sympathy with those economists who say that a tight fiscal policy will have some negative effects on unemployment. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to talk about the negative effect of a real restraint policy such as federal spending on unemployment, then we also have to take into consideration the recent report of the Economic Council of Canada tabled in this House. That report suggested that the $4 billion to be spent on unemployment insurance this year ought to be tied to productivity. The report made some concrete suggestions, and I know that many who served on the Economic Council of Canada would have liked to have made the recommendations far stronger and far more decisive than the watered down recommendations that finally appeared in the report.

I would ask the minister to take stock of the non-productivity of the unemployment insurance program and tie it back to productivity. The Economic Council of Canada had a great deal to say about the effect of productivity on international trade and our trade balance and competitive position in respect of world trade. I ask the Minister of Finance to take stock, not of this piecemeal, fly as you go, on the job training, but of the total program that reflects the studies, positions and suggestions, not only of opposition members but of people across the nation. I might make one suggestion to the minister. Perhaps he ought to fire all the economists on his staff, save one. At least then he would only be confused once.

● (2120)

When we consider the effects of the anti-inflation program, and particularly the amendment before us in relation to Bill C-89 which deals with the time element for the law of the land to be effective, it is important to point out that we in the opposition are not talking about the termination of the program. We ought not to be fooled or misled into believing that all we want is a commitment from the government in respect to the anti-inflation program. That would be deceiving.

It is not the program that we necessarily want ended because the program itself is arbitrary and can be changed by order in council. The existing law of the land allows the cabinet to write their own policy, and it can change day by day. The provisions of Bill C-73, which is now the law of the land, in no way specifies, outlines, details or establishes, except in the widest parameters, the specifics of the program. Therefore we are not asking for assurance in so far as the existing program is concerned because it can be changed. What we are asking is that the law of the land terminate in a year.

We on this side are not unreasonable. If in a year's time the government's program is working and it is getting in place the programs it ought to be getting in place, it will not only be helped by the Canadian people but by members on this side. We will give it the full measure of credit. If at that time the weight of argument warrants an extension of the program, we will be prepared to give that kind of extension. However, in the true parliamentary tradition, we stand opposed to the open-endedness of this kind of arbitrary legislation.

If the legislation were specific, that would be one matter, but it is not. It is arbitrary in so far as I pointed out that it is really a prerogative of the cabinet. It is that kind of arbitrary power which is not consistent with the parliamentary tradition. We have precedents for this kind of openended approach to legislation in our Defence Production Act. The former leader of my party made reference to that last fall when we were first discussing the anti-inflation program.

In conclusion, when this House recesses for the day, I ask the minister to find some corner of an office and, in the solitude of that moment, reflect upon the program and take the kind of stock I have been asking him to take. I ask him to give consideration to accepting some suggestions. The members on this side are sincerely interested in getting to the roots of inflation. Get a policy in place to fight inflation. We are prepared to accept the rough justice for a

specified period of time that Bill C-73 and the amendments to Bill C-89 provide.

I conclude by asking the minister to take this kind of sober second thought and accept the kind of suggestions that we on this side offer in a most sincere way, with humility, dedication of purpose, and conviction of presentation.

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate and to support the motion of my colleague, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). He has put forward an eminently sensible amendment to this bill. The effect is consistent with the position our party has taken with respect to the anti-inflation program and this type of legislation right from the beginning. In other words, the effect of this amendment will be to limit the application of the act for a period of about 18 months.

This has been the position of our party. It is consistent with the position we took during the last election under the able leadership of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), who unfortunately has just left the Chamber. We owe him a great debt of gratitude because he stood in the forefront of displaying candour to the Canadian people. Although we suffered electoral defeat on that point, it is now recognized universally, even by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) that the hon. member for Halifax gave to the Canadian people the candour that is expected of political leaders in this country, as opposed to the type of flipflopping we experience with the present government.

I am interested in the amendment put forward by the leader of the NDP. It seems to be an expression of frustration on his part. I know that he wants to ingratiate himself with a very substantial portion of his support, the organized trade union movement, which has come out very strongly against the anti-inflation program. He finds himself in a bit of a conundrum. He has joined with the trade union leaders of this country to indicate his opposition to this program.

The amendment of the leader of the NDP would terminate the program on May 1 of this year, in effect an immediate termination. However, he is faced with the conundrum of having to deal with his provincial premier colleagues in the NDP who have wholeheartedly embraced this scheme. They have apparently co-operated with the federal government with respect to the implementation of this program affecting matters under provincial jurisdiction.

I appreciate the fact that the leader of the NDP finds himself in this difficult situation. However, notwithstanding the fact that there are some very serious deficiencies in the program the government has brought forward, he should realize that, generally speaking, there is among Canadians support for an anti-inflation program.

Mr. Broadbent: Not this one.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The fact is we have this government. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Whiteway) just indicated that we have a situation and that we have to be pragmatic under certain circumstances. We face a government which is determined, using its brutal majority, to bring forward a scheme which was ill-conceived, hastily drawn up, and is a reversal of the position it took at the last election, a program which suffers from a lack of credibility in the eyes of the Canadian people by virtue of that very fact. Our party has taken the position that, notwithstanding the blemishes in the plan, we ought to give the government a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate it will work over a reasonable period of time. Thus, while we support the plan we consider ourselves free, in the meantime, to draw attention to what we consider to be its deficiencies.

[Mr. Whiteway.]

● (2130)

As I pointed out on second reading, if we ever get into a situation of the kind to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) alluded in his remarks at the end of last year, if we get into a system of permanent controls or an altogether different economic system in Canada, it would be very easy indeed for the government to abdicate its responsibility in the area of fiscal and monetary measures and rely exclusively on a system of controls which, I suggest, would not get at the root causes of inflation and would bring about more problems than it solves.

It seems to me, if I may say so without imputing motives, that the government is attempting to gain the benefit of the traditional advantage inherent in Canada's relationship with the United States—that of sharing any upturn in the U.S. economy. After all, between 60 and 70 per cent of our trade is carried on with the United States, and it is my impression that in bringing forward this program the government had in mind the hope that the economy will follow the trend in the United States, that the rate of inflation here will decline. Things are promising for our neighbours south of the border, and indeed I believe the prospects are not all that bad for us—we may experience an upturn here; all hon. members, I am sure, hope that the inflation rate will go down and that our economy will prosper. In any case we can do a great deal to help by limiting the period of application of wage and price controls. I ask the minister to give serious consideration to placing a limit on this program.

When I read the statistics with respect to the terrific backlog of cases now facing the Anti-Inflation Board I can only conclude that the proposal put forward by my hon. friend from York-Simcoe is really a favour to the government, because if this plan continues for any considerable period of time it will be necessary to extend the scope of the scheme, expand the administration, and increase the size of the bureaucracy required to operate the system.

When the program began it was said the total number of staff likely to be needed by the Board would not exceed 200 persons. On the basis of the figures now available with respect to the backlog it appears it will be necessary to increase that figure very substantially—not tenfold, not even twentyfold, but a hundredfold in due course if the plan is allowed to carry on for an unreasonable length of time as suggested in Bill C-73. That is why the proposal put forward by my hon. friend from York-Simcoe is one which should be embraced by the government; it would permit it to break away from this program and get rid of it within a reasonable period.

I want to direct these remarks to the minister, since he is here, and to indicate my sympathy with the Leader of the

New Democratic Party in the unfortunate position in which he finds himself, one which makes him uneasy and nervous since he has to justify his own position as leader of a national party on one hand while trying to support the position of his colleagues in the provincial parties on the other. I must say, though, that I agree with him to this extent: the program is ill-conceived and should probably not be supported for the period originally intended. We should face the issue and say that now is the time to bring the program to an end.

As I say, the problem we face now is the program's lack of credibility. The indication I have received as a result of questionnaires put out among my constituents is that while they support an anti-inflation program they have great difficulty in accepting the veracity and good faith of the government with respect to its actions; they find it difficult to understand the reason for the continuous and continued growth in government expenditures and the fact that government expenditures do not seem to be subject to the same rules as are expenditures in the private sector; they find it difficult to reconcile the government's calls for restraint with the increase in its own spending. So I say, in all sincerity, that if the Minister of Finance really wishes to do a service to his portfolio and to his country he will use his influence with the Prime Minister and his other colleagues, as well as with his caucus, to secure support for my hon. friend's motion. I personally feel it is worthy of support.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Halton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words.

An hon. Member: Of wisdom?

Mr. Kempling: Well, let us see what they are when they come out. Speaking to the motion put forward by my hon. friend from York-Simcoe I want to say that we are being entirely consistent in putting forward this motion. The economists to whom I have spoken, the people who have had experience of the application of controls, tell me that 18 months is the longest period for which a program of this kind can be left in place. The longer it is in place the more difficult it becomes to remove it.

This is the dilemma the government faces at the present time. It does not know what to do after the program ends. It is in a quandary. I recall very vividly a question it directed to us during the last election campaign: what are you going to do when the control period ends? Now, of course, it has that problem itself.

● (2140)

One of the points that we disliked very much in Bill C-73, the original anti-inflation legislation, was the open-ended provision whereby the legislation could be extended indefinitely by order in council. To us, Mr. Speaker, this sounded like permanent controls, and to people across the country who were broadly concerned about controls it also sounded like permanent controls. Recent comments by columnists and various commentators in this country on the progress of the anti-inflation program have confirmed that, in their view as well, this program is one of permanent controls. I believe the labour movement generally perceives it to be a program of permanent controls, which is why it is so opposed to it.

I believe only seven out of the ten provinces of Canada are committed to the anti-inflation program, and I think that without exception those provinces that are have placed a limit on their commitment. I understand that this is 18 months, though in one case I believe it is 24 months. Generally speaking I think we can say that the provinces want the program to end after 18 months.

In Bill C-89, which motion No. 1 is endeavouring to amend, there is provision to end the program prior to December 31, 1978, and I have been wondering why that provision is in the bill. Obviously it is in the bill to give the government the option of ending the program providing it finds a way to slip out of it easily and knows what to do when the program has ended.

The matter that really concerns me is this: we started out with three main points. There was an export levy, a limit on profits—and by a mathematical calculation that was supposed to control prices—and, of course, we had a limit on wage increases. Why the export levy was imposed at the very beginning is something I shall never understand, but however it has been removed. We now see a great deal of pressure building in the business community to modify the profit control provision or remove it. As a matter of fact the minister stated, I understand, that he is prepared to look at this question in October of this year. If that section of the act is extensively modified, then the only thing left is wage controls, and I do not think that is acceptable. It may be acceptable to some people, but I do not think that generally across the country it will be acceptable and that the legislation can continue if it controls only wages. There is the dilemma that we are facing.

I understand that the leader of the NDP, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), has moved an amendment that would end the legislation on May 1, 1976.

Mr. MacLean: May Day.

Mr. Kempling: Yes, it is, and I am sure that he will be out waving the Red Flag with all the rest.

Mr. Nowlan: He may even be dancing around the Maypole.

Mr. Kempling: My colleague has taken the words out of my mouth. I am sure he will be dancing around the Maypole. This is a very contentious issue for the mainstream of supporters who gather around him, and in order to try to make himself far more credible he attacks our speakers and accuses us of being inconsistent. That is a lot of nonsense. Certainly we are being consistent. We said that we believed in an 18 month control program, and this is exactly what a termination date of May 1, 1977, will give us.

I think it is generally agreed today by those who have carefully studied the program, even by people in the Anti-Inflation Board itself, that had there been a 90 day freeze at the very beginning—and I think the reason there was not a 90 day freeze is that it would have been an absolute copy of the main recommendations that we made and it was just too hard for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to swallow that—then the program may have had a better chance of succeeding than it has right now. However, the

Leader of the New Democratic Party, in order to try to remain a little bit credible to his people, says we are not being consistent in asking for a May 1, 1977, end to the program. It is he who is not being consistent, as he rarely is in many of the things upon which he comments.

The concern of people across the country to whom I have talked—and I have travelled a fair bit talking to quite a few people in labour and business—is that we are in a real decline. We are not pulling out of our recession. We see countries around us, like the United States, making really significant gains in their economy. We see more people being employed; we see a prime rate of 5½ per cent in the U.S., and we see a great deal of industrial activity taking place. One of the things I always watch for very closely is orders being placed for machine tools, and I think they are at their highest level now for several years. That is an indication of industrial activity down the road. Some of us who recently visited Japan saw a definite movement in their economy as well. Though they are planning for a slow growth period to about 1985, there is a definite movement and they are making progress.

In each of these countries, as well as others that have had control programs, it was found that the best way to control inflation is by means of good, strong fiscal and monetary policies. I know that those words have rolled out of the mouth of every politician in the country for several months now, but if you take politics out of it and look at inflation without politics this seems to be the solution that most countries have favoured.

I do not believe we are making much progress in this regard in Canada. We find our interest rates are high. This makes it difficult for businessmen to borrow money to expand their plant. We find a limit placed on profits and we find little effect on prices. This is why we feel the program should end on May 1, 1977, after an 18 month period. It has not gone the way we would have liked but it has been an interesting experiment. I think it has had some restraining influence; most of the provinces have cut back on their budgets.

Speaking in Toronto the other day the minister mentioned that if the provinces and municipalities would cut back on their budgets the anti-inflation program would have a much greater effect. A number of them have done this, and are endeavouring to continue next year and down the road. Perhaps the lesson of inflation has been learned by a great number of people. Having had this experience for 18 months, then I think we should end this on May 1, 1977. That is why I support the motion. With these few remarks I will give way to my colleague, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan), or whoever happens to stand.

● (2150)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Annapolis Valley.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, very rarely have I entered into debate with almost unanimity of support on catching the eye of the Chair. I am glad I caught the eye of the Chair in order to take part in this debate on the motion of my colleague, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), who has tried to put a limit on a program of a government that in some ways is almost limitless.

I can understand the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) moving an amendment to restrict the time period of the Anti-Inflation Board. From the purport of his amendment and the motion of the hon. member for York-Simcoe, it would appear that they both like May 1 as the date for the conclusion of this program, but the amendment refers to this weekend, the day following the day we must file our income tax returns. After you file your income tax return you are prepared to accept almost anything.

Having seen the lack of objectivity on the part of this government I can understand why the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby would move such an amendment. That hon. member was seduced by the government time and time again in another parliament between 1972 and 1974 when the respective parties were colleagues together in incest, but in terms of parliamentary progress did not produce a thing except dissension among the Canadian people. That hon. member wants to dance around the Maypole on May 1 after we pay extravagant taxes to finance a government that is almost unfinanceable. We have spent the money and I think it is a late hour in the day for me to have much sympathy for the problems of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). We have had other ministers of finance, some of whom are my friends and some of whom are my enemies in a political sense. I always have sympathy for ministers of finance.

The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) just a moment ago tried to be economically objective. He tried to separate economics from politics.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: There is my good friend, the Ms. from Saint-Michel. She is one of the dynamo kids over there. The fact of the matter is that we have seen the government dance around the Maypole many times when fighting a campaign that has deceived the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Nowlan: I say to my friend, the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth, who had to go outside to regenerate himself after trying to be too objective in taking politics out of economics, it is almost impossible to do that with a government that has been so intellectually dishonest with the people.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: We as Canadians in this parliament of Canada are trying to make work something that is almost unworkable.

Miss Bégin: Shame on you.

Mr. Nowlan: Let me say to my friend, the hon. member for Saint-Michel (Miss Bégin), that I would like her boss and my Prime Minister, the right hon. member for Mount Royal (Mr. Trudeau), to start to tell the people of Canada from coast to coast what they have to do in the fight against inflation. This is not something the Minister of

Finance, that poor man from Rosedale, has to do, and it is not something the Anti-Inflation Board has to do. This is something that each individual Canadian has to do if the fires of inflation are to be dampened. Perhaps we should do this on May Day following April 30 when some of our expectations have been dampened as a result of paying our tax bills.

My Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of all Canadians campaigned in 1974, and was anti-controls and anti-Stanfield. This man requires some intestinal fortitude, although he has the force of persuasion to a limited degree. The fact of the matter is that he should try to do a sales job across this country from coast to coast. I wonder why he does not try.

Mr. Paproski: He doesn't know how.

Mr. Nowlan: Let me say to the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) that he may know how, but I think he is fundamentally embarrassed in trying to take the message to Canadians to tighten their belts. I have lost 12 pounds because I had to pay my tax bill. How many other people have tightened their belts as much? I suggest that the government should start by tightening its belt.

I wonder if Bill C-89 or any of the mammoth works of the mammoth man from Rosedale are really going to do anything about the forces of inflation. There is one thing I am sure of, and that is that we have given our implied approval to the government in trying to do something. We advocated these controls in 1974 when we were scorned and laughed at. The people did not believe us then.

An hon. Member: And they don't today.

Mr. Nowlan: Let me say to the Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc) from that great province of New Brunswick, who is one of my finest colleagues—

An hon. Member: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Nowlan: It is ten o'clock tonight, but it is ten o'clock also for this government, and we know what the Canadian people will want to do after that deception of 1974. May I call it ten o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRANSPORT—ATLANTIC REGION—MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM—TRANS-NEWFOUNDLAND CORRIDOR STUDY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc) is here. I had hoped he would

have attended the committee but I knew he had to be in the House. I hope his very capable district director will be able to influence him regarding the very excellent presentation I made on behalf of the lobster fishermen of Newfoundland.

Let me get to the point of the debate tonight which has to do with transportation. On March 29 I questioned the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) because of my concern about the deterioration of the highway system in the province of Newfoundland and in the Atlantic region generally. I had in mind particularly the presentation by the ministers of highways and transport ministers of the Atlantic region regarding a highways improvement or strengthening program, similar to those presented in briefs by other provinces of Canada. The minister in reply indicated that his discussions with the provincial ministers related more to the issue of support for the movement of freight within the Atlantic region, and possibly to new programs using freight assistance more adequately for the development and improvement of the Atlantic region.

● (2200)

The minister also in his reply confirmed that a brief had been presented on highway strengthening and indicated that he would undertake a further examination of the brief before responding. Just today I had occasion to present the problem to the Canadian Transport Commission at the hearings of the transport committee, and in my representation I referred to the Trans-Newfoundland Transportation Corridor Study which made certain recommendations in compliance with the very objectives I preach tonight.

In addressing myself to the problem, and to the parliamentary secretary who represents the minister, I say there is a deliberate thrust by the CNR to downgrade rail freight and express service in Newfoundland. I suggest it is just as deliberate as was the thrust to downgrade the rail passenger service in that province back in 1969. Evidence exists that the CNR is deliberately moving to road transport in spite of denials to the contrary. There is evidence that traffic loadings are decreasing to justify the lay-off of personnel. Statistics prove that loadings in Newfoundland are increasing and yet the CNR is moving to road transport. At the same time the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland is being overtaxed by increases in rubber traffic. There have been increases in the last five years of almost 1,000 per cent, much of which is due to the fact that the CNR is contributing to that effort.

At the moment the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland is deteriorating to the point of no return, in fact to the point where soon it will be dangerous for persons to drive their cars on the highway because of the increase in road traffic. This is as a result of the increase in container traffic and the traffic which is being released from the rail traffic which we have in abundance. I say it is a condemnation of the government and the Ministry of Transport that the situation has been allowed to develop as it has today. Nothing is being done about it.

It further disturbs me to read news releases to the effect that many millions, indeed billions of dollars are being provided in other provinces to strengthen highways, to provide road link-ups, and to provide access roads for the development of the rural and industrial economy.

For some reason or other those who profess to know are ignorant of what is required by all regions of the nation to provide a basis for our economy. It becomes increasingly obvious that the province of Newfoundland will wait until all other provinces are looked after in respect of Canada's transportation needs.

The Atlantic region transportation ministers have submitted a brief to the Minister of Transport requesting support for the needs of Atlantic Canada. I would appreciate it if the parliamentary secretary would give me some hope concerning his minister's intentions to show that the Atlantic region, and particularly the province of Newfoundland, are still part of Canada. I hope he will indicate that Newfoundland will receive its just due in the contribution that our central government makes not only in respect of a strengthening program for its highways but more important in respect of the need for a recommendation concerning a transport system not only from Vancouver to Halifax but indeed to the province of Newfoundland.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I desire very much indeed to provide my hon. friend with some of the hope to which he alluded in the final moments of his remarks this evening. Further to the comments he has made both tonight and in this House on March 29, I should perhaps remind the House that it was on March 10, 1976, that the highway ministers of the four Atlantic provinces first presented a joint report to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) which is entitled "Atlantic Provinces Primary Highways—Ten Year Program". This report is a statement of needs as seen by the provinces and was prepared subsequent to previous meetings between the provincial ministers and the Minister of Transport. The report is presently under study by departmental personnel in the Ministry of Transport.

With regard to recent highway expenditures in the Atlantic region, these have been made mainly through special and subsidiary agreements between the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the respective provinces. In this connection it is interesting to note that in 1974-75 federal highway expenditures amounted to $18.2 million in Newfoundland, $1.3 million in Prince Edward Island, $1.4 million in Nova Scotia, and $18.1 million in New Brunswick. It is likely that 1975-76 expenditures will be in the same order of magnitude.

Concerning the standardization of truck weights we have now reached the point where these are all now at a minimum of 20,000 pounds for a single axle load with the exception of Newfoundland where the figure is 18,000, and at a minimum gross vehicle weight of 110,000 pounds, with the exception of Nova Scotia where it is 80,000 pounds. Completion of standardization of loads limits can be expected to result in increased economies for truck transportation which is one of the objectives of the federal Ministry of Transport and, I am sure, of the provincial ministers involved.

With regard to rail freight and express service in Newfoundland, may I assure the hon. member that every effort is being made to provide adequate rail service to shippers and receivers in this area. The CNR has undertaken a number of initiatives recommended in the trans-Newfoundland corridor transportation study completed in 1974 to improve the transportation system. These actions include the construction of a new express freight shed at Cornerbrook, increased capacity of the rail car wheel-set transfer operation at Port aux Basques, and the establishment of a freight planning group in St. John's to improve the scheduling of traffic.

In general, and in conclusion, I want to assure my hon. friend that the Government of Canada has substantially supported Atlantic region transportation and will continue to do so in the future.

FINANCE—SUGGESTED CHANGES IN EQUALIZATION FORMULA AS RESULT OF INCREASED ENERGY COSTS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps very appropriate that my question, following the one of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), should deal with energy because I think the two problems that are plaguing the Atlantic economy right now are the great and continuing difficulties we have had with transportation and transportation costs and with energy and the great impact which rising energy costs have had on the Atlantic region in the last three years.

Hon. members will recall that on April 5 I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) whether, in view of the meeting of the first ministers that was taking place that week, there would be some consultations with ministers from the Atlantic provinces with respect to the suggestion of the minister of finance in Ontario, Mr. McKeough, who had suggested that there might be a consideration of some alteration in the equalization formula, particularly with respect to the skyrocketing electrical costs in the two provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. To a lesser degree, of course, this affects Newfoundland and New Brunswick, and I think it has some impact as well on one or two of the provinces in western Canada.

The Minister of Finance at that time was not able to give me that assurance. He said he would be discussing the matter generally with his colleagues but that this might be a question which could be resolved prior to the meeting of first ministers on energy at the beginning of next month. Therefore it is doubly appropriate that I raise this question tonight because in a little more than a week's time that meeting of first ministers will take place.

However, it is extremely disturbing to be raising the question following the announcement of the energy policy by the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) this afternoon. To my mind the statement by the minister this afternoon showed an almost complete lack of awareness or sensitivity to the energy problems of Atlantic Canada. When the minister indicated this afternoon that eventually there would be a move on his part to raise the price of domestic oil to international levels, and that one of the purposes of increasing domestic energy prices would be to reinforce efficiency and conservation, it seemed to me that the minister was trying to make a virtue out of the hardship that will obviously be created for many of the people already living on low incomes, some of the lowest incomes in the country, and in those regions in the country that can least afford to protect themselves.

● (2210)

Quite frankly, I was shocked at the insensitivity of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in suggesting that. It is similar, of course, to the further part of the answer which the Minister of Finance gave me on April 5 when I asked about some assistance with respect to the conversion from expensive electrical generation to lower cost forms of electrical production. The answer of the Minister of Finance referred quite specifically to nuclear power and the CANDU reactor, particularly the one which is contemplated for New Brunswick, yet the Pointe Lepreau reactor, when it comes on stream, will produce something like 600 megawatts compared with the estimated potential of the Fundy tidal power operation, which could produce something like 4,000 megawatts.

When we examine the statement of the minister this afternoon there is no mention of the possibility of proceeding as quickly as possible with Fundy tidal power development. There was certainly no mention of it by the Minister of Finance the other day, even though he must be well acquainted with its potential, having served in the portfolio of Energy, Mines and Resources.

All in all we are faced with a situation in which there seems to be no awareness yet by the government that there are consumers and producers living in my province of Prince Edward Island and in Nova Scotia who are paying as much as 200 per cent to 300 per cent more for their electricity than those who live in parts of southern Ontario, or even in some parts of the province of Quebec. This further emphasis on disparity and economic and social hardship for the people of the Atlantic provinces is unacceptable, and quite frankly I find it illogical. The government, having moved some time ago to standardize a base price for the cost of petroleum products, whether it be in eastern or western Canada, is now making the assumption that what it can do in one area with respect to petroleum it cannot do in another, and that is in the area of electical generation and electrical costs.

If there is to be a consistent approach in this respect, and if the government believes that one price for petroleum products should be established, even if that price is an increased one, as was suggested by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources this afternoon—but it would be a price which would be equal and fair for consumers from coast to coast—surely the logic of that, which I think has been generally accepted on all sides of this House and by all Canadians, is equally true with something as basic as electricity costs. I think it is an absolute farce for a government to expend something like $500 million in an attempt to reduce the disparities which exist between the poor and the rich regions of this country and then say that it is in no position whatsoever to act with respect to the enormous burdens which are being placed on the backs of consumers in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and the other poorer provinces. I hope the parliamentary secretary can give us a definite assurance tonight that this kind of insensitivity and illogical approach which is presently being taken will in fact be altered at the first ministers' meeting.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) noted, some provincial finance ministers have raised at their last meeting the issue of electricity prices in the Maritimes. The problem is due to the fact that the production of electric power in these provinces relies more than anywhere else in Canada on fossil fuels. Fossil fuels account for 100 per cent of the electricity produced in Prince Edward Island, 62 per cent of that produced in Nova Scotia and 38 per cent of that generated in New Brunswick. Oil prices have increased and this has had a direct impact on hydro rates in these provinces.

I would also like to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Maritime provinces are not the only place where the cost of electricity has gone up. Other provinces have known similar increases as a result of rising price. Electricity rates in Ontario have gone up by about 15 per cent during the last two years and they are expected to go up by 25 per cent a year during the next three or four years. Quebec is in a similar situation.

The federal government is aware of the problem in the Maritime provinces and it has taken certain steps to rectify it. The hon. member may not be aware of all the efforts made by the federal government to help the Maritime provinces has concerns energy supplies.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government is already working actively at finding solutions to the problems of electricity production in those provinces. The present policy of the federal government consists in financing 50 per cent of loans granted at the lending rates which apply to Crown corporations for the first 600 megawatts, CANDU reactor obtained by a province. In this respect, the government has granted a loan of up to $350 million to New Brunswick for the construction of a reactor at Point Lepreau.

Under this treaty, a loan agreement was signed by AECL and the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission by virtue of which loans amounting to $30 million were granted in 1975-76, and loans are expected to amount to $70 million in the current financial year. It will cover the interest.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the agreement reached by New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and the federal government, we will take over 50 per cent of the cost of technical, economic and financial feasibility studies on the harnessing of tidal power in the Bay of Fundy, as mentioned by the hon. member.

In the province of Prince Edward Island, the federal government is financing electrical connection between the island and the continent. We have agreed to grant, through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, an $18 million subsidy and, through the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, a $9 million loan. That connection is expected to be completed by October 1976; it may not reduce the cost of electricity on the island but it will have a stabilizing effect in that the province will become less dependent on fossil fuels for its energy production. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is committed to implementing a single price policy—

Adjournment Debate

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. parliamentary secretary but his allotted time has expired.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF GUN CONTROL MEASURE TO SUPREME COURT TO DETERMINE WHETHER JURISDICTION FEDERAL OR PROVINCIAL

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, if I seem a little out of breath it is because I just ran over from the committee that is considering Bill C-83.

I want to deal tonight with questions I asked on April 6, 1976, as reported at page 12501 of *Hansard* when I put this question:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. It is with regard to the Di Iorio and Gérard Fontaine case in which the Supreme Court of Canada held that the provincial government should have the right to conduct a criminal inquiry within the terms "administration of justice of the province".

This bill is now before the committee and if anybody had heard the proceedings at committee tonight they would wonder how the bill ever got out of this House—except by closure. From page 47 to page 53 the bill deals in brief with the fact that the federal government is giving power to the provinces to investigate crime and hold criminal inquiries. The fact is, however, that the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that the province of Quebec, and any other province, under our constitution has that power. That means that when this bill left this House through closure, eight of its pages were redundant because the provincial governments already had the power it proposed to give to them.

I should like to read briefly from the judgment of Mr. Justice Pigeon of the Supreme Court of Canada. At page 13 he said:

If it must be said that such an inquiry prior to any charge being laid under the Criminal Code comes within the description of "administration of justice in the province", not of "procedure in a criminal matter", I cannot appreciate how one may take a different view where the object of the inquiry . . .

In other words, the province of Quebec had that power. I should now like to read from page 14 of the judgment where he says that under the British North America Act the administration of justice falls under provincial jurisdiction but questions of criminal law fall under the ambit of federal jurisdiction. The judge said:

. . . "administration of justice" in all matters civil and criminal, which has consistently been held to include the detection of criminal activities.

He held that this falls within the admit of the provinces.

I should like to read from the judgment of Mr. Justice Dickson of the same court, who said:

● (2220)

First, I cannot subscribe to the view that administration of criminal justice is for parliament alone to prescribe.

It is also for the provinces. I would also like to quote from page 12 where the same judge said:

It seems late in the day to strip the provinces of jurisdiction in respect of criminal justice which they have exercised without challenge for well over 100 years.

[Mr. Trudel.]

Part of that bill now deals with provincial inquiries. It has gone to a committee for study. The Supreme Court of Canada in its judgment constitutionally says that lower is well within the ambit of the province of Quebec. If it had not been for its inquiry we would never have found out that carcasses were being sawed up, ground, and turned into hamburgers at the World's Fair to be sold to the public of Canada. They had the right to make that inquiry.

It is beyond my comprehension as a parliamentarian of this House for some considerable length of time that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and the Liberal government would challenge the province of Quebec on the right to conduct that kind of inquiry. I can only say they wanted to cover up something they knew Quebec was bringing forth.

The main point I want to make is that two thirds of the bill dealing with control of guns is a matter of administration of justice falling within the jurisdiction of the provinces. The fact is that much of that law that says it can be done by order in council, such as the cost of licences, the administration, all of which is defined in the bill, falls within the ambit of the provinces.

I was at the committee. I wish Your Honour were on that committee because it is a big circus. The greatest defence we had was to move that the motion be not read a second time. My guess is that tomorrow morning the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will fire the Liberal members of that committee because their questions are right on. They pointed out that gun control is not only within provincial jurisdiction, but is unworkable. There are so many anomalies it will not do anything to solve crime. That is the reason why I asked that question.

Bill C-83 was produced for one reason. It is a legal poultice to try to get the Canadian people to believe that the government is doing something to solve crime and to cover up the fact that it brought in a bill only two and a half years ago regarding penalties for murder which it will not carry out. I end with this sentence. This bill is to cover up for the fact that the government will not carry out the law that it brought in with reference to murder.

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, tonight I am responding to my hon. friend on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) and his parliamentary secretary. I am pleased to have this opportunity to do so.

As I begin, I remind the Chair and the House that I will be dealing with the substantive matters of both law and procedure which the hon. member raised in his original question in the House before the Easter adjournment. I will not direct my remarks to the rather extraneous and gratuitous references which the hon. member has made, particularly in the closing part of the speech which he just delivered.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) on April 6, 1976, asked the Minister of Justice if the government intended to refer to the Supreme Court of Canada the provisions in Bill C-83 relating to the ownership and handling of firearms for determination of their constitutional validity. The hon. member formulated his question after having referred to the recent Supreme Court decision in the cases of Di Iorio and Gérard Fontaine.

There is, of course, no relation between the Supreme Court decision in the Di Iorio and Fontaine cases and the parts of Bill C-83 relating to firearms. The Criminal Code always has had provisions dealing with guns. There has never been any suggestion that these provisions would not properly fall within the meaning of the words "criminal law" as they appear in section 91, sub-paragraph 27 of the B.N.A. Act. The proposed measures relating to guns in Bill C-83 extend and modify the existing provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with guns. It must be submitted that parliament is competent to enact such legislation as being legislation in relation to Criminal Law.

It has been held by the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Canada that the words "criminal law" in the constitution mean the criminal law in its widest sense. It has also been held that the power to legislate in relation to criminal law is not restricted to defining offences and providing penalties, but it also includes the power to legislate for the prevention of crime. The precise point involved here was very aptly dealt with by the Imperial Privy Council in the case of Proprietary Articles Trade Association versus the Attorney General of Canada, particularly in the judgment of Lord Atkin. His Lordship's statement is a lengthy one and I shall not take up the time of the House by quoting it in full. However, the hon. member for Calgary North is a man learned in the law and I am sure he is fully conversant with Lord Atkin's speech and will find it constructive in this connection.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 28, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FISHERIES

PROPOSAL THAT REMOVAL OF LOBSTER FISHING RESTRICTIONS BE EXTENDED TO NEWFOUNDLAND—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Implementation of new regulations to exclude certain lobster fishermen has been delayed in the maritime region but appears to be discriminatory against Newfoundland. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House requests immediate consideration by the Minister of State (Fisheries) to include the province of Newfoundland which will allow all lobster fishermen in that province to engage in normal operations for this season.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 the motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AIRPORTS

DORVAL—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF EXTENSION OF SKY SHOPS LEASE WITHOUT TENDER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I too rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion that arises more particularly out of the lack of adequacy of answers provided in the House in the past few days. Considering that standard Department of Transport policy as acknowledged by the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) is to require the submission of public tenders for contracts like that extended to Sky Shops by an order in council on August 24, 1972, and considering that this specific extension was previously denied by Mr. O. C. Stoner, then deputy minister of the Department of Transport, on the grounds that public tendering would be required, and considering that the order in council on August 24, 1972, which reversed Mr. Stoner's position, was based on the recommendation of the then Minister of Transport and of Treasury Board, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House instructs the present Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the present Minister of Public Works to provide a full explanation for their recommending the extension of the Sky Shops contract at Dorval airport without calling for public tenders.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

SUGGESTED PROHIBITION OF FISHING VESSELS FROM THE GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE WHICH ARE NOT BASED THERE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

In view of the fact that the apportioning of quotas for carps, commonly known as goldfish, is prohibited; that the government ought to protect the spawning of goldfish which really need another generation to regenerate; that the fishing season in the Gulf of St. Lawrence opens only in late April and that fishermen in Gaspesia, Magdalen Islands and northern New Brunswick are now facing serious problems because big trawlers from coastal ports on the Gulf of St. Lawrence are plundering the sea bottoms of the gulf, particularly the Banc des Orphelins, which results in reducing the catch of deep sea fish, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise):

That the government allow the Department of the Environment to take any concrete measure it would deem necessary to ensure fishermen in Gaspesia, Magdalen Islands and northern New Brunswick better catches in keeping with their needs and to forbid all trawlers which are not based within the limits of the gulf waters to fish in that area.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, this kind of motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion may not be put.

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF MR. STONER'S BEHAVIOUR IN CONNECTION WITH FOOD CONCESSION TENDER—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I too have a motion to propose under the provisions of Standing Order 43 arising out of a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the explanation of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), made outside this House yesterday, that Mr. "Gerry" Stoner, during his tenure as the deputy minister of transport, was authorized to make a serious intervention in a tendering procedure, to wit, making suggestions to one bidder for the food and beverage concession at Mirabel airport that they explore merger possibilities with a second bidder for the same concession, without apparently informing any or all of the other bidders, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay):

That the Minister of Transport obtain and table in this House a written explanation of Mr. Stoner's behaviour, explaining the circumstances surrounding his behaviour vis-à-vis the aforementioned intervention in which it is made clear whether his minister of the day simply authorized the intervention or, indeed, ordered or suggested it.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

HOSPITALS

SUGGESTED NO CHANGE IN AGREEMENT WITH ONTARIO PENDING DECISION ON APPLICATION OF DURHAM MEMORIAL FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to raise a matter of urgent and pressing necessity which I hope will have the support of all members of the House.

In light of the fact that Durham Memorial Hospital is now before the Supreme Court of Ontario to challenge the legality of the Ontario government's decision to close the hospital, I would move, seconded by the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Jarvis):

That this House instructs the government not to agree to any amendments to the memorandum of agreement between Ontario and the federal government dated March 3, 1958, concerning the provisions of hospital services in Ontario which would in any way affect Durham Memorial Hospital at least until after the Supreme Court of Ontario has ruled on Durham Memorial Hospital's application for judicial review.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 43 this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

[Mr. Speaker.]

HIGHWAY SAFETY

PROPOSED SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATED USE OF SAFETY BELTS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my motion under Standing Order 43 is similar to one I presented shortly before Christmas, but in view of the action yesterday by the governments of Saskatchewan and Quebec I trust that this will find general acceptance by hon. members of this House. I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House supports the efforts of provincial governments in implementing laws designed to protect Canadians through the legislated use of safety belts, and encourages these governments to achieve uniformity across Canada in such laws, where practical.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR MORATORIUM ON SLAUGHTER OF CATTLE FOR BLUE TONGUE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. H. Whittaker (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a motion under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Whereas the Department of Agriculture has no real and concrete evidence that the eradication program for blue tongue disease through the slaughter of cattle in the south central area of British Columbia will be successful because the disease is known to be spread by flies which can easily fly across the Canadian-U.S. border, because deer and other wildlife animals are known to be carriers of this disease, and because there is ample evidence that this disease has been in the area for years, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco):

That the Department of Agriculture establish a moratorium on this slaughter program until the full extent of this disease can be checked throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

SUGGESTED REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF EMBARGO AGAINST UNITED STATES CATTLE BECAUSE OF BLUE TONGUE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the charge made by United States cattlemen that the Canadian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) imposed a non-tariff embargo against American cattle, and that he attempted to indict U.S. breeding stock so that it

would damage potential export trade that Canada and the U.S. compete for by summarily and without consultation instituting the blue tongue embargo, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie):

That this matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture for study.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 43 requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SKY SHOPS INVESTIGATION—REASON FORCE LAID CHARGES IN ONTARIO—CONSULTATION WITH MINISTER

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

An hon. Member: Where is Joe?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It has to do with the unfortunate matter of the Sky Shops affair about which that government over there has nothing to cheer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Where is Joe? We want Joe.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On Monday, April 26, the Prime Minister indicated that he had requested the Solicitor General to investigate the jurisdictional question which seems to have arisen between the RCMP and the Quebec Department of Justice with regard to the laying of charges in that matter. Now that the Solicitor General has had had some time to consider the matter I wonder whether he might tell the House if he was consulted by the RCMP on its decision to lay charges in the province of Ontario and, if so, would he describe the nature of those consultations?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I was not consulted, and that is the usual thing. The police laid charges without consulting me. They have told me since that they had jurisdiction to lay charges in both Ontario and Quebec, the alleged offence having been committed in both provinces, and that they had consulted with the Crown Attorneys of both provinces, and finally laid the charges in Ottawa.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Solicitor General for that answer. In the course of discussions the hon. gentleman had with the RCMP, consultations that took place after the event, having indicated a choice of jurisdiction, did the RCMP indicate to the Solicitor General, and can he in turn indicate to the House, the reasons for that choice of jurisdiction?

Mr. Allmand: Not completely, Mr. Speaker. There was some disagreement between the RCMP and the Crown Attorneys in Quebec on the nature of the charges to be laid. I am presently gathering more information on the basis of that disagreement. But there was a disagreement on the nature of the charges to be laid.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the difficulty the Solicitor General may have in getting that kind of information. Would he be prepared to undertake to the House that within the next few days when his investigation is complete that he would respond either to questions or make a statement with regard to the complete reasons because I think this is of interest in the course of the administration of justice.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I have made arrangements to meet with the Solicitor General of Quebec and following that meeting I hope to have more information.

[*Translation*]

NAME OF PERSON WHO AUTHORIZED VISIT TO MR. RIVARD

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish of ask a question of the Solicitor General.

After the Minister of Justice said yesterday that a notice was necessary to get an appropriate answer, the Solicitor General said that he would find out which RCMP officer authorized the examination of Télé-Média reporter Mr. Rivard. In such circumstances, can the minister tell the House today who authorized this visit and why was Mr. Rivard questioned?

[*English*]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not yet have a complete answer on that. I know that the agent of the RCMP who approached Mr. Rivard was from the A Division here in Ottawa. I am trying to find out who authorized or ordered that particular approach to Mr. Rivard. I have not yet received a full answer.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON ALLEGED RAID ON QUEBEC NEWSPAPER OFFICE

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Considering that the Solicitor General said last week that he would ask the RCMP to report on the search made at the Agence Presse Libre du Québec, can the minister give the House some information or else is he considering it would be better to make a specific statement on this matter?

[*English*]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, there again I have quite a bit of information from the RCMP. There were three participating police forces. By the way, it is clear now there was no warrant obtained from the court to enter, search or seize, but this will be another matter I want to discuss with Mr. Lalonde, the Quebec Solicitor General when I meet with him shortly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a final supplementary.

Can the Solicitor General give the House the assurance that he will make a statement as soon as he gets the information he is now looking for?

[*English*]

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to answer questions in the House and give as full a report as possible once I have more information.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

REASON FOR ORDER IN COUNCIL EXTENDING SKY SHOPS LEASE

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister arising from questions I put to him yesterday and the day before concerning specifically the Order in Council that was passed by the cabinet on August 24, 1972. Since this Order in Council, which was passed on the recommendation of both the then Minister of Transport and the President of the Treasury Board, contradicted the general principle that there should be no extension of such leases prior to the resubmission of bids, I wonder whether the Prime Minister now can give us an answer to the earlier question concerning the reason cabinet reached the particular decision it did on that date?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, it was a decision of council which was recommended to it in the normal way by official recommendation and which was passed in the routine fashion. I understand that the hon. member may want to have further explanations on this. I have looked into some of the answers given in this House and elsewhere beginning back in November by the Minister of Transport and others. If the hon. member opposite or any hon. member on the other side wants to ask further questions on this, I suggest that they take up the offer of the Minister of Transport. His estimates are still before the committee. He has been heard during three days and I am informed that there was practically no curiosity expressed about Sky Shops or about Dorval or about Mirabel or any of that.

● (1420)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: Members had no comments; they are not interested when they have the chance to ask questions.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: In all earnestness, and in an effort to make sure that answers to questions come in a consequential way and not piecemeal from day to day, I urge the opposition to accept this invitation from the minister to ask any questions they wish to ask and to make any suggestions they might have. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal suggests parliament. If hon. members wish to revert to committee of the whole, we are prepared to do this also.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We are prepared to answer every and any question. If it is truth that is to be obtained, the way to get it is to have the minister in the House or in committee—this is the choice of the opposition—where he will be able to answer every question that opposition members can think of. I repeat this invitation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has had this precise question—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Broadbent: The Prime Minister has had—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Despite the atmosphere of slight political antagonism in respect of these questions, I wonder if the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby could be given the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has had this precise question put to him three days in a row. If he had answered it on Monday, we would not have to repeat it today.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister again, given the exceptional nature of the decision which was reached in the cabinet on August 24, 1972, a decision not reached by officials, as the Prime Minister said yesterday and again implied today, but by ministers of the Crown responsible politically for the decision, would he or the Minister of Transport give us an explanation for that precise decision?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the explanation was given by the Minister of Transport and is recorded in *Hansard* of November 6. He explained the circumstances under which this lease was recommended for renewal under improved terms. It was recommended by the officials without any political pressure being put on the officials for that recommendation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: It resulted in improved benefits for the Crown. I could repeat the answer given at that time by the minister, but I am sure that what the hon. member would like to have is not bits and pieces of answers to questions asked sometimes by him and sometimes by other hon. members. I urge them to summon the minister before a standing committee or before committee of the whole to get the truth on all this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: If indeed there is a wish for truth rather than to create insinuations.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, for my final supplementary I will try the minister himself. There might be some hope of getting an answer.

In three days of dealing with this issue last November the minister made two points, if I understood him, for renewing the contract without a new bid being submitted. The two reasons given were that there were certain financial benefits greater than was the case under the previous contractual arrangement and, second, that there was going to be some kind of needed capital expansion in the facility at Dorval by Sky Shops to be paid for by Sky Shops themselves. Given the fact that there was going to be reduced international activity at Dorval, what sense does it make to say that they needed to expand the Sky Shops facility at Dorval when the expanded operation in fact was going to take place at Mirabel? Secondly—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Broadbent: —would the minister not agree that if the contract had been put for public tender, as it should have been, it might well have been the case that other people submitting bids could have provided benefits to the public of Canada which would have exceeded those submitted by Sky Shops? How would he have known if he did not put it out to tender?

Mr. Paproski: Would you repeat that question?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has missed one element, and that is that the volume of activity at the Dorval duty free shop was due to decrease significantly at some point in 1975, 1976 or 1977. We are looking at it at the present time. We must remember that then we were looking at it in 1972, at that point in time there was no opportunity for a tender of the operation for three more years. What we entered into in 1972 was an upward revision of a lease which had three years left to run where, in other words, a much higher price was being paid for the remaining three years in order to get the extension.

Mr. Broadbent: To 1980 as well.

Mr. Lang: But we could look at the fact that the situation would be very different in that particular duty free shop with a good deal of the business transferred away from it in 1975.

In the complex business of business, which hon. members opposite will, I am sure, not understand—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: What do you know about business?

Mr. Lang: In the Annapolis Valley there are some who would, although their voices are not heard here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lang: The issue of whether a tender is called or an extension is given to a lease is a matter of business judgment, and what a government should be expected to do is to apply its best business judgment to that question. To the hon. member there seems to be some misunderstanding about this, and I should like it to be understood that the recommendation for the extension of the lease came after a final offer from Sky Shops which was much improved over anything which had been discussed before, and it was to be made effective virtually immediately.

At that point in time the view was taken by the Department of Transport that that was an extension which should be granted, and therefore the information was put to the company that indeed it would be recommended. For practical purposes it was taken at that point as approved, and I should just like the hon. member to know that the only approval which is needed—beyond that of the government—for a minister or his department to sign a contract of that sort is the official approval of Treasury Board.

In due course that was sought and obtained, but that is not the approval of cabinet which is referred to. It is not as if a major issue of principle were before it. The judgment of the Department of Transport was that that was a good transaction which should be entered into then for the benefit of the higher amount of lease which could be obtained from 1972 to the end of 1975 where there was a firm lease, about which we could do nothing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

● (1430)

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REQUEST THAT LOANS BE GRANTED PROVINCES UNDER SAME CONDITIONS AS LOAN TO CHILE

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

We learned this morning that some American and Canadian banks have agreed to grant loans and credit to Chile for an amount of $125 million. Is the minister in a position to tell the House the conditions of the loan, that is its term as well as the rate of interest charged to Chile for such a loan of $125 million?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of such a transaction, but I will take the question as notice.

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

When the minister will be asking about the nature, the interest rates and the term of the loan, would he also inquire whether the Canadian provinces could obtain such loans from chartered banks in Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—ALLEGEDLY CONFLICTING MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS ON FOOD CONCESSION TENDER—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister on a point of clarification of ministerial statements in today's and yesterday's press involving the food and beverage concession. The present Minister of Transport is quoted in the *Globe and Mail* this morning to the effect that Senator Giguere was not involved and there was nothing to indicate that he was. The former minister of transport is quoted in yesterday's Ottawa *Journal* as saying:

. . . of course Senator Giguere approached me and was told that he was not going to get it because he was not the lowest bidder.

On a point of information for the former minister of transport, Mr. Speaker, I hope he understands it was the highest and not the lowest bidder who should have got it. That is pretty complex, but I hope he understands that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacKay: I want to ask the Prime Minister which, if either, of these statements is correct?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not even know if the quotations attributed to the ministers by the hon. member refer to the same series of incidents. Maybe one was—

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You don't know anything.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, in case you are wondering, the animal noises over there are from a bunch of hyenas.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: You are getting pretty testy.

Mr. Fairweather: You have had a week's holiday; you cannot be as testy as that already.

Mr. Nowlan: Why don't we have an election?

Mr. Trudeau: They are not all hyenas, Mr. Speaker. There are also some donkeys over there.

An hon. Member: One of the donkeys is for Ottawa-Carleton.

Mr. Nowlan: There are a few horses' asses on their side.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): There is the north end of the horse pointing over there.

Mr. Speaker: Happily, without being called upon to make any sort of judgment upon that assessment,—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Speaker: —I might say that at various times during this question period the noise has been equal from both sides of the House. I think it would be better if we were to allow those putting the questions to put them and those answering them to answer.

Mr. Nowlan: How do hyenas put questions and horses' asses answer them?

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ALLEGED INTERVENTION IN TENDERING PROCEDURE—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION AND REPORT

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he could indicate to the House whether he agrees that it is proper procedure for bidders or tenderers to be encouraged to change their status after they have submitted bids or tenders and before tenders have been awarded? Could the minister also inform the House if his department is investigating this acknowledged intervention in a normal government tendering procedure to see what violations may have occurred with respect to the provisions of the Financial Administration Act?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, when tenders are made to the departments, we examine each one individually and accept the recommendation of the departments after having studied it seriously. I do not know whether there are negotiations between the parties once the Treasury Board has made a decision. In this case, the decision was made in the light of avaiblable information.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has provided a general answer. In terms of this specific case, is he or any officials of his department investigating the alleged irregularities that have taken place in the handling of this particular tender?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: I do not know what tender he means, but if he is alluding to the decision whereby a restaurant in Montreal was leased to Entreprises Cara Québec Ltée, then the award was made to the best offer, that is to the tender who made the best offer to the government. That is all that counts.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Am I to take it from the minister's answer that he is in agreement that those tenders can be manipulated, that there can be intervention after the tenders have been set up and before the award has been made? Is the minister saying he is condoning that practice?

An hon. Member: Patronage!

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member raises those things when he acknowledged that

the best bid was accepted by the government. It is complete nonsense.

An hon. Member: What about the intervention?

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

IMPORTATION OF EGGS—DEPARTMENTAL ACTION TO PROTECT CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister satisfied himself that the consumer interest is being protected in relation to permits issued this week by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the importation of eggs into Canada and if not, will he inform the House what specific action his department is taking?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in his question the hon. gentleman did not indicate the whom the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce issued these permits. If he would do that, perhaps I could answer more fully. I would give him an opportunity for a supplementary in order to be more specific.

Mr. Grafftey: I said this week, Mr. Speaker. This week permits have been issued by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to import eggs into Canada. That being the case, has the minister satisfied himself that the consumer interest has been protected? If not, what specific action is his department taking?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the role of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is to issue permits to traditional wholesalers or importers of eggs from the United States whenever there is a shortage. I presume that is what the hon. member is talking about. In that case, I am quite satisfied that consumer interests have been protected. So far there is no evidence that eggs were being sold at a higher price than set by CEMA and there is no evidence of any shortage. If, on the other hand, which I think is what the hon. gentleman is really getting at, the permits were issued to other than regular importers such as to CEMA directly or indirectly, I would be very upset because this would be in contravention of all the concepts of CEMA in the first place.

SUGGESTED EXAMINATION OF USE OF VETO POWER BY CANADIAN EGG MARKETING AGENCY OVER ISSUANCE OF IMPORT PERMITS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In pursuing his responsibility of protecting the consumer interest has the minister examined the use of the veto power that CEMA has with respect to import permits issued by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and confirmed that they are not in fact using these legal powers to make windfall profits on eggs imported into Canada?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no evidence of any veto powers of CEMA. In fairness to the question I come back to the point that when there is a shortage of eggs in this country it is traditional to import supplies from the United States, as the hon. member knows. For many years traditional importers have imported eggs. Government policy at the moment is that they should be allowed to bring eggs into Canada, when eggs are needed. This is done by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in such a way that everyone has an equal opportunity. Some rumours, which my department is attempting to trace, suggest that CEMA themselves have circumvented this process. If they have, CEMA should be condemned. My job, which I did not take under false pretences, is to concern myself with the consumers of this country. I intend to do so.

* * *

● (1440)

HOSPITALS

DURHAM MEMORIAL—REQUEST NO CHANGE MADE IN HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT UNTIL COURT CASE DECIDED

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare arises from a motion moved earlier. Whereas Durham Memorial Hospital, in its effort to continue operation despite notice of closure from the Ontario government, contends in the Supreme Court of Ontario that such closure can only take place under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act if the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare consents to a change in the act, will the minister give assurance that he will not consent to such a change until the Ontario Supreme Court has decided the case concerning Durham Memorial Hospital?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there are agreements with various provinces concerning hospitals under the Hospital Insurance Act. I have heard of the particular case in which the hospital concerned is contesting action planned by the government of Ontario before the courts. I assure the hon. member, since the matter is sub judice, I will not consider an amendment to the agreement concerning Durham Memorial Hospital until the court has disposed of the case.

* * *

ENERGY

OIL—DATE ON WHICH SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACHIEVED

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In his statement yesterday, on the so-called energy self-reliance policy, the minister said that by 1985 we shall probably import 800,000 barrels of oil per day, in contrast with present imports of some 240,000 barrels a day. In view of this gloomy prognostication, can the minister estimate the approximate date by which Canada can hope to reach the self-sufficiency

toward which the government, according to what it has been telling us, has been aiming for the last few years?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I told the committee last night, I should like to be able to give a date. Clearly, it is impossible. It will depend a great deal on good luck and on a great deal of exploration in the north. That is the main thrust. We must have exploration and development activity in the frontier regions of Canada.

Mr. Nowlan: The minister doesn't know what thrust means.

POSSIBLE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING MANDATORY GUIDELINES FOR CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I thought the government was running the country, not running a lottery. In addition to luck, you need policy. The Science Council of Canada having said that with proper conservation methods we can save between 20 per cent and 30 per cent of the energy we consume, and that industrial users could save large quantities of energy by following proper programs, I ask the minister if he intends during the present session, or in the near future, to introduce legislation which will provide for mandatory guidelines for saving on energy consumed in this country?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. member does not understand the oil industry. He thinks you can make a hole in the ground and expect to find oil.

Mr. Nowlan: No; he knows if you have a dry hole you will find the minister.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed. If the hon. member knew more about the oil industry, he would know that it takes much luck to find oil. To speak on his second question, again, I am surprised that he, as official energy critic of the NDP, has not been following our debates. If he had followed them, he would remember that I tabled a full document on energy conservation measures some weeks ago, when I indicated that we shall introduce mandatory measures.

PROPOSED DELAY IN APPROVAL OF MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE PENDING APPLICATION FROM POLAR GAS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I know we must drill holes. I also recognize that the oil industry puts down lines and, every once in a while, catches a sucker. They caught one when they caught the minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development having said that supplies of gas presently available in the Mackenzie Delta put in question the advisability of proceeding with the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, I ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources if he will consider asking the National Energy Board to postpone a final decision on the Mackenzie Valley pipeline until Polar Gas, which has found adequate amounts of proven gas to warrant a pipeline, has had time to apply to the National Energy Board, and the board has had opportunity to consider that application?

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

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): No, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the National Energy Board proceed as expeditiously as possible.

* * *

BROADCASTING

GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS FOR GREATER CANADIAN CONTENT

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: —my question is to the Minister of Communications. In view of the rhapsody that her speech occasioned with the "sterile press" of this country—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: —I congratulate her on the attainment of her portfolio. Having congratulated her, may I ask this. We are talking about communications.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: In view of the expansive response of the press of Canada to the minister's speech given to the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' meeting on Monday, can the minister say what definite proposals she will make in this House or elsewhere for making even more Canadian the broadcast air waves of this country?

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I welcome my new critic, the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: It's Annapolis Valley.

Mrs. Sauvé: I so much like the hon. member for Fundy-Royal. That is why I made a mistake. I will try to like the hon. member for Annapolis Valley, my critic, as well. I disagree with the hon. member, who suggests that the press is sterile. Considering all the comments it made about my speech, I think it is very prolific. I did not make a specific proposal to the broadcasters, but threw in an idea which I think would help them to increase their revenues in an industry which, as we know, is fragile. It was not a specific proposal. It was an idea, to which I want them to respond. I think it is important to enhance the revenues of broadcasters, so that we may have in this country still better broadcasting.

Mr. Nowlan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the minister's response, and her congratulations. It has taken me four long elections and some extracurricular activities to get this far. But, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the astronaut, Neil Armstrong, the next big step is going to be a big step for Canada and a small step for me because we are going right across the way.

● (1450)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: Those were reciprocal congratulations. So now we can cut the mustard and get down to business. I should like to know from the hon. lady, the minister who is most genteel and not necessarily gentle, whether the fact that she took the CAB as her forum to talk about Canadianizing the air waves—

An hon. Member: What is the question?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. member for Annapolis Valley would now come to the point. In fairness, I must say he has been allowed considerable latitude with respect to the preamble.

Mr. Nowlan: And quite rightly so, Mr. Speaker, because this is the first time I have paid attention to the hon. lady minister. And it is the first time she has paid attention to me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: The point is, and especially with regard to the digression by the rabbit from St. Boniface—he hasn't learned the first law of philosophy, and that is from Descartes—"I know, therefore I am"—

An hon. Member: Bravo!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Egmont.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

EFFECT ON ATLANTIC AREA OF INCREASED FERRY RATES AND LACK OF ASSISTANCE WITH COST OF ELECTRICITY

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. It relates to the announcement earlier this week of the increase of rates on the car ferry to Prince Edward Island by some 60 per cent this year and the announcement or non-announcement, made yesterday by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources with respect to the provision for assistance in terms of sky-rocketing electricity costs in Atlantic Canada. Has the department made an assessment of the impact of these two moves by two other departments of the federal government in terms of the deterioration of federal assistance when it comes to reducing the disparity between the economically disadvantaged regions of Canada and others.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, in fact the department follows very closely the evolution of energy costs in the Maritime provinces and especially in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. We keep an eye on the influence additional costs could have on the activities of the industries as well as the general population.

We have expressed our concern in this regard to our colleagues of the cabinet, and I can assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that the department and myself keep watching the situation very closely and try by every means at our disposal to ensure that the effects are not too severe in that part of the country.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

POSSIBILITY OF EXTENDING SINGLE PRICE POLICY TO ELECTRICITY

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): In view of the remarks made just now by the minister and the comments of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance which were made last night in the course of the adjournment debate, I would direct a supplementary to the Minister of Finance. Inasmuch as the parliamentary secretary was not able to complete his remarks but indicated at the end that the federal government was committed to implementing a single price policy but was not able to clarify whether that will be extended now to electrical costs, can the minister tell us whether or not such a move is now under consideration and whether it will be an item for discussion by first ministers when they meet next week?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, a single price policy is now in effect and has been for the last several years with regard to petroleum.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am well aware of that fact, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform us, in view of the remarks of his parliamentary secretary and suggestions at the earlier conference of finance ministers about adjustments in the equalization formula which the minister said were under consideration, whether there will be consideration of government policy which will have the effect of widening the gap of disparity of electrical costs in, say, the Province of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia as compared to the cost in, let us say, Central Canada?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): There will undoubtedly be discussion of this question at the meeting with regard to petroleum and natural gas prices which will occur early in May. I have to point out to the hon. gentleman that there is presently a great variation in electricity costs right across Canada and even within provinces. The notion of attempting to equalize to a single price would, of course, place a tremendous burden on the treasury.

Oral Questions

ENERGY

EFFECT OF NEW ENERGY POLICY ON CONFERENCE TO ESTABLISH OIL AND GAS PRICES—AGREEMENT OF PROVINCES WITH POLICY

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the fact that the main item on the agenda of the first ministers' conference next week is the establishment of the domestic price of oil and natural gas, and since the energy policy tabled yesterday states that the first target is to move domestic oil prices toward international levels and to move domestic prices for natural gas to an appropriate competitive relationship over the next two to four years, would the minister tell us whether all the provinces have agreed to this policy and, if not, would he agree that the purpose of the first ministers' conference next week to establish oil and gas prices has been pre-empted or at least seriously inhibited by his announcement?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I would not say that the announcement in any way inhibits the conference. Indeed, I think it will be a very useful background to the conference. I might add in that connection that contrary to the views expressed by the hon. member's benchmate yesterday there has been a great deal of consultation between myself and the other energy ministers. At least two conferences of energy ministers dealt with this matter as one of the items on the agenda and there have been further conferences between the leading officials of the various provincial departments of energy or their equivalent extending over some months. So there has been a great degree of consultation and, I might say, a broad measure of approval for the measures introduced yesterday.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

CONCLUSION OF ECONOMIC COUNCIL THAT ACT RAISES UNEMPLOYMENT RATE AND FOSTERS DISINCENTIVE TO WORK—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I know he has had an opportunity of studying the recent report of the Economic Council of Canada, "People and Jobs", which has concluded that the present Unemployment Insurance Act raises the unemployment rate and fosters a disincentive to work. Is the minister in a position to respond to these findings? In short, does he agree with the findings of the Economic Council?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): As I indicated to the hon. member the other day, we will have a chance to discuss this matter in detail when I appear before the standing committee which I think is the more appropriate occasion. As to agreement with the council's conclusions, I think the hon. member, as is sometimes the case, has taken one single portion of the report and exploited it to illustrate a particular point without covering other portions of the report. In other words, it is slightly out of context.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Alexander: I know the minister is very concerned about the eight-week eligibility period and the time during which a person can receive unemployment insurance benefit. He stated on October 27, 1975, when dealing with Bill C-69, that he was assessing or reviewing the benefit structure which includes those matters to which I have just referred. Has he concluded this study and if so is he able to give us any hint as to what he has found? In particular, will he assure us that he will lay before the standing committee or before the House the findings of the study he has made with respect to the benefit structure?

Mr. Andras: I believe I have already laid before the standing committee considerable detail as to the findings which have emerged from this study, but I will be glad to do more when we consider the matter in committee.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF PRIME MINISTER OF BELGIUM

Mr. Speaker: I know all hon. members will join with me in welcoming the presence in our gallery of a most distinguished visitor in the person of the Prime Minister of Belgium, Mr. Leo Tindemans.

● (1500)

During his all too brief visit here the Prime Minister is accompanied by Mrs. Tindemans, by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Development Co-operation, in the person of Mr. Renaat Van Elslande, and Mrs. Van Elslande; and a person who may be "slightly familiar" to the members of this House—our very distinguished ambassador to that country, the Hon. Lucien Lamoureux.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Surrey-White Rock has a question of privilege.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Communications, recently said that she wants to eliminate violence on television. In view of the proceedings in the House today, I wonder whether she would get together with the government House leader and shelve his plan to have television in the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been complaints in this House for several days about the denial of the right to bid on certain projects. I wish to enter a protest on behalf of the hon. member for Egmont, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond, as well as on my own behalf, in that we were not given the opportunity to bid on a certain project. I may say that if we had been given that opportu-

nity, any one of us would have done it completely free of charge. So I wonder why the President of the Privy Council had to run off to Toronto to get married!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Even so, Mr. Speaker, we would add to the congratulations that were expressed on the floor of the House the day after he did it. We wish him and Mrs. Sharp the very best, and we are happy to welcome him back to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in once again expressing, now in the presence of the hon. gentleman, the good wishes which we expressed on the day he "flew the coop" from us and took upon himself a wife. I was looking at the tanned visage of the government House leader, and judging from his tan I, for one, would have to second guess whether or not he was in fact on honeymoon when he was away. Nonetheless, we do welcome him back and all of us join in extending to him and his wife our very best wishes for a long and happy married life.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank all hon. members for their good wishes on my recent marriage. I feel very fortunate: I mean fortunate to have married, not just to have been away from the House—so that there is no misunderstanding about that. It is one of those happy occasions. Indeed, when I let my parliamentary secretary into the secret the night before, so that he would be equipped to speak for me the following day, he said, "I'm glad there's a little romance around here".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize. Earlier while someone was talking about the minister, I was discussing with a colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party. Still I want to extend personally, on behalf of my colleagues and on my behalf, our best wishes to the minister and congratulate him for having recognized the official bilingualism in Canada by marrying a French Canadian. This is an outstanding quality of the minister which I want to point out to the House. So we sincerely wish him many years of happiness.

[*English*]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a different point of order. Two weeks ago today, the last day the House sat before the Easter break, I asked a question in the House which is to be found at page 12811 of *Hansard* and to which I should like to make a correction. My question was:

Has the Prime Minister been advised that a company whose principal owner is a fairly senior employee of the Bank of Canada has been awarded at least four cleaning contracts in federal government buildings in Ottawa since 1972 and, if so, does the minister consider that to be a conflict of interest?

During the Easter break I found out that some of the information on which I had based that question was incorrect, and I thought it only fair for the record to point this out in the House. The information was honestly obtained. I also want to say that I regret if I have caused any inconvenience to anybody in the Bank of Canada. I also want to point out that a case like this illustrates that it would be wise if the Department of Public Works discontinued the practice of issuing contracts to companies whose principal owners are unknown to the government.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

TABLING OF REPORT ON ASSOCIATION MARKETING

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a further report from the Anti-Inflation Board with regard to the question of association marketing in certain industries.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,813, 3,815, 5,035, 5,159 and 5,207.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

BILINGUALISM—KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH AND FRENCH AS FACTORS FOR PROMOTION

Question No. 3,813—**Mr. Howie:**

To what extent is linguistic knowledge of (a) English, (b) French a factor in promotions to and within the commissioned officer class in the Canadian Army?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) and (b) Linguistic knowledge of both English and French is not a factor in promotions to commissioned rank and within commissioned ranks up to the rank of Captain. However, in all officer classifications, (except for some specialist officer's classifications) knowledge of English is necessary to complete classification training which is a prerequisite to promotion within commissioned ranks up to the rank of Captain. For promotion to the rank of Major and above linguistic ability in a second official language is a factor. The total scoring system which determines relative merit is based on two major appraisal scores, "Performance and Potential". "Performance" accounts for 80 per cent and "Potential" for 20 per cent of the total possible merit score, and linguistic ability is one of the factors considered under "Potential". Other factors under "Potential" are qualifications, experience, personality, age and such other factors considered appropriate by the promotion board membership. Thus linguistic ability in a second official language, whether English or French should enhance an officer's position with respect to promotion to the ranks of Major or above in relation to a unilingual contemporary when all other factors are equal.

Order Paper Questions

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PERSONNEL LINGUISTIC QUOTA SYSTEM

Question No. 3,815—**Mr. Howie:**

Does any linguistic quota system exist in the commissioned officer category of the Armed Forces that could require the promotion of a junior officer to a senior position in preference to a more senior officer and, if so, what is the quota system?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): To support the Government's Bilingual program the department is endeavouring to establish by 1987 an Anglophone/Francophone balance of personnel in the forces corresponding to the national ratio of the two groups, currently 73 per cent Anglophones/27 per cent Francophones. To provide an equitable distribution of this ratio in all classifications and trades and at all rank levels some adjustments to the promotion merit lists as described in Question No. 3813 are made periodically, when possible and practicable, in the ranks of Major and above. Where such an adjustment is made the promotion of the officer who would otherwise have been promoted is protected and he or she will be promoted when the next vacancy occurs.

UIC BENEFIT PAYMENTS

Question No. 5,035—**Mr. Lawrence:**

1. In (a) 1974, (b) 1975, how many persons receiving unemployment insurance benefits had a gross annual income (i) in excess of $50,000, (ii) from $40,000 to $50,000, (iii) from $30,000 to $39,999, (iv) from $20,000 to $29,999, (v) from $10,000 to $19,999, (vi) of less than $10,000?

2. What was the total number of persons who received unemployment insurance benefits in (a) 1974, (b) 1975?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. (a) and (b) Information concerning the number of persons receiving Unemployment Insurance Benefit by gross annual income is not compiled by the Commission.

2. (a) 1974 2.03 million. (b) 1975, 2.44 million.

NOTE: estimated from T4u and TP4u

AMOUNT OF ESTATE TAXES COLLECTED IN CANADA AND PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Question No. 5,138—**Mr. Matte:**

For the fiscal years 1973-74 and 1974-75 what were the amounts of estate taxes collected in (a) Canada, (b) the Province of Quebec?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): 1. (a) Canada

	1973-74	1974-75
(i) Estate tax	$14.4 million	$7.1 million
(ii) Provincial succession duties	$24.8 million*	$17.6 million*

*Includes provincial gift tax.

[Mr. Richardson.]

Tax reform for 1972 discontinued the application of federal estate taxes for the years subsequent to 1971. All estate tax activity in recent years has been in respect of estates arising before that time and revenue collected during the period in question is strictly due to reassessments and prolonged assessments of estates that arose before 1972. Provincial succession duties were collected in 1973-1974 and 1974-1975 when the Department administered the Succession Duty Acts and Gift Tax Acts of the provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. (b) Quebec. (i) No provincial breakdown is available of collections of estate tax in 1973-1974 and 1974-1975. (ii) The Quebec Succession Duty Act is administered by the Quebec provincial government and we have no information with respect to amounts collected in 1973-1974 and 1974-1975.

DEVELOPMENT PROJECT OF PARK NEAR LAKE LONG OF MONTAUBAN—CHAMPLAIN CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 5,159—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Have any monies been voted for the development project of a park near Lake Long of Montauban in the Constituency of Champlain and (a) if so, in what amount, (b) if not, for what reason?

2. Is the project (a) the subject of a conflict between the government and the Province of Quebec, (b) hindered by the existence of the National Saguenay Park?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. No. (a) None. (b) Parks Canada has no such project under active consideration.

2. (a) Answered by 1. (b) Answered by 1.

INCOME TAX PAID BY HUTTERIAN BRETHREN

Question No. 5,207—**Mr. Horner:**

1. In what years did the Hutterian Brethren pay income tax and what was the total amount in each case?

2. Has the government refunded this money to the Hutterian Brethren and, if so, was interest paid?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of National Revenue): 1. This information is not available as departmental records are not maintained according to the religion of taxpayers.

2. See answer to Part 1.

* * *

[*English*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO ADD NEW DEFINITIONS

The House resumed, from Tuesday, April 27, consideration of Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in my place at this time. Having spoken last night for five minutes, I did not appreciate that today I would be honoured by the return of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). From the grassroots of the House of Commons, not just through the House leaders, I should like to congratulate him and to echo and repeat ad infinitum the good wishes that we all have for him regarding the very happy step he took at Easter. I would not pontificate about the Easter message, but I would question the fact that the government House leader took only a week's Easter recess. In view of what happened over the Easter recess to the President of the Privy Council, I think he would have had the almost unanimous blessing of members on all sides of the House if he had taken two, three, or perhaps even four weeks to make sure that the happy union that occurred at Easter shall continue thereafter, as I am sure it will.

After those Goldilocks words and, as the leader of the Social Credit party said, after the happy moonglow of romance, I find it difficult now to shift from platitutes about honeymoons and marriage to the realities of the Anti-Inflation Board. Not since the doctor created Frankenstein has there been a creation on the floor of this House to equal Bill C-89. There are many of us humble people from the grassroots of Canada who believe in what our leader has said. We campaigned, we fought, we talked, and sometimes we were even questioned about what went on in that grand old election campaign of July, 1974. I was one of those who took a stand in trying to defend something that was vital to Canada, with all its imperfections.

● (1510)

Like other members in my party, I took a stand and our party was politically lacerated by the people of Canada: we are not now sitting over there. I will not waste too much time on sad, bittersweet memories or thoughts of what might have been—because we will be there. One thing that many people can say about the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), my former leader, is that he may have many pluses and he may have many minuses, but he speaks because he believes in something, and because he believes, he remains true. He did not do a flip-flop like this government. This government is like a gosh darn cookie jar in a lumberjack camp. This government wanted to cook pancakes; they put all the ingredients into the old frying pan.

An hon. Member: Come to the point.

Mr. Nowlan: Now we hear from the mountain member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane). If he wants to get involved in this debate, I would like him to speak now or go back to his riding and try to match his words of today with what he said in July, 1974. There may be a Gregorian calendar, a Christian calendar and there may be a Judaic-Christian calendar. The fact of the matter is that my happy friend from Hamilton Mountain, who is one of the lovelier people in this House, cannot face himself in the mirror. That is why the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) does not shave his face; that is why he has a beard.

I am amazed that the hon. member from "Happy Mountain", or the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain, has the temerity to even look in the mirror. I guess he does shave, though, and has never got over the baby fuzz. "Happy Gus MacFarlane, I do not know how you can face yourself in the mirror after the way you people campaigned in July, 1974, as compared to the facts of reality today." In any event, I do not want to get too political.

Mr. Paproski: Go ahead, Pat.

Mr. Nowlan: I do not want to get too political, but the fact of the matter is, in very serious vein, that my colleague the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) has moved an amendment to a clause that in fact will allow controls for 18 months. Then my happy friend the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), who has to find happiness somewhere, and my friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is a happy fellow too, have concocted what I call the maypole dance. They have proposed a subamendment, not to have controls for 18 months but to end them on May 1, 1976. I am not going to waste too much time trying to analyse that subamendment because, quite frankly, it has no credence at all when taken in the light of what this party believes in or what this party stood for and campaigned for, namely, that this government should get off its duff and try to do something about inflation. This subamendment comes from my friends to the left, and they are so far to the left that I think they should be locked up in some type of sanatorium. They are so far to the left that obviously they do not put any credence in the fight that every Canadian is trying to win that is, the fight against inflation.

I said last night, in the few remarks I made before the hour of ten o'clock, that I respected the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and Jean-Luc Pepin, chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board, and that I had some respect for the government. However, unless each individual Canadian begins to fins some personal solution to inflation, quite frankly we are not going to dampen these inflationary fires. The point is that some hon. members in the back row across the way have lately echoed what my leader has said. We want a 90-day freeze to wet the towels of all Canadians across the country so that we can get out of this inflationary psychology. We want people to stop and think before buying, perhaps because they know the cost will be 20 per cent lower tomorrow. This might cause people to pause and think. Perhaps that is what this government should do: it should begin to think.

Coming back to the bill—and I am very serious about this—this is the party that wanted some type of government intervention, and this was part of our campaing back in July, 1974. I found it very difficult to campaign because—

An hon. Member: And your party lost.

Mr. Nowlan: My hon. friend from Bathurst—

Mr. Breau: Gloucester.

Mr. Nowlan: We have heard from my friend Herb from Gloucester. The point is that this was the only party to take a stand in 1972 and 1974. We tried to tell the Canadian people that something could be done.

An hon. Member: And you struck out.

Mr. Nowlan: The hon. member is right; electorally and politically we failed. However, there is something that means much more to many of us, and that is our country.

An hon. Member: And integrity.

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, and integrity, as my hon. friend says. We did not fail because our integrity was not intact; in fact, our integrity is even better today than it was, as is the integrity of the hon. member for Halifax. His reputation for integrity is better today than it ever was as a result of those heydays in the summer of July, 1974.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nowlan: I have not finished, but the hon. member wants to ask a question.

Mr. Breau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity of putting a question. I agree with the hon. member that we all value integrity and that there is integrity in that party. I do not quarrel with that, but he seems to be questioning the integrity of other people.

Mr. Nowlan: Certainly.

Mr. Breau: Is he not aware that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) admitted during the election campaign of 1974 that the government of Canada had a contingency plan for some kind of wage and price controls, and that under certain circumstances they would be brought forward?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before returning the floor to the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) I should indicate that his remaining time is rather short.

Mr. Nowlan: How many minutes?

Mr. Speaker: About three, officially.

Mr. Nowlan: I am not going to take up those three minutes in answering the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau). I am talking about integrity, and the fact of the matter is, as I said last night, if you are really going to sell the inflation package, the person who should sell it is the leader of the land, your Prime Minister and my Prime Minister. Why is that right hon. gentleman, who is a persuasive man, not out across this country from sea to sea preaching the message of belt-tightening, discipline and integrity? The reason he is not, has not and will not, is that there is no integrity: he has done a flip-flop that is the biggest pancake in the political history of Canada.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Getting back to the anti-inflation bill, this country of Canada in 1968 was caught up in something called "Trudeaumania". Many members won and are here. There were many members on this side who lost as a result of that so-called "Trudeaumania". It is a sad thing to this particular member of parliament, who happened to win in spite of Trudeaumania, that the so-called just society will, under Bill C-89, become a controlled society. I am seriously suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all my colleagues in this House that controls are alien to the Canadian public. This country was not built on controls. It was built on the initiative of individuals who were sometimes rewarded by tax incentives.

One of the reasons I do not hesitate to support the amendment of the hon. member for York-Simcoe, who is trying to restrict the controls to a period of 18 months, is that this bill is not designed to allow controls for three years but allows, by order in council, the Treasury Board to impose controls ad infinitum. Controls are alien to the North American continent, and certainly to parliament. This bill distorts the economic picture. I give great credit to my friends to the left for their sincerity and because some of them are school teachers. I have a brother-in-law in Nova Scotia who is a school teacher. The package in respect of the school teachers in Nova Scotia which was brought before the Anti-inflation Board has been distorted. These teachers did not ask for an increase for a long period. However, through a collective agency which bargains for all teachers in Nova Scotia, a package was prepared which has been challenged by the Anti-Inflation Board.

● (1520)

We have the idiotic situation that the teachers in that province must come to Ottawa to make sure that they get what they are entitled to. Because they did not make a demand for three years, what they have asked for in a one-year period appears to be above the guidelines set out by this government. They are being penalized by school boards in other parts of this country who have successfully negotiated in the last three years and are far above the level of the teachers in Nova Scotia. They are so far behind they can never catch up. There is no more responsible body in Nova Scotia than these teachers.

This is one reason controls are anathema to this country. I would not be in the House of Commons if there was equality. I am here because of the fundamental disparities and differences which are our curse and our challenge. That is why this House of Commons must deal in its funny way with procedural rules which are almost archaic and which you, Mr. Speaker, labour on and on to give fundamental judgments. However, you are a captive of this system that has been a fundamental part of our procedure.

In any class in which I have spoken to my students I always told them that when this House of Commons is in session it is the closest thing there is to the heart of Canada. I do not know of another institution which is so symbolically representative of the 23 million or 24 million Canadians, even with all its imperfections. Earlier I said that I would not be here if we had controls, because if we had controls and equality in my area we would never have survived.

I think, quite frankly, that the strength of this country lies in what the late right hon. member for Algoma East, Lester B. Pearson, used to say. He said that through diversity there is strength, and with unity there is common cause. Here we have a long-term control package at a time when we have escalating energy problems in Atlantic Canada, where people on moderate incomes have electricity bills of $300 and $400.

The fabric of this country is not based on linguistics or on race. This is an integral part of the country, but we must do something about an economic condition. As yet there has not been too much hue and cry from the people of Atlantic Canada. This is the reason I am happy to have an opportunity to participate in this debate on the amendment. We go along with controls that are down to earth, but I will never vote for a bill that puts controls in force for three years which, by order in council, can be extended ad infinitum. I am amazed that the Minister of Finance could acquiesce in this. I am amazed that he would ask the opposition to become an accessory before the fact in respect of Bill C-89.

The cabinet will change, and we do not know what attitude another cabinet will have. Ministers come and go. Very many of them will go. In fact, they should all go and I hope they do. Seriously, however, I cannot understand how my good friend from Rosedale, the Minister of Finance, who has taken constitutional law, let alone any government whether Liberal, Conservative or, in the name of infamy, NDP, could have brought in an open-ended program of controls. While I was interested in the endorsation of the just society, I will not be a part of this controlled society.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) has returned. I am always interested in noting the behaviour of the Minister of Finance. He seems either to take some words out of context to take simplistic attitudes or come to simplistic conclusions concerning the attitude of the opposition. Yesterday he referred to the remarks of my colleague for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). He referred to what he claimed might have been insincere words and attitudes by the former leader of our party the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), with regard to parts of this bill.

Bill C-89 is not only concerned with the granting of the right of appeal from decisions of the Anti-Inflation Board by salaried and hourly-rated workers or parties to a decision, but there is something much more fundamental. There is an amending of section 46 of Bill C-73, which has to do with the period of these controls and the procedures and formulas that may be adopted. I think it was dishonest of the minister to say what he did about this party. This party voted in favour of Bill C-73 on second reading in order to have it sent to the committee, although we had reservations which were clearly expressed by the then leader of the party and other spokesmen in respect of the period of controls which we considered to be excessive.

We said we would do everything we could to have the period shortened and, depending on the action and attitude of the government in committee, we would then reserve our position at third reading. We voted against the bill at third reading, as we had undertaken, because the government refused to change it one iota except for the introduction of a review formula that was of little consequence. In the same way, there is nothing insincere about our having voted for Bill C-89 to go to the committee. That is not approval of the bill. This is the reason I say it is wrong for the Minister of Finance simply to say we voted before for this bill on second reading, and now are bitterly complaining about it and doing a flip-flop. That is not so. It was clearly indicated that we wanted to see the bill go forward to committee. That is where bills are supposed to be studied. The Minister of Finance is the author of the present rules under which we operate. All he has to do is review the speeches he made in proposing and supporting the rules.

● (1530)

My colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke), in committee raised a point with regard to the power of the governor in council to extend by way of order in council the ambit of the Anti-Inflation Board under Bill C-73. Even with regard to the construction industry section 3(2)(b)(i) provides for a limitation of jurisdiction on firms employing 20 or more persons. Yet we now see the jurisdiction extended to all construction firms, even one-man firms. I wish hon. members and other persons outside the House, particularly those who write and comment about what goes on in the House, would realise that under section 12 of Bill C-73 the governor in council has the right to refer a question of extension to the Anti-Inflation Board, the board then will consider it and make a recommendation back to the governor in council, who in turn issues an order in council implementing the recommendation of the AIB as to the extension of jurisdiction.

It is as simple as taking a tennis ball, bouncing it against a wall and then having it come back to the hand, because the governor in council is extending the jurisdiction of controls not only from the few Galbraithian, selective controls that they allege were to be have been the basis of this program last October, and then in November and December, but from when the legislation was under consideration in the House. We have seen them go from some 650 firms to possibly 65,000 or 100,000 firms; and we will see the jurisdiction extended to insurance companies, property and casualty insurance companies, life insurance companies, banks and all the other institutions which are to be gradually brought under the net of controls.

How is it to be done? Not straightforward, but covertly, as I have said, by throwing a ball against the wall and catching it. The government say it thinks it would like to extend the jurisdiction of controls over this or that section of the economy. They turn to the Anti-Inflation Board, which merely reflects back the thinking in the form of a recommendation, and on that recommendation which was generated by the governor in council the order in council is issued and the extension made. That is how control over the construction industry was extended all the way down to one-man firms.

Some surveys of results of the AIB decisions have appeared recently, one of which is to be found in the *Financial Times* of April 26, 1976. This is an indication of what has been happening. Because I do not have much time, I will read directly from the report. All credit for this

must go to those people who researched and prepared the story. The story originates in Ottawa and reads:

Ottawa—The Anti-Inflation Board has been allowing far more generous pay increases in the public sector than in private industry.

A *Financial Times* survey of 104 wage decisions made by the board shows this divergence clearly.

The survey shows 69 per cent of workers in the public sector have been allowed increases of 20 per cent or more, while raises for 79 per cent of employees in the private sector have been held to 15 per cent or less.

The survey also raises the question of whether the board is controlling wage levels at all. It finds that in most decisions the awards handed down from Ottawa have been in line with the pace of wage settlements before last October when the board was created.

This is particularly true for public sector employees who, in several recent cases, have won pay increases of 20 per cent or more when the guidelines the board is supposed to enforce allow first-year pay rises of little more than 10 per cent.

During the whole of 1975, wage settlements averaged 19 per cent for government employees and 14.2 per cent in the private sector. This is the situation that the board was brought in to control last October, with the wage ceiling set at a maximum 12 per cent for this year.

Analysis of 104 cases involving 57,000 workers meriting "special consideration" show that in the case of first-year wage settlements, the board has approved:

Wage increases of 20 per cent or more for 15,000 public servants, most of them employees of Ontario school boards.

That is over 15 per cent in one year. The article continues:

Wage rises of 15 per cent or more for 7,500 private sector workers, and pay hikes in about the same range as last year's settlements (10 per cent to 15 per cent) for another 27,000 employees in private sector cases.

A mere 1,000 private sector workers, and 500 government employees, have been held to the government's intended guideline of a 10 per cent salary advance (8 per cent for inflation, and 2 per cent for productivity).

The figures on the number of employees covered by board decisions are not complete. In handing down decisions before March, the board did not always detail the number of workers involved.

What has been the effect of the AIB with regard to wage rates? Have they, in fact, slowed down the wage rates that were being negotiated and won during 1975, which were this prime motivation for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government to come forward with this program of wage controls last October? Why were the increases so high in the public sector as against the private sector? These are questions which the AIB will have to answer.

Let us talk about some other impacts. My colleague the hon. member for York-Simcoe referred yesterday to the restrictions imposed upon property and casualty insurance companies. I cannot warn hon. members too much about the perilous condition in which property and casualty insurance companies find themselves in Canada at present. Do they know that there are many major building projects for which insurance cannot be obtained, that performance bonds cannot be obtained, that firms with fleets of automobiles and trucks are restricted to two or three brokers in the country, and that 27 major and minor foreign insurance companies withdrew from Canada in 1975?

Mr. Benjamin: Good.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) says it is good that insurance companies are withdrawing from Canada because the NDP operate a deceitful plan so far as the public is concerned. One has only to look to British Columbia and to the difficulties in Manitoba and Saskatchewan with regard to public insurance.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

● (1540)

Mr. Broadbent: In Manitoba and Saskatchewan they have the lowest auto insurance in Canada.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Speaking about lower-priced insurance, look at the mess which came about in British Columbia, with hundreds of millions of dollars of loss and additional gasoline taxes to cover deficiencies in the insurance program. In Manitoba that is the only way they are able to reduce the losses to several millions of dollars a year.

Mr. Broadbent: Absurd.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In any event, we know there is a very difficult decision to make in Canada. Casualty claims are far too high. We know that the performance in 1974 was nearly disastrous. There is insufficient insurance in Canada today to meet the requirements of the Canadian market. Why? Because insurance companies at the present time are not being allowed to increase their rates in order to meet the level of casualty claims, and the casualty claims include inflated damage settlements and inflated claims for property damage from body shop repairs where the charge by automobile companies for parts increased from 40 per cent to 70 per cent last year. This situation is scandalous. The cost of building is high and any damage claim resulting from fire damage to a building is out of this world. Some of the blame has to be levelled at the courts because of the extent of the damage awards they are making. They are entirely out of line. That is one of the effects on the insurance industry.

I want to quote from a speech made by R. M. MacIntosh, executive vice-president of the Bank of Nova Scotia, on April 15, 1976. Mr. MacIntosh is a man who has appeared before many committees of this House and who is well known as one who really understands banking and business. He said:

The general philosophy of the anti-inflation guidelines is to weigh more heavily on corporations whose profits are in a high and rising profile. This necessarily follows from the use of a five-year average as the base for calculating "excess" profits in 1976. Those who have been successful, efficient and productive—

That is anathema to the New Democrats. The quotation continues:

—are penalized more than those who have been the opposite. So also are those who may have had some poor years during the base period for whatever reason, but have since experienced a turnaround. A record of declining or flat corporate performance is a badge of honour under the guidelines.

Also for the New Democrats.

This being the case, the guidelines are forcing the more profitable firms to become price leaders. They are the ones who must raise their input prices or reduce their selling prices relative to others. Since the market system still impacts even the biggest fellows, no matter what Ottawa ideology may declare, the less profitable will have to meet these market prices. By definition the most profitable will be best able to withstand regulatory control of profits in the short-run. The greater the severity of the AIB's interpretation of the guidelines, the greater the marginal impact on those who are least able to stand it. Hence through

the price system, those firms which already had inadequate profit margins for whatever reason will not benefit from the welfare approach to the application of the guidelines to profits. If the margins of the profitable are squeezed, so will be those of the unprofitable, thus making it more difficult for the latter to raise capital, expand and compete.

In summary, the underlying theory of using heavy leverage on the most profitable to achieve control over inflation may well prove to have unintended side-effects on the unprofitable. This is not an argument against having wage and price guidelines at all, but against the particular methods of application.

I underline this because in 1973 and again in 1974 I, along with my colleagues, advocated a total wage and price freeze with selective controls to follow.

In retrospect, it would have been better to use the U.S. technique of a total short-term freeze to break expectations, followed by a selective removal of controls over perhaps a year.

I would have said 18 months, but Mr. MacIntosh says a year.

The only real purpose of controls is to break the psychological spiral—

This is admitted by the Minister of Finance and by the Prime Minister.

—and to seize the occasion in order to establish a tougher combination of fiscal and monetary policies. Unfortunately the whole issue of anti-inflation technique has become obscured by a quite different debate over the social and economy structure.

We are not against any question of appeal. That should have been in Bill C-73. What we are against, though—and this is why the hon. member for York-Simcoe advanced amendments Nos. 1 and 2—is that Bill C-89 amends the formula contained in clause 46 of Bill C-73, and it is perfectly proper to come back to this House to review the decision about three-year controls and to reduce them to 18 months. We support the idea of 18 months. That is the essence of the amendments of the hon. member for York-Simcoe and we intend to support his amendments. To my mind, that is a justifiable reason to vote against the bill, because that is consistent with the statements and the votes of this party a few months ago on Bill C-73, at which time the same question was at issue.

We do not oppose the right of appeal, but we find that there is greater wrong in the terminal danger of the period of control and the extension, by way of order in council—after a totally inadequate debate in this House—of controls for an indefinite period into the future. To us that is totally wrong and fatal to the program and that is why we will vote against it.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond to some of the points made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). First, with regard to his quotation of Mr. MacIntosh in his discussion about a one-year period for American controls, I remind him, as I would remind Mr. MacIntosh, that the American controls were on, not for a period of one year but for a period of just under three years, with at least two freezes and with several different selective methods of control. So if in his quotation the hon. member is using the American experience as any kind of example of what the expected lifetime of controls should be, it seems to me that should be an argument in support of a three-year period rather than the shorter period he is talking about.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Just to make sure that we are talking about the same thing, would the minister accept, however, that in the United States the program started with a total freeze and then a phasing out of the controls, and it was that period when there was a total freeze, and the first phase of removal or relaxation lasted a year?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I think the hon. member should go back and look at it, because they started in with a total freeze, went to another phase, had to come back to a total freeze again and had to go to a fourth system. So I think when we look at the record of the American program it is perfectly clear that it was a highly erratic one and that they would have been better off in the long run to have tried to set for themselves a planned interval in which the program would be effective than to have stopped and started the shift from freeze and off and on again, as in fact they did.

The hon. member made a series of arguments in favour of casualty and property insurance companies not being covered by the anti-inflation program. I think the best way to answer him would be to read a letter dated April 9 on the notepaper of Walter Baker, QC, MP, to me as Minister of Finance. The letter reads as follows:

I realize that the government has brought the property insurance companies under the umbrella of the anti-inflation guidelines and subject to the review of the board, but I have had a letter from constituents of mine, who indicate that they recently received an invoice for renewal of their car insurance policy which is due on April 1st, 1976. They were amazed to see that there was an increase of 26 per cent on the wife's car coverage and a similar increase on the car operated by the husband, who are insured on the same policy and this occurred after a period when there have been no claims in the last 12 months.

● (1550)

Mr. Speaker, things may be all right for the casualty insurance companies a far as the hon. member for Edmonton West is concerned, but the constituents of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) and a lot of other people in Canada are concerned about the rate of their car insurance and insurance on a number of other things such as property. They are not unreasonably expecting to have some kind of protection from the Anti-Inflation Board, to the extent that it can be done, from unjustified increases in costs.

An hon. Member: Why do you not intervene?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If the hon. member is advocating that we should not have the kind of protection that the constituents of his colleagues seem to be concerned about, that is an interesting observation. At least we have two viewpoints on the question.

On the third point, an article appeared in the *Financial Times* of April 26, 1976, with regard to the settlements which were scrutinized by the Anti-Inflation Board. I might say it was a highly misleading article in which the author sought to establish that the board had been unduly discriminatory in favour of the public sector rather than the private sector, in his judgment. I should like to point out to the House that of course the principal group that the board has had to consider in the public sector is the Toronto school teachers and other school teachers in the

province of Ontario, in the cases of all of whom the opportunity to catch up in terms of salary and inflation had not been present in the way it was for the private sector.

Prior to October 14, two-thirds of the Ontario teachers had signed collective agreements which were predominantly in the 25 per cent to 30 per cent range for the first year of the contract. To restrict the other one-third to increases of 10 per cent to 12 per cent would have seriously impaired historical relationships by opening a 10 per cent to 20 per cent salary gap between teachers who had previously received similar salaries. If the article had been written with some honesty, I think the writer should have taken into account the fact that for historical reasons the school teachers in Ontario had not been able to catch up with the rest of the community but were in the course of doing so in this particular year. It was for that reason that the school teacher settlements have distorted the over-all settlements scrutinized by the Anti-Inflation Board.

By way of comparison, in the same period 18 non-teacher public sector cases covering only 1,776 employees came before the board. On average the award was 13.1 per cent, a rollback of 1.7 percentage points from demands of 14.8 per cent. This contrasts with total non-teacher awards of 14.6 per cent which were 1.9 percentage points below demands of 16.5 per cent. In other words, taking out the Ontario school teachers' case, because that particular group had not had an opportunity to catch up as had most others in the community, one can see that there was not in any sense an unbalanced favouring of the public sector over the private sector.

I am sure this article will continue to be quoted by hon. members. I think they should bear in mind, however, that the writer of the article, whether deliberately or otherwise, failed to take account of the distortion that was introduced because of the high school teachers' situation. If hon. members opposite want to say that the Toronto high school teachers, or Renfrew high school teachers and others in Ontario should not be permitted to catch up, that in those particular communities where, because of the accident of time they have not had the opportunity to catch up, that is one thing. If they are saying that people in my city and some others should be held down to 10 per cent or 12 per cent, then I think they should honestly come right out and say so. If they agree, however, that this particular group had fallen behind and that some of their colleagues throughout the province had other chances to catch up and they were caught by the program in the middle, then I do not think they can fairly argue against the historical relationship exception being applied in their favour.

I see the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) in the House. He was calling for historical relationships in favour of the steelworkers in his constituency. Surely he is not going to say that should be applied as well in favour of the Toronto high school teachers.

Mr. Smith (Churchill): There is no comparison.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a few comments on the amendment now before us. Is it necessary to remind hon. members of this whole story and the reason for today's debate? An amendment which we consider reasonable has been put forward with a view to terminating on May 1 of next year the peculiar powers granted to the Anti-Inflation Board, as provided in this legislation.

In view of the effects that we have had in recent years as a result of the adoption of a legislative measure, we have followed the principle and even recommended that steps be taken to control inflation. However, we believe that in view of the huge powers granted to the board, it would be sufficient to end the control period as of May 1, 1977. At that time, we will be in a position to assess the effects of this legislation introduced by the government a few months ago.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to representations made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), who was then leader of our party, and in particular to the warning he has been extending to the governement for the past four or five years. I would like to remind hon. members of the many representations made by the hon. member for Halifax, supported by his colleagues, as well as the warning he was giving the government when he spoke of the danger that inflation involved. How many times did government members try to make a mockery of him or our party and suggest that we were frightening all the Canadian people? And yet the then Minister of Finance, who was not he who holds this office today, did not listen to these recommendations which we considered good—which were good as a matter of fact—and which would have been very helpful to the government. The Minister of Finance of that time got out of it; he resigned from Parliament washing his hands off it and saying: "It is not my fault!" I believe that we must all remember this period when the hon. member for Halifax went to great lengths to emphasize the importance of this danger and the hardships Canadians would have to face. This problem finally fell on us. Today we are still discussing an amendment and this whole matter.

Of course, one has to recall this government's attitude during the last election campaign of 1974, when we decided as a party to put forward a program that we thought provided a short term solution. It was not easy to tell the truth but we had deemed it necessary and in the interest of the Canadian people to do so. And yet, how many times have we been ridiculed, how often have they attempted to run down our proposal instead of giving it conditional approval with the option of readjusting it later to protect the small man's interests.

● (1600)

I remember very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that it was not easy to make trade unions, agencies and businessmen believe that our proposal was unacceptable, although God knows that the government succeeded very well in doing so. The Prime Minister did not spare his statements and insisted he would never use such a proposal.

Therefore the people were led to believe our proposal was not valid and supported the present government during the elections. It may be asked whether the government has not failed to honour its 1974 commitments and whether it has not deliberately lied to the Canadian people. We are convinced of it because we have seen the government change completely its policy and make to the Canadian people a proposal whose principle had been sug-

gested by my party and whose particulars are entirely different especially in certain cases.

I remember having heard the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board regret this absence of a 90-day period to enable the board and the government to pave the way for reaching some agreement with the provinces, organizations and unions. We thought it necessary to provide a period to discuss those agreements prompting the population to endorse that proposal aimed at improving present conditions. That period or preparation was disregarded and then one is surprised by the strong opposition shown in every sector of the country. How can we trust, Mr. Speaker, a government which had undertaken to reject that formula in 1974? How can one trust a government that shows no concern for such a time of preparation and adaptation, and then ask the people to believe in that board or in the principle of inflation control?

There than, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons why many bodies and some provinces are still reluctant in some regards. Even now, we see that the board has to make some changes, some amendments, proving once again that the lack of a period of preparation and adaptation, for better acceptance, is one weakness in the present law, and was the first error the government made.

And so the people have not only a feeling but the proof of having been cheated by this government in 1974, and that the government did not use the absolutely essential tool a period of preparation would have constituted. Under the circumstances, and bearing in mind the excessives powers of the board, we, who believe in the basic principles of the anti-inflation act, and for that very reason, support the amendment of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), that is to say, that it should not apply beyond May 1, 1977.

May I be allowed to quote here, a statement made by the hon. member for Halifax who said, in no uncertain terms, and I quote:

> It is important to distinguish between a wage and price control program such as has been outlined by the government, such as it is, on one hand and the bill before us because they are not the same.

On November 25, 1975, he said:

> We are not being asked to vote into effect a wage and price control program for a period of six months, a year ... or three years ... We are being asked to give the government the authority to write its own wage and price control program, an anti-inflationary program, or to exercise these powers in any way it may see fit. If the bill should pass, there is nothing to prevent this government changing the program beyond recognition without any further reference back to this parliament. That in itself is sufficient reason for limiting the life of this bill to a period not in excess of 18 months.

I think this statement made by the hon. member for Halifax is very serious and very relevant. For this reason, I also regret that this bill provided for increases from 10 to 12 per cent, taking into account some factors. To what extent, Mr. Speaker, is there an attempt to give the small wage-earner an advantage equal to that of the worker with a reasonable income? When we refer to 10 per cent as applied to a salary of $8,000 and to 10 per cent applied to a salary of $20,000, we succeed once again in widening the gap that exists between the poor and the rich. In my opinion, this is not the objective that the government set for itself concerning the establishment of a just society.

I believe that it is important, Mr. Speaker, to develop a readjustment policy concerning the wage earner who is completely overtaken by the increase in the cost of living and who, under this legislation, has no possibility of getting an increase. On the other hand, those who already have a good income receive increases. Some will say that they have the same percentage of increases. But this is precisely what widens the gap for those who find it hard to keep up with today's cost of living.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I repeat that we support to a certain extent the implementation of this legislation. I am not saying to the minister concerned that we are against the principle of the measure and against the efforts that the government wants to make to curb the inflation which is causing so many problems for all Canadian citizens. But we believe that controls extended over an excessive length of time, in view of the changes which happen daily in our economy, we believe that a reasonable limit would be the one suggested by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (M. Stevens) and that, taking this as a starting point, the government will find and introduce other legislation much more brilliant than what we have seen to date so that the problems that Canadians have in view of the present economic situation will disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is nearly expired. I hope that after this debate, the minister will consider the arguments advanced by the opposition. I believe that the population in general is aware that the government had committed itself not to use this tool and felt at a certain time the need to do so but, unfortunately, did not provide this preliminary period which would have been quite useful to the board, because of which it must now amend its programs nearly every day. Under the circunstances, we can certainly not follow blindly a government which shows such weakness concerning such serious legislation. In conclusion, I hope that the comments made on this side of the House will not only enlighten the facts, but also cause certain improvements to be made to this legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, as usual, my comments will be brief and to the point. Bill C-89 allegedly amends Bill C-73 in that, as we are told, it provides for certain appeal procedures. But it goes further and leaves open the termination date of the anti-inflation program. It can be extended by decree or order in council on Thanksgiving day, Christmas day, New Year's day or any other time. The point is, the termination date is left open.

I did not support Bill C-73. I have never supported controls which interfere with business enterprise, and still doubt if this procedure is or will be effective. The people of this country, not the anti-inflation program the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced on Thanksgiving day, will help our nation overcome our present inflation, poor economic performance, high unemployment, and so on. In no way will the government be responsible. Controls of this kind have never worked effectively.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

Mr. Jones: Sure, we need restraint, we need a little belt-tightening and we need to halt inflation and rising unemployment. The process must begin with the Prime Minister and cabinet, with this country's leaders. I come from Atlantic Canada where the effects of the anti-inflation program will be disastrous. Already the program is creating greater unemployment. It is a disincentive to greater productivity and is hurting us tremendously. The government, by introducing such programs, interferes with the individual entrepreneur and wage earner. It is not wrestling inflation to the ground; it is wrestling the average working Canadian and small businessmen to the ground, sometimes into bankruptcy.

● (1610)

Government has an obligation to encourage self-restraint and belt-tightening, instead of enforcing it. If hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches enjoyed the confidence of the people, they could do just that. But they have lost the confidence of the people of this nation. Too much power has been given to the Anti-Inflation Board and to the administrator. The administrator himself said in a speech made recently in one of the western provinces that he had more power than the Department of National Revenue. The legislation has merely built up two or three additional bureaucratic empires. If the present bill goes through, I doubt whether this system of control will ever be eliminated. The controls have certainly eliminated collective bargaining.

Controls are repugnant to the thinking of most Canadians, as I have said on many occasions. I believe the program as proposed by the government should be terminated as soon as possible. It should not be open-ended. With less interference and more good sense on the part of the government this nation could decrease its unemployment rate, become more productive, slow down the inflationary trend and do all the things which need to be done for the good of the state.

To sum up, I believe the anti-inflation program as it has been proposed and put into effect by the government is utter foolishness and should never have been thrust upon the nation.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of points to raise at this stage of Bill C-89. As hon. members may have recognized, for the last few years I have been greatly interested in the public perception of government, and for a minute or two I should like to discuss what I believe to be the cause of increasing public cynicism with regard to the government's program. In my view, it would have been better from the point of view of public perception of the program had the government not seen fit to opt itself out of these arrangements. It would certainly have been better from the point of view of encouraging efforts such as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has asked all Canadians to make in support of the program.

At a cabinet meeting last January the government itself opted out. It did just that. It gave each minister power to rule whether an increase in departmental charges or fees was within the anti-inflation guidelines or not. This can be confirmed by consulting an order in council passed on January 27. Since that date a number of fees, for example passport charges and postal rates, have been increased substantially. In each case they have risen well beyond the guidelines suggested by the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board or by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald).

It seems to me that by this cynical act of opting out, the government has added to the legitimate criticism which is being directed at the program by the general public and increasing the confusion which surrounds it. We have listened to many injunctions from the head of the government, from the Minister of Finance and from the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board urging Canadians to make sacrifices in the interests of getting inflation under control and to support the program of controls for three years in the time-frame of the government. In the time-frame of the opposition it is about 1½ years.

What happens? These injunctions are delivered and advertisements are inserted in national newspapers. As a matter of fact, one newspaper stated in December of last year that the guidelines would apply—I am now quoting—"evenly and fairly to everyone covered by law, including the government of Canada". That was in an advertisement which appeared in December, 1975. On January 27, scarcely a month later, the government itself turned its back on its own advertising campaign by deciding it would not be bound by the regulations administered by the Anti-Inflation Board.

This increases public skepticism. I do not know whether the government is worried about public cynicism and public attitudes toward parliament, but a great many people in the opposition parties are worried about it and a great many people outside this chamber are concerned about the disaffection of the public, about the public attitude toward parliament and toward government in general. I am not given to hyperbole, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest that public disaffection has reached great proportions in this country. One hears evidence of it everywhere, and the situation is made worse by the actions of the government itself.

The chairman of the board has confirmed that the government is exempt from the board's jurisdiction despite the fact that government employees come under the wage guidelines. I am really concerned about the fairness of such a state of affairs. The report of the Economic Council of Canada has now come to hand. We have seen the results of the *Financial Times* survey showing that of 104 wage decisions made by the board, 69 per cent of the workers in the public sector have been awarded increases of 20 per cent or more, while 79 per cent of the private sector increases have been held to 15 per cent or less. The inconsistencies were defended by the chairman on the ground that precontrolled wage levels must be taken into account.

As the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) has just said, this is the very problem employees in the Atlantic provinces face. With an over-all program of controls such as the one the government has put in place, people in the poorer parts of the country are much more seriously affected than others. This goes to the very nature of our federalism. I am not thinking in partisan terms, but when a very large number of the people of Canada do not support the concept of responsible government, then we find ourselves in a very grave situation. I deplore the fact that part of the authorship, if I can use the term, of this dissatisfaction is

the action of the government in deciding to opt out of the program. Surely the increase in the cost of a passport could have been held to 8 per cent or, better still, the government might have believed its own rhetoric, believed its own advertising with regard to the necessity for control and kept the price of a passport at $10 for the three-year period.

It is not only a matter of the dollars and cents involved; that is not the message I am trying to get through to the House. The problem that I and many other Canadians have is that by substantially increasing postal rates, passport fees, airport landing fees, security costs at airports, and so on, the government is flying in the face of the exhortations given by the Prime Minister as to the necessity for all of us to do some belt-tightening. In my opinion, the increased cost of a passport merely adds to the cynicism shown by the public toward this program.

● (1620)

Many of my colleagues may have already seen a survey, which has appeared in various publications, conducted by an American professor, Daniel Yankelovich. My hon. friend from Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) may be able to brief me on the pronunciation of that word.

Mr. Paproski: Quite correct.

Mr. Fairweather: He informs me *sotto voce* that I am right. According to Daniel Yankelovich, the public, generally speaking, is very anxious to support the mixed economy system and responsible government. But the public sees, both in the United States and Canada, that those who now have the advantage of power are not affected fundamentally by a system of controls, whereas the people who have no power, those at the bottom end of the wage scale, are most grievously affected by controls.

I suggest that this situation has serious implications for peace, security and good order in this country. It is a concept that has a fair amount of jurisprudential history in our country and I am surprised that the minister, who in many areas has displayed some sensitivity, would have countenanced the order in council which declared that controls would be all right for the rest of us but would not in any way affect any increases the government itself wished to impose upon the Canadian people.

I think that as a result of that somewhat brutal and insensitive act the government went a long way to changing around the results of polls that were taken by the Canadian Research Centre for the CBC "Newsmagazine" program. The latest polls show that public support for the program has dropped radically. Now only one-third of those surveyed feel that the controls have been applied equitably and will be effective.

As I said a minute or two ago, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister repeatedly urged all of us to give the program our full support and confidence or it would not work. How can the Canadian public have confidence in a government which exhorts us all to fall within the ambit of the controls, and then in the next breath passes an order in council which says, in effect, "It's all right for everybody else, buster, but it is a different game for us. The government of Canada can increase fees and charges well beyond the guidelines. There is one law for all Canadians but not for the government of Canada".

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): That is not true, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Fairweather: Perhaps the minister will want to speak again in a moment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): With the hon. member's consent, may I speak?

Mr. Fairweather: I have no power to give consent. If the minister wants to deny that the order in council was made—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would require unanimous consent to speak. Is the hon. member willing?

Mr. Fairweather: I am prepared to, but there is a Chair and presumably the Chair is in charge of the proceedings. If you have a question, go ahead.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Is the hon. member permitting a question at this point or terminating his remarks?

Mr. Fairweather: I was in the middle of a speech. The hon. gentleman wanted the floor and I am doing my best to give him the floor.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I thank the hon. member very much. Let me point out to the House that the question whether or not the imposition of taxation should be applied both federally and provincially—because exactly the same provision under the agreements applies to the provincial governments as well as the federal—and whether or not it should be under the Anti-Inflation Board has been very much discussed in this House. It was the subject matter of a very full release by the government on January 15, and was the subject matter of questions answered by me in this House both during the time when Bill C-73 was going through the House and since.

The fact of the matter is that unlike the private sector, when a cost in the government service increases it has to be paid for. It does in other cases, too but in this case any cost increase does not come out of any Crown corporation's or anybody else's profit; it has to be paid for by the taxpayers. The question is, is it to be paid for by the user of the service, the person who parks at the airport or gets a passport, or should it be paid by the taxpayers generally?

Yesterday's *Globe and Mail* report, which I referred to as a false and misleading one, I repeat is just that. The fact of the matter is that we made this issue perfectly clear both before and after the issuance of the particular order in council referred to. We also made it clear that it was either a question of increasing the user fee, or taxation. Very obviously, under those circumstances a different set of criteria would apply to government than that which applies to a private party, who would have a choice as to whether to take it out of his pocket or not. That is the basic position. I know the hon. member may have been misled by the article, and I regret that; but I think that is a fair statement of the position.

Mr. Fairweather: I think that is wonderful, Mr. Speaker. It is great to have that statement in this debate. I was not misled by that article, but I was apparently misled by the government's injunctions and exhortations. I have certain-

ly been misled by an advertisement saying that the guidelines would apply evenly and fairly to everyone covered by law, including the government of Canada.

I am interested in the fact that whenever this government gets into trouble with its program, it gently passes the buck to the provinces. The provinces are made the whipping-boy for many of the frustrations of this government. I know that the provincial governments can look after themselves, but I happen to be deeply concerned about the public's conception of the fairness of the government of Canada and its ability, first of all, to get wide public support for controls about which, I say quite frankly, many of us fought an election. At the time the government was pretty cynical about them. Then it brought in controls and we were asked to live with them.

The next thing we learn is that various fees and charges made by the government, including postal charges, passport fees, and so on, are to be increased. It is not the passport and postage increases themselves that are the problem, though it is extraordinary to me how, on the one hand, the government can announce what purports to be a periodicals' policy for Canada, and in the next breath almost puts periodicals out of business by increasing postal rates—but that is an aside. The dilemma is that the public's perception of this program and the public's support for it are being diminished by the cynical attitude of the government which in December said that everything would be fair, even and above-board, and then in January exempted itself from its own regulations.

As I have said, I am deeply concerned about public attitude toward government and toward parliament. If the hon. gentleman is not, then he must be luckier than most of us because I can assure him that judging from the results of polls that I read about, whether in the *Globe and Mail* or elsewhere, there is a lot of disaffection in this land on the part of the public for government and parliament. I, for one, resent the fact that having spent all my working life trying to support the institution of democratic government, at this stage in my life I am finding—and I do not think we should all take this burden on our own shoulders—that the institution we serve is not perceived by the public to be a place where things happen that matter, that affect the individual citizen.

● (1630)

Although I am probably grossly out of order, except that this is part of the general trend of thought about public perceptions of government, I think in a way this accounts for the popularity of such television programs as "Ombudsman" and the fact that there are so many storefront organizations, as they are called, which have had to interpose themselves between members of parliament, the government and the citizen. I am not criticizing this and I do not think we should be surprised about this development, particularly with a government which does not even support its own advertising.

I am sure the interpretation by the Minister of Finance will grip all Canadian citizens when it is relayed to them in the next hour or so. Presumably the workers at the Irving Pulp and Paper Company will be reassured by the minister's message. Presumably the people of Thompson, Manitoba, who are to be gravely affected by the minister's decision, along with the people of Elliot Lake and Sudbury, must feel much better now that the minister has interjected himself into this debate by saying everything is fine.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

The point I am interjecting today is that if the Prime Minister and his government expect general and wide public support, then it has to be seen and believed by the public that the government is part and parcel of this anti-inflation program and that the Anti-Inflation Board is serious about getting inflation under control. The evidence is very strong, by poll and by individual contact that hon. members have with the public, that the public has not yet been persuaded the government is serious. The public has not yet been persuaded that it can support this scheme as being one fairly applied to Canadians from one coast to the other, by big and small corporations including the largest and most monolithic of them all, the government of Canada.

Mr. Cecil Smith (Churchill): It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to speak on this amendment to Bill C-89 proposed by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). It is my intention today, as it was yesterday when I proposed a motion under Standing Order 43 which this government did not see fit to accept, and when I asked questions similar to those asked by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), to bring the minister up to date about the cost of living in the north. I really do not believe this government understands how the high cost of living in the north affects the citizens living there. They are there, trying to make a living by extracting the resources this country so badly needs.

Le me start by pointing out the location of Thompson, Manitoba. It seems to me the only time this government recognized there was a place called Thompson was during the 1974 campaign when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and five cabinet ministers paid it a visit in an attempt to win that seat for their candidate. Since then we have not had any representations from the government respecting the north. Thompson is over 500 miles north of Winnipeg. That is quite a distance to those people who are accustomed to travelling in that great corridor from Quebec to Windsor, and I can understand that they would not want to venture that far north.

When this government wants to extract the resources of the north it has no hesitation and no restraint whatsoever. Government forces move in and do the work necessary to take those resources out of the north. However, the government is not willing to put anything back into the north to support the people who are there and have made the north part of their lives. Thompson, Flin-Flon, Snow Lake, Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake are all mining towns where 80 per cent of the payrolls are from mining. The headline in the *Journal* today suggested "This city will die" and referred specifically to towns like Thompson, Flin-Flon, Snow Lake, Leaf Rapids and Lynn Lake.

The Anti-Inflation Board recently rolled back an agreement between the International Nickel Company of Canada and the steelworkers of union branch 6166 in Thompson negotiated after many months. The workers felt they had put forward a clear and precise proposal. Built into the proposal were provisions to cover the extra costs to the people who live in the north. As I have said, Thompson is 500 miles north of Winnipeg, a good day's drive by

car. The return fare by air is $106. The cost of gasoline is now $1 a gallon, and I see that we can expect a further increase of 25 cents a gallon. The cost of living in the north is much higher than it is in Toronto. The minister was talking about the historical relationship of teachers in Toronto and the steelworkers in Thompson, but he is so far off base that it is obvious he does not know or understand the situation in the north.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Smith (Churchill): Let us take a brief look at hydro rates. They have increased by 25 per cent in the last six months in Manitoba. Heating costs have gone up out of all proportion in the past eight to ten months. In the north, people have to heat their homes for ten months of the year, unlike those in the south who heat just for six months. A normal heating bill in Thompson, Manitoba, using an oil-fired furnace in a three-bedroom home, runs from $750 to $850 a year. This is what the steelworkers of INCO meant when they talked about a historical relationship with Sudbury.

I could go on talking about the high cost of living in the north, including the cost of transportation and building costs. There are no controls whatsoever on building costs or on various other costs. All this government has done is impose a wage freeze without putting controls on prices. The steelworkers in Thompson say that they really did not support wage and price controls proposed by the Conservative party in 1974, but they say if they had they would be a lot better off than they are now. They are being hamstrung by the controls this government is imposing. The people in the north do not have access to specialized services. They must travel to one of the larger cities to see a specialist for their children, to look after their teeth or anything of a specialized nature.

I mentioned the historical relationship between Sudbury and Thompson. Thompson is a relatively new city, approximately 17 years old. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) referred to the Falconbridge and Sudbury contracts. The Falconbridge contract was settled before the controls went into force, and the Falconbridge contract was settled after the Anti-Inflation Board was formed. The Anti-Inflation Board considered the Sudbury agreement and then looked at the contract Falconbridge was seeking. They said they had better take a close look at it because if they did not give Falconbridge a wage comparable to that given the workers at Sudbury, the workers would walk across the road and work at Sudbury. They gave them a raise comparable to that given the workers at Sudbury. The rollback proposed by the Anti-Inflation Board in respect of Thompson, Manitoba, is below the Sudbury rate.

● (1640)

Mr. Speaker, through you I ask the minister whether the cost of living in Sudbury is higher or lower than it is in Thompson. Anyone who has any knowledge of northern Canada or of northern Manitoba will know that the cost of living rate in the north is at least 15 per cent or 18 per cent higher than it is in Sudbury. I really cannot understand how he can say that there should be this rollback by the AIB in respect of a negotiated settlement which brings it to a point where it does not even meet the rising cost of inflation in the northern areas of the country. This makes a laughing stock of organized labour in the country. I can understand why they have no faith in this government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you how concerned the people of Thompson are in this regard. They called a public meeting as of last Monday night. There were 500 people from the town of Thompson who attended that meeting. It was a well organized meeting. These people were serious. Let me give you an example of what one lady had to say. She said that they had moved to Thompson 18 years ago. They have made their roots in Thompson. They have five children. They have one income, and at the present time are just able to meet the payments on their home and their other commitments, plus the cost of raising a family.

She said that if the decision is not reversed and they have to live with the loss imposed on them by the AIB in respect of this rollback to 12.5 per cent the first year, they will have to pack up and leave Thompson. That leads me into something else that was said last night as recorded at page 12930 of *Hansard* when the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacDonald) was speaking. He was referring to a question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver South who was concerned about the work force leaving Thompson and going somewhere else. He said:

> Where else—Snow Lake, Lynn Lake, or the other communities? If all those communities are restrained in the same way, to what avail is it to leave one for the other? That is the exact point of applying a general system of this kind to restrain incomes throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask whether this minister is so naive that he believes he can put a fence around a certain region of our country and say that if restraint is imposed in this area the people will not be able to leave and will not have a job. What will those people do? They will just quit their jobs if they cannot earn a living. They will move back to the area from which they came, probably somewhere in Ontario or in the maritimes, and will go back to living on unemployment insurance which this government hands out so freely without any control.

Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale): Nonsense.

Mr. Smith (Churchill): When the unemployment insurance runs out, the people will be forced to go on welfare. I think this is what the government wants them to do so that the government will have control over them.

Mr. MacDonald (Rosedale): Don't be silly.

Mr. Smith (Churchill): The government really feels it does not have too much control over the people living in the north and is damned well going to get that control by imposing this idiotic rollback on the workers in Thompson. That will happen not only in northern Manitoba but right across the north. The government wants to extract the resources of the north. The government exercises no control or restraint in respect of the money it spends in the north in attempting to extract the resources, but in respect of the people who were unemployed in the east and moved to the north to obtain employment, the government clamps down so that they cannot earn a decent living. As the heading in this article in the newspaper reads, "This city will die". I certainly commend this article by Victor Mackie which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of today.

I close with a reminder that there will be a group of concerned business people and a cross-section of people from the north coming to Ottawa within the next couple of weeks. My only message to the government is that it had better have Bill C-89 cleared up before they arrive here.

Mr. Peter Elzinga (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) wishes to rise and make his maiden speech in the House. I hope to fashion my speech after the women's fashions by keeping it short enough to be interesting and long enough to cover the various points I wish to make.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the amendment that has been proposed by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), the thrust of which is to limit this program which appears to be almost limitless. I should like to share with the House the wording of the amendment. It reads as follows:

That Bill C-89, an act to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, be amended in clause 11 by striking out lines 10 to 23 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) This Act expires on May 1, 1977, or on such earlier date as may be fixed by proclamation or a motion taken up and considered by the House of Commons that is adopted by the House and concurred in by the Senate pursuant to subsection (8) and (9) unless, before May 1, 1977, or any earlier date fixed by proclamation or any such motion that is so adopted by the House and concurred in by the Senate, an order in council is made to the effect that this act shall continue in force for such period of time as may be set out in the order in council".

This amendment is consistent with what we advocated both in this House and during the election of 1974. It is the approach we took in respect of Bill C-73. Yesterday the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) stated that the hon. member for York-Simcoe was being rather contradictory in respect of his statements. I suggest that the minister look at the government's record to see how consistent it has been. We in this party might appear at times to be inconsistent, but one thing we are not is dishonest.

As I said earlier, the minister should look at some of the actions of the government. For the benefit of the minister I shall review some of these actions, because it appears to me that far too often the minister in charge of finance finds it acceptable to forget whatever he wishes to forget. During the election of 1974 we advocated a 90-day freeze on all commodities—a 90-day freeze with an 18-month period to follow with flexible controls. This is different from the policy brought forward by the Liberal party which proposes a 3¼-year policy with open-ended controls which could very easily lead us into having a country with almost dictatorial powers and a controlled society. Let me also stress it was our plan to break the psychology of inflation.

● (1650)

The two main planks in our platform during the 1974 election were government restraint and control of our money supply. I ask the minister if there is any government restraint in his program. We have had indications from all hon. members who have spoken against this bill that the government is not exercising any restraint, but that it asks the public to abide by an 8 per cent increase when the government's expenses will rise by about 18 per cent. How can the public have any faith in an administration that asks one thing of the public and does another thing itself? There is no consistency in what the government does. In 1974 they campaigned bitterly against our suggested program of controls, yet a short while later we saw the implementation of a control policy without any government restraint or control of our money supply. This government's fiscal and monetary policies are working against the very goals of the program they are advocating. I ask once again, where is the consistency in this government's action, when they are criticizing us for lack of it? The majority of economists agree that if a program such as this is to work, government restraint in spending and growth of our money supply have to be curbed.

[Mr. Smith (Churchill).]

Let me point out another clear indication of the inconsistency of this government. During the 1972 election we were the party that campaigned on the indexing of personal income taxes. We were the party that proposed a modest increase for pensioners. Hon. members opposite on a good many occasions have wanted to take credit for this program, and I commend this government for implementing a program along these lines when they were in a minority in parliament after the 1972 election. They instituted a program which we suggested in our campaign and for which they condemned us, yet when they were elected in 1972 with a minority government they brought in exactly what they had criticized us for advocating. Where is there consistency in that? The rules of the House do not allow me to express my true feelings for this administration and for the way they have dealt with the Canadian public.

A short while ago the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) quoted from an article which appeared in the *Financial Times*. The minister stated that the article distorted the truth. I think the minister is the man to state that this article distorts the truth, because in my view he knows what distortion of the truth is. The *Financial Times* stated that the survey they took showed that 69 per cent of the workers in the public sector had been allowed increases of 20 per cent or more, while raises for 79 per cent of the employees in the private sector had been held to 15 per cent or less. The hon. member for Edmonton West quoted most of the article, so rather than read it again I will merely suggest that if someone wants to do some good reading on the subject we are debating, he should read in *Hansard* the comments of the hon. member for Edmonton West this afternoon.

I find it extremely hard to understand, as do the majority of the Canadian public, how this government can expect the Canadian people to have any faith in it. During two consecutive elections they campaigned against the positive proposals which we put forward, yet directly after that time, when they were elected to govern the country, they implemented the same proposals. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) did an excellent job in sharing his thoughts with hon. members with regard to the dissatisfaction of Canadian people with this institution. I can easily understand it, because the government has bred this type of feeling across the nation. Today, during the question period, our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gave the opposition some suggestions on how they could perhaps derive some truth out of this government, but I am afraid there is very little of that to be derived.

Mr. MacFarlane: Nonsense.

Mr. Elzinga: Did the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain wish to take the floor?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

Mr. Elzinga: Please accept my apologies, Mr. Speaker. When a noted individual across the aisle makes his intentions known, courtesy requires that I suggest he take the floor, with your permission, Mr. Speaker. Another example of the inconsistency of this government, their program and the amendment to it, is that on the implementation of this program it was stated that the AIB would have a staff of some 200 people. But six months after the program was put into effect, we find close to 600 people employed by the board. I ask the Minister of Finance, through you, Mr. Speaker, at what point will this increase stop? When will employment in government circles end? In six months we have seen a tripling in the size of the staff estimated by the government. It puzzles me how the government can come forward so often with figures such as this, and when the program is implemented the Canadian people are given a distorted picture. The public's faith will not be restored for this institution or for government so long as the present administration is in office.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this bill before, as have many of my colleagues, but I welcome the opportunity to make a few brief comments about some of the elements that have come into play since this bill was last before the House and we last had the opportunity to discuss with members across the aisle some of the aspects of the anti-inflation program and particularly the amendments to the bill.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed deal with the appeal procedure which earlier was sadly lacking. One of the new elements that has been introduced into the debate since the bill was brought forward are the statements of the administrator whose appointment was made rather late. He said that anyone who comes before him must be prepared to suffer the consequences of his office adjusting the decision made by the Anti-Inflation Board. That is an interesting statement, because we do not have access to an appeal board, we do not have a man who allows or disallows an appeal or who reconfirms the judgment made by the lower tribunal, but he can go further and say that the lower tribunal missed something and that the rollback or the increase will have to be greater.

● (1700)

That is a strange situation. I have been trying to see whether in the Criminal Code or in any regulatory body that kind of power is bestowed upon an appeal tribunal. If the miners from Thompson, Manitoba, or the pulpworkers from the Irving complex come before the administrator, he might well decide that the lower tribunal was not right in making the adjustments it did, and he might come up with a worse decision than they were faced with at first. The administrator might use his all-powerful and almighty office to run the program further into the ground than it is now.

Many of my colleagues have said the program is not working. I say that it is working: it is working too well, because it is altering human behaviour in our country to quite an extent. It is establishing a degree of public cynicism such as we have never known in this country. The government is achieving a degree of public dissatisfaction and disaffection which it has probably never experienced before. Of course, we hope this kind of feeling will be reflected in the next election. But my colleagues and I are concerned because we probably have another two or three years to wait before the next election comes along, and of course this public cynicism and disaffection will rub off, not just on this incompetent government but on the whole political process and on all the agencies of government in which the people of Canada at one time had much confidence.

As I said the last time I had a chance to speak on this bill, I am particularly concerned about the dual standards which have been established as a result of this anti-inflation program. My hon. colleague from northern Manitoba has articulated to quite an extent how this program affects people in the outlying areas and northern areas of our country where the government has such a great influence. Here we have a minister who is practising restraint. He has sent letters to all government agencies throughout the country and told them to find where they can cut corners and make adjustments to their budgets in order to save money. Some civil servants run all over the country doing this, and they are striving to get to the top. That is only human nature. This happens everywhere. They invent all kinds of ways to cut corners.

For instance, when the district postmaster in Prince George received the minister's letter telling him that he should cut corners, where did he cut corners? There is a stretch along the Alaska Highway which is 1,200 miles long and there are about 27 mail stops along that stretch. The district postmaster sent an officer with a car and a helper to find out how many of these mail stops could be eliminated. They found that about seven of them could be eliminated. The mail truck goes up the highway and comes back down, and some of the mail stops which were eliminated are the ones where the truck driver stops for coffee and a snack. However, he could not open the truck and drop off the mail. The postal service there was not very good in any event. The driver merely dropped off the mail. But he could not even do that. He had to get back into his truck, drive another 35 miles and drop off the mail which, of course, necessitated everyone driving 35 miles to pick up their mail. With all respect to the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey), when I brought this matter to his attention, he saw how stupid and ridiculous it was, so that order has been rescinded.

However, these are the kinds of things which affect people in the north particularly. My colleague told us about some things which are going on with respect to insurance rates and government agencies which are just unbelievable. All of a sudden the government is on this kick that government services must be self-sustaining and that the users must pay the bill. When we talk about insurance rates—I am coming back to one particular insurance problem which exists in British Columbia—and particularly car insurance, people in the north have a higher accident rate. That is not because they are less competent or more reckless drivers, but because they spend more time in their automobiles.

As my colleague said, some people in the north have to drive 130 miles to a hospital. They drive for shopping every day and to the post office because there are no mail deliveries. They have to drive their children to school because sometimes the temperature outside is 40 below. There is no rapid transit, so they use their automobiles more frequently. That is why there are more accidents.

Then the government imposed a further gasoline tax to show people how to practice restraint. That is the situation in the north where the automobile is as essential as the knife and spoon with which they eat. People in the north cannot live without automobiles. When the government practices conservation of energy reserves, who pays for it? The people in the north. The same is true of the effect of the excise tax on aircraft in the north. Another ridiculous thing the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) brought in is called landing fees for small aircraft. In the north the aircraft is as essential as the automobile. I, and I am sure several of my colleagues who are here at this moment, cannot get around our constituencies without a private aircraft because there are areas which cannot be reached by car; they are not accessible.

Let us consider that since we discussed this bill last time, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) has announced the government's energy policy. That was yesterday. He told us that energy prices and the price of gasoline and heating oil will go up another 25 per cent by 1980. The government makes these decisions and the excuse it uses is that this is an essential public service and someone has to pay for it. Either we jack up the rate and make users pay, or it has to come out of general revenues, and eventually it filters back to the taxpayer anyway.

Not all the services this government provides are essential. In many areas, with 60 Crown corporations, the government is in direct competition with private enterprise. When we give CNR $200 million to run commuter trains, that does not help people in the north. But if we did not give CNR $200 million, I suppose the rates would have to go up and some taxpayers would have to pay more for travelling on trains. However, because the trains run between metropolitan areas along the American border we cannot upset the many taxpayers who live there, so we have to subsidize those rates. That is not important for the people in Thompson, Manitoba, Prince George, British Columbia or Gaspé. Certainly transportation is essential, but it is not so essential that if CNR employees went on strike all other private companies would also go on strike.

The question of essential public services should be discussed in this House and we should determine what an essential public service is. The other day someone asked what would happen in Lower Post, British Columbia, which is an isolated community, if the Post Office did not provide mail service. When the Post Office employees go on strike there is no mail in Lower Post, just as there is no mail in downtown Toronto. Who provides the local store with food? Private industry does that, and that never seems to be interrupted; everyone eats all the time. So in this modern day of industrial evolution and technological evolution, is the Post Office an essential public service? It used to be a crime to tamper with Her Majesty's mail; today postal workers walk out on strike and stay out for a month and nobody misses them. These are the kind of things we have to put in proper perspective, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Oberle.]

● (1710)

The minister argues for a 150 per cent increase in hydro rates in the north by saying that if we do not increase the rates the moneys will have to come out of general revenue. But he is in direct competition with some private companies—and what are those private companies going to do? They are going to apply to the Anti-Inflation Board and ask for permission to increase their rates to match those of the government. Of course, the Anti-Inflation Board is going to tell them that they have to justify the increase and show that there has been an increase in their costs. The companies are going to take pains to do that. Perhaps they will be able to show a historical relationship with a government-owned company and maybe that historical relationship will apply as well to private industry as it does to labour, and so forth.

The whole thing does not make sense, Mr. Speaker. The government imposes an increase, and nobody tells them what to do. As a matter of fact, they are making deals with provincial governments, particularly those that are also in the business of maintaining a number of Crown corporations in every sector of the economy—the wood fibre industry and the service industries. There are all kinds of Crown corporations in competition with private enterprise. That is why we have no price control element in this program—because the government sets the standard, private industry follows and the Anti-Inflation Board has to stay away.

I should like to refer to a problem which I previously mentioned in this House in the question period. That is the problem of the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. I should like to read from an article which appeared in the Vancouver *Sun* early this year where the reporter responds to statements made by the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board, Mr. Pepin. The article begins:

> Those pronouncements by Jean-Luc Pepin that Autoplan rates will be subjected to pencil-sharpened scrutiny from the Anti-Inflation Board deserve a little scrutiny of their own along with a lot of cynicism.

This reporter was kind. I have heard another report of a man who said the only reason he is not calling the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board a bare-faced liar is that he has a little moustache. The report continues:

> Let's go back to December 23 . . . where finance minister Donald Macdonald has his office.
>
> That afternoon Macdonald was meeting other cabinet ministers, including two of his colleagues, labour minister John Munro and consumer affairs minister André Ouellet.
>
> The other cabinet ministers were from B.C., finance minister Evan Wolfe, labour minister Allan Williams and consumer services minister Rafe Mair.
>
> If Pepin had been a fly on the wall in Macdonald's office he might not be saying the things that appeared in Saturday's Vancouver *Sun*.

That is, that he was sharpening his pencil to roll back the increases of the insurance companies. The report continues:

> At that point, December 23, the Social Credit government in B.C. was so young that it was hardly breathing. The three B.C. cabinet ministers had been sworn in the day before and their first course of action was to head for the Victoria airport and hop aboard a B.C. government jet for Ottawa.

The reason for the urgency concerned B.C.'s potential participation in the federal anti-inflation program.

At that meeting it became clear that the B.C. group had one major hang-up about joining the program and signing a contract with the board. The hang-up was ICBC and the rate hikes that were then in the works.

To put it mildly, B.C. was reluctant to sign on the dotted line when the signature could kill the upcoming boost in car insurance rates.

Mr. Speaker, British Columbia is not the only province to suffer these problems. All provinces have done their share in increasing the cost of their services and then running to the Anti-Inflation Board and saying that professional people, teachers, and so on, want higher wages and would the board come in and solve their political problems. I continue reading the article:

Macdonald and his group were also worried. The anti-inflation program was slow in starting and the change in B.C. threatened to pull that province back to October 13, which was when the anti-inflation program was first announced. Now Macdonald was threatened with the possibility of B.C. balking over ICBC.

With both Wolfe and Macdonald worried, the two ministers came to a quick understanding. If B.C. joined the program, the federal government would not allow the anti-inflation program to interfere with increases in ICBC rates.

This was not an implicit understanding or a vague promise by Macdonald to do everything he could. It was a carte blanche undertaking from the federal Minister of Finance to exempt ICBC from the anti-inflation guidelines.

This verbal pact had been checked and conformed through both parties.

So when Premier Bill Bennett, who has given a record quick commitment to the anti-inflation program, says he is confident ICBC's increases will be approved, he is not talking glibly.

Somebody should tell Pepin to forget his analysing, his pencil-sharpening and his standing on toes over ICBC because its rates have already been approved by a higher authority.

Mr. Speaker, would it be fair to ask the minister just what authority he exercises over the chairman of the anti-inflation program? What backroom deals has he made with the province of British Columbia or any other province? What deals have been made to protect agencies of government such as Crown corporations against the impact and authority that is provided to the Anti-Inflation Board in this bill? There is no way that Canadians will put up with this kind of skullduggery any longer, Mr. Speaker, and there is no way that this government can earn the confidence of the people with actions like this.

The program in British Columbia is not yet in operation and nobody knows where they stand. The small businessman protects himself and so do the large corporations. They formerly engaged people to walk through the plant to see what areas could be made more efficient. Now they are walking through the plant to see where additional costs have occurred which can be demonstrated to the Anti-Inflation Board so that prices can be increased every four months. That is the new regulation, Mr. Speaker. Prices are not just increased once a year any more; they are increased every four months. Any businessman who does not do that would need his head examined, because if he does not increase prices this period he will not know where the goal posts will be next time around. So every three months businessmen will jack up their prices, particularly in businesses where energy resources are dispensed.

Yesterday the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources laid out certain guidelines which showed the discretion businessmen will have to increase prices by 25 per cent by 1980. Anyone in business with control over the pricing and marketing of his product would be very foolish if he did not increase prices in accordance with those guidelines.

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

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): No, sir.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald).

• (1720)

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, the amending bill we are considering today deals with the substance of the dispute raised last October 13, when the government announced its anti-inflation program, by the previous leader of my party and other Progressive Conservatives. We were, and are, concerned about the lack of effective government programs for halting the inflation besetting our country and, indeed, a number of other countries in the western world. The government's attempt to justify the unjustifiable is disappointing, especially if we bear in mind that as long ago as 1968 the government promised that it would do its best effectively to attack regional economic and social disparities in this country.

Hon. members who were here in 1965 will remember how the government acted in its previous attempt at restraint. The government attempted to restrain prices, but we remember how insensitive and inappropriate government policy was on matters affecting regional economic development. We remember how the government attempted, or did not attempt, to restrain its own spending in that period. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) did not then occupy his portfolio, but he was a member of parliament. He will remember, no doubt, that the cabinet ignored the advice of the then leader of the opposition, other members of my party and people outside this House. In 1969 we told the government that inflation did not affect us all uniformly. The problem was not monolithic. Inflation did not work the same way in Toronto, Ontario, as in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. But the government chose to ignore advice which came from respected and influential persons.

Mr. Breau: That is not true, I suggest.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): With respect, it is true. I shall be delighted to hear the hon. member from New Brunswick defend the government's program of that period.

Mr. Breau: Is the hon. member encouraging a filibuster?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): No, I am not, and I do not think any member on this side wants to filibuster.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member should address the Chair and speak to Bill C-89.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am always delighted to discuss these questions with my hon. friend from New Brunswick. He and I share a community of interest with respect to federal government policy.

Mr. Breau: About 40 miles separate us.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): We are about 40 miles apart. We are both concerned about federal policies affecting the economic and social betterment of peoples living in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

Important lessons are to be learned from the earlier attempt at restraint. Unfortunately, those lessons have not been absorbed, as is evident if one examines the government's present anti-inflation program and its attempts to restrict federal expenditures. Let me cite two examples to show that the government has failed to co-ordinate its cornerstone policies for social and economic development. Yesterday, when making his statement—I call it a non-statement—on energy policy, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) in no way came to grips with rapidly growing energy costs, electrical costs in particular, in Atlantic Canada. Two days earlier we heard that there was to be a 60 per cent increase—

Mr. Breau: No.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the hon. member speak in this debate. He does not agree with facts. But they are on record. I mentioned the minister's statement of yesterday. It is recorded in *Hansard*. I was about to mention the 60 per cent increase in transport action costs, announced earlier this week, affecting Prince Edward Island. Do hon. members opposite wish to disagree with the announcement of the Minister of Transport concerning increased transportation costs?

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Is the hon. member not aware that the government of Canada is participating financially, to the tune of 50 per cent, in supplying a transmission line to Prince Edward Island and will also pay 50 per cent of the financing of the nuclear power plant in New Brunswick?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to say that I am aware of both those programs. The minister mentioned both in the short question period which followed his announcement yesterday. Neither program, I suggest, will resolve the kind of problems to which I have alluded. Should we not be concerned about them? Is that not what this debate is all about?

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am sorry; I thought it was.

Mr. Cafik: Why not talk on the bill and the amendment?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I thought I was sticking to the bill. I hope hon. members opposite understand exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. Breau: We can't hear you.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am sorry the hon. member opposite cannot hear me. I am talking about the economic burden being borne by the people of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. As well, I must mention the cost differentials which must be borne by people in Atlantic Canada. Present federal government policies are exacerbating the situation in Atlantic Canada and promoting the continuation of these cost differentials. I see the hon. member smiling but I know that he agrees with much of what I say.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner).]

Mr. Breau: I support government policies.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): How can the hon. member suggest that government policies are helping to alleviate the unbelievably high unemployment in Atlantic Canada, including his area and many parts of my province, where last winter and up to the present unemployment in some regions has run at between 25 per cent and 30 per cent? I would dearly love to hear the hon. member explain how the federal government's anti-inflation announcement of October, its restraint program of December, together with and compounded by present levels of inflation in Atlantic Canada, will reduce our high levels of unemployment.

Mr. Breau: I did not say that.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I did not think the hon. member said it and he will not be saying it, because what I have mentioned is a fact of life in Atlantic Canada, as the hon. member well knows. This matter falls under the purview of the amendment we are considering, inasmuch as the continuance of present government programs will defeat the federal government's basic commitment to the elimination of regional economic and social disparity. The government elected in 1968 was committed to eliminating regional disparities. It established the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. For the last two or three years the department has administered a budget of over $500 million in trying to solve the difficulties of the Atlantic provinces, parts of Quebec and some northern parts of the western provinces.

The irony of it is this: we, as members of parliament, are committed to maintain a certain level of expenditure in disadvantaged areas. At the same time, present government programs are making it increasingly difficult for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to administer its own programs effectively. It will be increasingly difficult for members of parliament to defend programs administered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion unless the department's programs are co-ordinated with other major programs of the government. I am thinking particularly of the two programs we are discussing this afternoon, the anti-inflation program and its companion program to do with restraint in spending announced by the Treasury Board last December.

● (1730)

While we are giving with one hand and taking away with the other we are in a self-defeating situation and we are certainly undermining any advance which has been made with respect to closing the gaps in income standards, employment opportunities, and so on. It is crucial that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues realize the implications of what they are asking us to do.

The motion put forward by my hon. friend from York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) attempts at least to apply some measure of reality with respect to the continuance of a program whose benefits, whatever they might be, cannot be expected to continue for an indefinite period. As a number of speakers have well stated, we face a major difficulty here. It is one thing for the minister to introduce a program which will last for up to three years. It is quite another for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to indicate subsequently, along with the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board, that the program of controls is not really a short-term program—if one can refer to three years as being a short period—but that it might be prolonged to become a more comprehensive system of economic controls than anything we have so far experienced.

All members realize that an economy such as ours is not one which operates on an eighteenth century or nineteenth century laissez-faire model. On the other hand, if the government is planning to change substantially the rules under which a mixed economy such as ours operates, then surely it should not do so unilaterally and, in particular, it ought not to do so on the pretext of dealing with one particular phenomenon, namely, inflation. That is the difficulty we face under the present program and its continuance for three years.

Economists not only in our own country but in countries which have had a good deal of experience in the operation of anti-inflation programs concede that such programs are indeed useful during periods in which the fires of inflation appear to be out of control, in periods when great damage is done, particularly to those living on low or fixed incomes. But it has also been concluded by a number of these economic experts that controls exercised for too long a period not only destroy the traditional economic pattern but are extremely harmful to the very people they are supposed to benefit.

This brings me back once again to the people I represent, to those who have to live in areas of great regional disparity, far from the centres of the decision-making goes on with respect to economic policy, people who far too often become the victims of the heavily centralist approach which is so involved in programs of the kind we are considering today. To my mind, the remarks of Jean-Luc Pépin and the remarks made by the Prime Minister have been in no way helpful to the credibility of the scheme for which the Minister of Finance is directly responsible. It must have been chilling for members to read the statement of the Canadian Labour Congress in the annual report and recommendations made to the Prime Minister and members of the cabinet. What disturbed me was not only the rhetoric contained in that document and the extent to which a significant section of the economy so totally rejected the government's program, but the degree to which neither side appeared able to engage in a useful conversation with the other.

We live in a time of very large institutions. We in this chamber do not have to ask ourselves how large the institution of government has become. We are well aware of it. We are also well aware of the strength of the big corporations. One of the other major segments of our society is organized labour. It is not as large here as it is in Britain or in certain other European countries, but it is certainly a significant factor. The degree to which the unions find the present program filled with injustice convinces me that it is not good enough for the government to ride roughshod over this basic antipathy, nor is it good enough to believe that a program such as this should be allowed to continue longer than is absolutely necessary.

From the outset, the Minister of Finance has not been able to produce any objective argument in support of his contention that three years is the correct period, the period necessary if the program is to achieve whatever virtues it is expected to produce. The motion which has been placed before us deals realistically with a predicament which must surely have occurred to members on the government side. What I am saying is that, particularly with respect to Atlantic Canada, the longer the anti-inflation program continues the less likelihood we have of getting away from the kind of centralized decisions which have not been helpful in the past. It is obvious that a program which looks at things, presumably, from a national perspective but becomes greatly coloured by the influence of the central regions is slow to take into account particular problems in Atlantic Canada or in the Atlantic portion of Quebec or in western Canada.

I trust hon. members will reflect on this aspect because there has not been a great deal of discussion so far on the impact of anti-inflation policy on regional development. I have attempted during the last few months to put questions to various ministers with respect to this matter. I believe it is incumbent, particularly upon the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, not simply to make recommendations in the secrecy of cabinet but to state publicly from time to time his views as to the real impact of the anti-inflation program on the effective reduction of regional disparity. This is necessary if the minister's own credibility and the credibility of his department are to be maintained. In the absence of such an assurance we shall find it most difficult in the future to defend any commitment made by the present government or any other with respect to making the reduction of regional economic and social discrepancies a cornerstone of the federal position.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party in Parliament have opposed the government's so-called anti-inflation program from the day the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) first announced his intention to go ahead with it. We said then that the program would not work because it was inequitable and that because it was not equitable the people of Canada would not, in the long run, support it. The other night on "News magazine" we heard the results of a poll conducted by the CBC which substantiated precisely what we had said would happen. In November of 1975 the CBC conducted a poll which showed that 61 per cent of the people supported the idea of wage and price controls. Six months later the proportion which supported controls had dropped to 53 per cent. To another question as to whether the people believed controls were being applied fairly or not, two thirds of the people polled indicated that they did not believe the government's control program was being conducted fairly for all people.

● (1740)

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and sundry other cabinet ministers, both in

speeches in this House and in cities across the country, have said that the people of Canada as a whole support the government's program, but that a few rabble-rousing labour leaders are trying to stir up opposition among their members to the government's program so as to destroy it. It is interesting to look at what is actually happening, Mr. Speaker. Who is actually opposing the government's wage and price controls, not just in speeches and in resolutions but by actually stopping work? It is not the blue-collar workers, the steelworkers, the autoworkers or the railway workers who have belonged to unions for 25 years or more. It is the teachers, the nurses, the policemen in New Brunswick, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan. These groups, which a few years ago would have killed anybody who suggested that they belonged to the labour movement, have gone on strike and refused to accept the wage increases offered to them by their employers. They are saying in a graphic way that they are not going to accept the government's anti-inflation program.

The Minister of Finance should ask himself why it is that these white-collar workers, most of whom would consider themselves part of the middle class, are so militant. Why are they refusing—I am sure the minister would agree—to be good citizens? Why are they refusing to work despite the laws that this parliament has passed? They are refusing to work because their day to day experiences tell them that the anti-inflation program is nothing more nor less than a program to control wages and salaries. One has only to look at the fact that yesterday the Anti-Inflation Board approved an increase of one cent on a gallon of oil for two of the oil companies in the country. Similar approval was given a week or two ago to Imperial Oil.

Natural gas prices have gone up by about 30 per cent. If we can believe the policy statement tabled yesterday by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), the price will probably go up by 25 cents within the next couple of years, as will the price of oil. The cost of electric power has gone up. In Nova Scotia the price has virtually doubled within the last year. Municipal taxes in city after city are increasing by as much as 20 per cent. Housing costs are to go up, probably by another 10 per cent this year. The Anti-Inflation Board, which has been preening itself about how the cost of food has gone down, yesterday announced that food will increase in cost by 3 to 4 per cent in the next couple of months.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the ordinary people of this country are saying that the anti-inflation program is not working and that they are not going to support it? Even though we oppose the whole program and the way in which it is being administered, we did support the minister when finally, after a great deal of urging, having refused to face up to the unfairness of the situation, he brought in this bill permitting groups of workers who feel that a decision of the Anti-Inflation Board is unfair to them, to appeal. Yesterday the administrator of the anti-inflation program made a speech in Edmonton in which, interestingly enough, he came down hard on workers in this country. I must say it was made to a very non-partisan organization, the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Paproski: What have you got against Edmonton?

Mr. Orlikow: I have nothing against Edmonton.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Paproski: Then what have you got against the Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. Orlikow: I have nothing against the Chamber of Commerce. They are good people and I give them a good deal of credit for defending the rights of their members, businessmen who are interested in getting work done, and in paying labour—I do not blame them for this—as little as they can get them to accept. After all, that is their job, just as it is the job of the labour unions to get for their members as much pay per hour as they can from the employer. So I make no criticism of the Chamber of Commerce.

Let me quote from a report of what Mr. Tansley, the administrator of the Anti-Inflation Board, said in his speech to the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce. According to today's *Globe and Mail* he warned the unions that his role as enforcer of the government's control program may require him to set tougher limits on wage increases than those allowed by the Anti-Inflation Board. Later in his speech he said:

> Unless their case is strong the parties seeking a reference run the risk of ending up with less than the Anti-Inflation Board is willing to grant.

He said those comments applied equally to prices, profits and dividends but were aimed primarily at the trade unions and the more controversial issue of wage controls. To whom, Mr. Speaker, is it more controversial? Are wage controls more controversial than price increases? When the administrator makes that kind of comment I suggest he has virtually ruled himself out as an impartial judge.

I am much more concerned with the fact that the Anti-Inflation Board permitted a sharp increase in the price of cement in the city of Winnipeg a month or two ago. When I wrote to the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board he did not even do me the courtesy of replying to my letter. I am much more concerned about the second increase in the price of copper which the Anti-Inflation Board permitted this week than I am in any increase in wages. I am much more concerned about the increase in the price of oil that was permitted last week than I am about the increase in wages. Yet the administrator does not seem to be concerned about those matters; he is concerned about wage increases.

Let me say something about wage increases, Mr. Speaker. I want to refer to a speech reported in today's Toronto *Star* given by the Minister of Finance in which he showed his complete ignorance of the working conditions and needs not just of workers but of companies in this country. One of the biggest producers of foreign exchange in Canada is the mining industry. One of the biggest corporations in this country is International Nickel, which has an operation in Sudbury and in Thompson.

● (1750)

Traditionally, the wages paid at the two operations in Sudbury and Thompson have been the same. The Sudbury workers and their union reached an agreement with INCO just before the anti-inflation program was brought down. The Thompson workers did not. They reached an agreement a few weeks ago which gave them the same wage rate as the Sudbury workers. The Anti-Inflation Board which received that application from the union and the company

turned down the agreement and said that the company and the union would have to accept a reduction in wages. The minister is quoted in the Toronto *Star* as saying he agreed.

The INCO operation in Thompson employs about 2,800 workers. Last year International Nickel hired 3,100 workers. In other words, there was a turnover of more than 100 per cent. Who goes there and does not stay? I suggest it is single people who do not have any roots and probably live in company bunkhouses. If the Anti-Inflation Board decision is upheld, what will happen in the course of the next year is that the INCO operation will probably be short somewhere between 200 and 300 workers and the company will not be able to produce all the nickel possible which it could export at a good price. The minister thinks that is a very good idea, which indicates to me the minister has not the slightest concept of what is going on in this country or what are its needs.

The same thing is true at Elliot Lake. Hardly a week goes by when we do not read news stories and reports of discussions in the Ontario legislature about the dangers of working in the uranium mine at Elliot Lake and about the possibility of getting cancer being 200 or 300 per cent higher than in respect of workers anywhere else. Obviously, the workers at Elliot Lake and their union people think they should get some compensation for that danger. The company agreed partly because this was right and partly because of its knowledge that if it did not pay the same wages as those paid at Sault Ste. Marie or Sudbury they would not get the workers.

The Anti-Inflation Board has ordered that the wages be shaved. If that situation is allowed to exist and the wages in Elliot Lake are lower than at Sudbury or Sault Ste. Marie, it will mean that the company will not have the workers it needs to produce the uranium which I presume is required for those generating plants in Ontario and the United States which use that product in the production of electrical power.

Again we have this incredible decision by the Anti-Inflation Board backed by the Minister of Finance with his usual ignorance of the realities of life. I have to assume that on the basis of the statement made by the administrator this decision will likely be backed by him. If that is the way the administrator is going to deal with cases which come before him, we are not going to have much in the way of industrial peace in this country in the next year.

There is one other matter about which I should like some enlightenment before I vote on this bill. At page 3 of the bill, in clause 4(2) it is provided:

> "(1.2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) (*d.*1), the parties entitled to advise the board of their dissatisfaction with a notification from the board and thereby entitled to require the board to refer a matter to the administrator for consideration by him, are
>
> (*a*) where the notification relates to a price or profits, the supplier who is charging or is proposing to charge the price or whose profits are in question;

It then goes on to talk about wage increases. If the administrator is to do the job, and if the public is to accept that the administrator and the program are fair, the administrator should be given the job of dealing with wage increases. I believe he should also be given the job of looking at price increases approved by the Anti-Inflation Board. A consumer, myself or anyone else, should be able to appeal to the administrator to look at high price increases approved by the Anti-Inflation Board.

The workers who produce copper have had their wage increases monitored and there is a limit to what they can get. Why should a company which purchases that copper for use in one of its products not have the right to appeal to the administrator to look into the two price increases that have taken place in just over a month which the Anti-Inflation Board has permitted?

There is no indication that the companies are not making a fair profit on their sales of copper in Canada. I have no objection to the companies charging every penny the international market will support for copper exported, but I do not think Canadian copper should be sold to the United States at less than U.S. copper, Chilean copper or Zambian copper. I see no reason why the Anti-Inflation Board should have permitted the two increases of almost 10 per cent in the price of copper in just over a month. I should like to appeal to the administrator to look at this. I hope he will be as tough in looking at that increase in price as he threatens to be in respect of increases in wages.

Because I have so little faith in the government's program I intend to support the subamendment put forward by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) which calls for the ending of the program on May 1 of this year. Failing that, I will vote for the Conservative amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 29, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

SPORTS

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO CONTROL VIOLENCE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

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

Since it has become urgent to control violence in sports generally and particularly in hockey; since violent fights, blows and excessive brutality are not at the present time covered under criminal law; and, finally, since control over sports activities is generally left to the goodwill of sports monopolies, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House direct the government to take all necessary arrangements in the shortest time possible so as to use any legal mechanism to punish rightly acts of violence in sports generally, particularly in hockey, and so as to develop amateur sports and invite people to play an active part.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, the motion can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion cannot be put.

* * *

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

REQUEST THAT REMOVAL OF RAPESEED OIL AND MEAL FROM STATUTORY FREIGHT RATES BE DELAYED PENDING CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity; in fact, a matter of a double-cross.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Benjamin: As the present and former Ministers of Transport as well as the government have promised repeatedly to consult fully with the provinces and to provide them with full cost information before deciding on the question of freight rate subsidies on rapeseed oil and meal, and as the order in council of April 13 removing rapeseed oil and meal was made only five days after mailing the latest cost information to the provinces, which they view to be inadequate and inaccurate, and as the meeting of western premiers in Medicine Hat has condemned the federal government for reneging on its promises at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That the federal government live up to its promises of full consultation with the provinces and not implement the order in council removing rapeseed oil and meal from the statutory freight rates until after full consultation with the provinces at next week's meeting of first ministers.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for such a motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

● (1410)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASON RUSSIA HAS EXILED SECRETARY OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL FROM MOSCOW—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of standing order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn):

That the Soviet Union be asked by our external affairs department, either at the United Nations or through diplomatic channels, to explain why they have exiled the Secretary of Amnesty International from Moscow.

Mr. Speaker: Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can only be presented with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REVIEW OF POST-CONTROL SOCIETY—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In view of the kind of speculative reports which are now circulating, for example the report which is featured in the Ottawa *Journal* of today, could the Prime Minister confirm for the House of Commons and the people of Canada that an extensive policy of review is now underway within the government in respect to what has been called the "post-control" society, and could he tell us something of the nature of this review procedure.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what today's Ottawa *Journal* says about this. It is naturally true that in so far as the control of the economy, the operation of the control mechanism, is concerned and the kind of difficulties which created the anti-inflation situation in Canada linked with the undesirable high unemployment figure, we are looking at the subject and trying to find ways in which the economy would operate better in the future. The hon. member will remember that in the white paper on inflation published last October we indicated certain non-structural changes which, among others, will have to be contemplated. This kind of work is in progress.

Mr. Clark: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The white paper also indicated there would be some fairly extensive consultative procedures with other sectors in the society. In view of the fundamental importance of the issues under discussion and in view of the fact that whatever the Prime Minister might think and might be suggesting this direction for Canadian society cannot be decided simply be the government alone and imposed on the rest of the community, would the Prime Minister be prepared to bring this whole subject matter of policy for the "post-control" period before a parliamentary committee and would he be prepared to begin that procedure with a full statement by the government of a range of options, and details of those options now being considered for the basis of the "post control" period?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I would not want the question of the Leader of the Opposition to lead to the belief that there has not been and will not be a great deal of consultation on the matter of productivity, for instance, which interests the member for Prince Edward-Hastings so much. I stated to him in reply to a question in the House that there has been consultation. I believe there have been some personal meetings between the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and his advisory committee on that subject. I have reported to the House on several occasions that members of the cabinet have met with representatives of the public sector and the labour sector. We are very anxious to hear the views of the opposition on this subject—

An hon. Member: Here we go again.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Trudeau: —If they have any views on the matter of anti-inflation.

As to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that parliament sit down and begin to study the post-control period, my general answer is no; I do not think that would be a proper course of action. I wish parliament would be more concerned with the control period which is the one we will have with us for another two and a half years.

Mr. Clark: Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised that the Prime Minister is interested in the views of the Official Opposition on national policies since he continually borrows from them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Clark: What we want to have is full information on the range of options now being considered in secret by advisers to the government of Canada. We want to have that information brought before, not this whole parliament, but before a standing committee of this parliament so that there can be an opportunity for full public debate on the various options by the House of Commons and by the people we represent. Then, there will not be simply an imposition of the Prime Minister's personal values upon the society. I ask the Prime Minister: will he make that kind of reference to a standing committee so that the House of Commons and the people of Canada can become aware of the range of options that are now being considered?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question which was asked twice by the hon. member—

Mr. Clark: And not answered.

Mr. Trudeau: It was not answered because the hon. member remained standing and asked it the second time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition seems to take offence that we borrow some of his programs. If they are good, then certainly we should borrow from them. But I do not see why they vote against them when we borrow from them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Because you change them as well as steal them.

Mr. Trudeau: With regard to the substance of the question, it seems to me to be a most unreasonable request. Naturally, the government is continually trying to plan ahead to see what will develop—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Do you mind if I doze off?

Mr. Trudeau: This may not be the mandate of the opposition, but it is our mandate. If we are doing this, naturally

we are looking at a series of alternatives, economic and social, which might occur in the country and naturally we have a desire to cover various options. Naturally, there are hypotheses about the future. The fact that we do it in secret, to use the hon. member's word, seems to me to be a prudent way of doing it. We cannot possibly come before the Canadian public or the House of Commons and indicate all the various scenarios which could develop in Canada and have them studied one by one and the response which they would give to these various scenarios. Even the very talk of looking at new values emerging in a new society spooks the opposition out of their seats.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Since it is clearly an unreasonable position for the Prime Minister of Canada to suggest, as he has in Scarborough and other places, that the only choice for Canadians in so far as the new values of the new society is concerned, is to accept them voluntarily or have them imposed by the government, since that is an unreasonable and undemocratic position—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: —will the Prime Minister now give the House of Commons and the people of Canada a commitment that we will have the opportunity to discuss and participate in the decision on new values for the so called new society before they are imposed without choice by the government?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The answer to that is obviously yes, Mr. Speaker. If we introduce any new policies or legislation, obviously they will be brought before the House. We will expect the opposition, perchance, to express some views on them.

● (1420)

The hon. member refers to what I stated in York-Scarborough. One of the examples I gave was pollution, and it does not seem very undemocratic to me to suggest to the audience and to the panel there that either the private sector voluntarily makes sure that it produces without polluting every aspect of Canadian life, or we impose legislation upon it to keep the environment clean.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I think that this is a very reasonable question which even the opposition will have to face some day when it gets around to it.

FORM AND TIME-FRAME OF CONSULTATIONS ON POST-CONTROL SOCIETY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: —I should like to ask the Prime Minister something about the consultations he has talked about with Mr. Morris and also with the radio audience in Toronto when he indicated it is time we sat down together to discuss whether new mechanisms are necessary to promote better mutual understanding and co-ordinated action. Could the Prime Minister indicate the form such consultations will take, consultations presumably with sectors of the economy and sectors of society? Could he indicate the forum of those consultations and the time-frame he has in mind?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the most obvious example of that forum for consultation was the Labour Relations Council set up by the Minister of Labour of this government when he provided a forum wherein labour and management could at a very real difficulty in our economy, the difficulty having to do with industrial relations. In this forum, as indeed in the meetings we have unilaterally with labour on the one side or with management on the other, we try to ascertain some of their views which would permit Canada to have improved policies in the area of labour-management relations, hopefully to reduce the number of strikes and to reduce the inconvenience to the public by strikes in essential services. We believe this can best be approached by getting the views of both sides involved in the conflict.

CONSULTATIONS WITH PROVINCES ON POST-CONTROL SOCIETY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): In view of the statement in the white paper on inflation tabled by the government last fall, which said that in concert with provincial governments the government intends to identify and correct public policies which impede in a structural sense the efficient operation of our economy, would the Prime Minister tell the House what consultations have been held with the provinces during the past six months?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Would you read the words about consultation again?

Mr. Stanfield: "—in concert with the provincial governments, consultations to identify and correct public policies which impede in a structural sense the efficient operation of our economy." Would the Prime Minister indicate what consultations have taken place with the provinces, and could he also indicate whether the provinces are to be involved in the general kinds of consultation the Prime Minister has in mind with regard to the post-controls society?

Mr. Trudeau: So far as the last part of the question is concerned, I attempted to deal with it in answering the question of the present Leader of the Opposition. In so far as examples of consultation with the provinces, from memory I can name several. There have been meetings of ministers of finance, ministers responsible for housing, ministers responsible for health and welfare, and I believe ministers responsible for agriculture. These are all areas which we believe were precisely pointed out in the white paper as perhaps in need of some structural reforms. I believe, to be specific, that we mentioned the food and housing areas.

Oral Questions

PUBLIC SERVICE

POSSIBILITY RIGHT TO STRIKE WOULD BE ABOLISHED—INTRODUCTION OF NEW LEGISLATION ON EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Before we are given another committee, the report of which can be set aside, may I ask a question based on a report that the government is considering that in its post control plans it will abolish the right of public servants to strike. In view of the fact that a special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on employer-employee relations in the public service spent a year and a half studying this subject, and made a report just a few weeks ago in which it was recommended that the right to strike be continued, may I ask the Prime Minister if any attention is to be paid to the report of that committee?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know to what report the hon. member is referring. If he is talking of the report in the newspapers about the right to strike—

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No; the Finkelman committee report.

Mr. Trudeau: —I can tell him there is no movement afoot in the federal government to abolish the right to strike.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister if the government is working on new legislation respecting employer-employee relations in the public service based on the report of the special joint committee?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Arising out of the joint committee report, work is going on in the government toward changes in present legislation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

ALLEGED DELAYS AND IRREGULARITIES IN SENDING OLD AGE PENSION CHEQUES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare concerning problems now experienced by most old age pensioners in connection with their old age security pension cheque. This month, the supplement and spouse allowance were not included with the old age pension cheques. The pensioners received only the basic amounts. Our constituency office must take in many calls and the office of the department in Quebec advises us that it is snowed under and that we will have to wait a month. Could the minister tell us whether he is aware of that situation and what steps he intends to take to correct that serious problem which has dire consequences for older people in Quebec?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, indeed I was informed of a number of cases such as the hon. member mentioned. Apparently, these situations are due to some problem in the programming of computers which issue old age pension cheques. It is something I deeply regret and I gave instructions to my officials to prepare the cheques by hand if necessary each time there is a complaint. I thank the hon. member and I hope the other members will be able to explain the present difficulties to the citizens who will be affected and to bring each case to the attention of the responsible officers in each province, so that we may correct the situation as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF BANK LOAN BEING NEGOTIATED

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. On Monday last I asked the minister a question about the progress of financing arrangements between Lockheed and the Canadian banks. The minister declined to answer but immediately afterwards told reporters that an agreement was being negotiated for something more than $300 million but less than $400 million. While not wishing to raise a question of privilege about this at this time, I feel that since the question was first raised in the House, the House should have been given the answer before reporters were apprised of the situation.

Will the minister now tell the House more exactly how much is being borrowed, at what rate of interest, how long the period of the loan is and what kind of security Canadian banks will get for their loan, inasmuch as the government has said categorically that it will not guarantee the loan?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the financing arrangements are being worked out between Lockheed and the Canadian banks. It will be up to them to make the first announcement about the terms of that financing.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I had three questions wrapped up in that first one. The minister answered one and avoided two, which is about par. If the minister cannot tell the House what rate of interest will be payable on the loan which is being negotiated—what interest the Canadian people are going to pay—can he at least assure the House that it will not be above the prime rate? Can he tell the House whether he expects that the government will be required to pay more in interest than the $111 million which was allowed as part of the total program cost?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the answers to all those questions will be made available at the time the announcement is made concerning the whole matter.

An hon. Member: In the House?

Mr. McKinnon: Can the minister assure the House that he will make the announcement in the House of Commons where the questions have been asked?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Yes or no.

* * *

● (1430)

POST OFFICE

USE OF PRIVATE COURIERS BY DEPARTMENT—ACTION TO RECOVER BUSINESS LOST TO PRIVATE COURIERS AS RESULT OF STRIKES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Postmaster General in his dual capacity as Postmaster General and Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs? Does the hon. gentleman consider the admission by a Post Office official that his department uses expensive private couriers to carry urgent interoffice and intercity mail to be good advertising for the Post Office and an example of efficiency in restraint on behalf of consumers of Canada?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I have looked into the use by the Post Office of private couriers and am told it has been the practice for 28.5 years. I am not sure if further investigation might not show that it has been done for at least 35 years. It is a special service. When a parcel, package or letter has to be delivered from point A to point B in Ottawa in 20 minutes, it is much more efficient and less expensive to use this service than to divert regular workers within the Post Office for this service.

Mr. Dinsdale: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Postmaster General has stated that private couriers are "costing the taxpayer" by creaming off revenue which would ordinarily go to the Post Office, why does he want the cost to be even greater than necessary by having the Post Office use these couriers? And, what does he plan to do to recover the business which has fled to private couriers because of the failure of the Post Office to provide consistently reliable performance?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I have already announced that we intend to go into that business within one year in order to recover the type of business which private couriers attempt to attract. Basically, it is a profitable business only in big, metropolitan centres. As for regaining some of our business, the hon. member will be pleased to know that the volume and revenue of the Post Office in January, February and March this year was 6 per cent higher than in the corresponding period last year.

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE OF SIGNING

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Supply and Services. Since the Minister of National Defence apparently does not intend to inform the House about the status of the Lockheed contract and financing arrangements for it, will the Minister of Supply and Services tell the House if he expects to sign the contract tomorrow?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to supply the House with more information but I believe that during negotiations one must necessarily proceed with utmost discretion. We have of course, until tomorrow midnight to make a decision but I do not know at this point whether or not the contract will be signed before midnight tomorrow.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ALLEGATION MINISTER CONSULTED PSYCHIC ON LOCKHEED CONTRACT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence? According to reports earlier this week in the Toronto *Sun*, the minister has apparently inherited an interest in things extrasensory and made at least half a dozen telephone calls to Dr. David Hoy, a psychic operating out of Paducah, Kentucky. Apparently the minister made the calls during a recent visit by Dr. Hoy to Toronto. The minister is reported to have sought advice from the psychic on defence policy and the Lockheed LRPA contract. Will the minister tell the House the advice he received and if it will be his practice in future to consult psychics?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the newspaper report but, as stated by the hon. member, it is totally erroneous. The man referred to as Dr. Hoy telephoned me two or three weeks ago and said that he had information concerning funding which might be useful for the Lockheed program.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Did you ask Mackenzie King?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I did not return the telephone call and did not seek the source of funds suggested.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBLE SHORTAGE OF EGGS IN ONTARIO—REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE OF SUPPLIES

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of

Agriculture. I gave him notice of my intention to ask it. It arises from the fact that Aaron Metzzer Produce, a major egg distributor in Ontario, has been unable to get CEMA to fill more than 50 per cent of its orders since Easter, that it has been unable to get import permits to fill the gap, and that a carload of eggs promised by CEMA for delivery today has not arrived. What assurance can the minister give the people of Ontario that there will not be egg shortages in stores in Ontario, shortages which may arise because this major supplier will not be able to meet orders as early as next Monday if eggs do not become available?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it has not been reported to me that anybody in Ontario went without eggs. I am told that the distributor will have eggs on Monday.

* * *

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES AND CLOTHING—REQUEST FOR QUOTAS ON IMPORTS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of deteriorating conditions in the textile and clothing industry of Canada—there has been a drop of 20 per cent in business over the last decade—can the minister explain why his department continues to refuse to place quotas on imports, particularly winter outerwear, coming from cheap-labour southeast Asian countries?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will refer to the proceedings of the Senate committee—I think it is the finance and banking committee—of yesterday morning he will find that I and my officials appeared before the committee for about three hours and many of these questions were dealt with in considerable detail at that time. On the question of refusing to introduce quotas, let me say that we have actually introduced quotas on a number of items. As for the matter of outerwear, and specific commodities relating to the report of the clothing and textile board, insufficient data was available in order to enter into the necessary negotiations with the countries concerned. But we have put all these items under import surveillance, which means that they require import permits. As soon as a case has been established as a result of surveillance, further action will be taken.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

ALLEGATION EGG MARKETING AGENCY CIRCUMVENTING LAW IN CONNECTION WITH IMPORTATION OF EGGS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture? Has he, himself, or the Farm Products Marketing Council, looked into the serious allegation that CEMA is attempting to circumvent the law in issuing permit orders, through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, to other than legitimate egg brokers for the importation of eggs to Canada from the United States?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have met with members of the council and am perfectly satisfied they are acting within the law. They are not acting illegally, nor, as the hon. member suggested, are they being dishonest.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INQUIRY AS TO COMPLAINTS ABOUT ACTIVITIES OF EGG MARKETING AGENCY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question may I ask the Solicitor General if a complaint has been registered with the RCMP about the activities of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency and if an investigation is about to commence?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the RCMP in Ottawa received one complaint about possible irregularities concerning CEMA. The complaint was received only recently and the RCMP is presently assessing it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OLYMPIC GAMES

GOVERNMENT ACTION TO EXTEND SELF-FINANCING PROGRAMS

Mr. Serge Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board.

Considering that, in the last few weeks, there were meetings between the President of the Treasury Board and the Quebec Minister of Finance in which they discussed the continuation of the self-financing programs for the Olympic Games in the summer of 1976 and that, according to the provincial minister, negotiations would be completed by this time, and in view of the fact that the right hon. Prime Minister stated in the House two weeks ago that the government was still supporting the self-financing objective, can the President of the Treasury Board inform hon. members of the House of the nature of the agreements between himself and the representative of the Quebec government, and tell them when he proposes to introduce in the House the bills which are necessary to extend the existing programs or to establish new programs?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else to report at the present time. We have not quite completed the negotiations and as soon as they are, I shall be glad to make a statement in the House.

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

FREIGHT RATES—EFFECT OF CHANGE IN RATE ON RAPESEED

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. As the minister's predecessor pledged in February, 1975, to reduce freight rate anomalies as between raw and finished products, especially rapeseed, and to consult fully with the provinces, I ask the minister what will be the effect of the order in council of April 13 increasing even further the present anomaly of 25 cents per hundredweight in favour of crushing rapeseed in Montreal over crushing it in parts of western Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, consultations have taken place and there was a general understanding on the part of western transportation ministers that under existing law we cannot impose a lower rate for rapeseed oil than the technically compensatory rate. That being the best we can do, it is what we propose to do. Of course, there is an anomaly which continues because of the movement of rapeseed at a very low rate. It would take another form of action which could correct the situation. There will be a possible opportunity for legislation next session to deal with some of these problems. I should say to the hon. member that if he thinks the existing use of Crow rates on meal and rapeseed is going by the board, he is wrongly informed.

● (1440)

Mr. Benjamin: I am informed today that rape processing plants in western Canada are losing at the rate of $300,000 a month at the present time. In view of the fact the Department of Regional Economic Expansion provided grants for these plants, will the Minister of Transport advise if he has made any representations in cabinet or if the government is considering any compensation? How does that square with the policy of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, in view of the fact that the government and the Prime Minister pledged in 1974 to do something about the anomalies between raw and finished products in western Canada?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the action to legislate changes in freight rates will be taken in the next session. The necessary changes in the National Transportation Act are being developed for that purpose. The hon. member knows that the figure he refers to as a loss in processing plants in western Canada is really due to the fact that there is a very low rate on rapeseed moving to destinations at the Crow rate. I am not sure whether he is proposing a solution by bringing those rates into line with costs.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

DATE ON WHICH RATE OF INFLATION WILL REACH SIX PER CENT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. When does the government expect this country will reach the 6 per cent inflation rate which has been achieved by the United States government and, following that, the 2 per cent inflation rate which the Secretary of the Treasury Williams Simon said recently he is confident the United States will reach within two years?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish Secretary Simon well in his expectation. I myself would think that is rather ambitious. From our standpoint, we do not anticipate reaching the 6 per cent rate in the current fiscal, or, indeed, calendar year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Elgin.

Mr. Wise: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I note that he has momentarily left the chamber. Perhaps I might be recognized upon his return.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

BEEF CATTLE—REPORT OF SPECIAL INQUIRY—DATE OF PUBLICATION

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Agriculture has now re-entered the chamber, I will direct my question to him. I understand that on Tuesday of this week the Prime Minister received the report of the special beef inquiry that was ordered some time ago. I assume that since two days have past, the Minister of Agriculture has received the report from the Prime Minister and has had time to read it. Does the report make any recommendations as to greater government regulation of the beef industry?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had time to read the report and, therefore, I am not aware of what recommendations have been made, except for a telephone conversation with my assistant deputy minister in charge of the stabilization board.

Mr. Murta: As the report is going to be very important to not only the beef producers, but the consumers of this country, can the minister now give an approximate date when the report will be made public?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I have been as eagerly awaiting this report as the hon. member or anyone else. He can rest assured that we will make it public as soon as possible.

SKIM MILK POWDER—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON PURCHASE BY CIDA

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he give some indication as to the status or progress of the purchase of some 75 million pounds of skim milk powder by CIDA? Can he give some indication as to the progress of those negotiations?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I know of no problem there. I read some things in the press the other day which I found very hard to believe.

As far as I am concerned, the arrangements have been made. CIDA has agreed to spend an extra $10 million in the program and at world prices.

Mr. Wise: In the minister's statement we are led to believe that the purchase will be entirely financed by CIDA. Is it not true that the dairy producers will be contributing a greater amount of money than the government, $28 million from the producers compared to the $20 million from this government? When the minister is clarifying this matter, can he give some indication as to the method or formula used to arrive at the $8.60 used in the penalty clause of his statement on dairy policy?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the connection. However, in the case the hon. member has raised, CIDA has agreed to put $20 million into a fund to purchase from dairy producers. I am glad the hon. member has raised this. The dairy farmers of Canada will be contributing in a tremendous way to the food aid program, much more than the rest of society is being asked to do. This is something that many people do not realize. At the first opportunity I will present the complete memo to the hon. member on why the $8.60 is as high as it is. Basically, it is because they paid no attention, that is the provincial marketing boards and everyone else, to my appeals to cut back on production. It is just wasteful to produce and then do what they are now doing. They might as well do what they did the day before yesterday, throw it down the sewers in Toronto or anywhere else. If they are going to produce it for nothing, that is something that cannot be accepted when there is no market for the product.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LICENSING AGREEMENT WITH ITALIAN COMPANY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF REACTORS—POSSIBLE FAILURE TO ACHIEVE SAFEGUARDS AGREEMENT

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It refers to a report on April 24 that negotiations are expected to be completed shortly on a licensing agreement allowing an Italian company to build CANDU reactors. In view of the fact that on July 22, 1975 the then Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources went to some lengths to outline the safeguards agreement he was trying to achieve to cover the resale by the Italian company of Canadian technology to other countries, and since the April 24 report states that the licensing agreement if approved would cover only construction of reactors in Italy and the company would not be permitted to sell reactors to other countries, does this mean that the Canadian government was not able to achieve the safeguards it was seeking from Italy?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question is a complicated one, as one would expect from the complex member who posed the question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Whelan.]

Mr. MacEachen: If I may revert to the normal Celtic relationship that exists between us—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: —the simple answer to the question is if the hon. member is referring to the licensing and licensing arrangements, that situation is fully safeguarded under the policy that has been adopted by the government.

● (1450)

Miss MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to point out that it is not a complex matter at all. Last year the government was talking about allowing the Italian government to have the right of resale of Canadian technology. Now it seems that that condition has been withdrawn because the safeguards being sought have not been met. My question is, is it the situation that the safeguards that were being sought for resale of Canadian technology at that time have not been met by the Italian government and therefore resale is not to be permitted?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, such resale or retransfer of Canadian technology could not take place to a third country without the concurrence of the government of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—TENDERS FOR INSTALLATION OF SOUND SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Supply and Services.

As reported on page 12900 of *Hansard* for April 27, the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) asked the minister if he could assure the House, and I quote:

> ... that to his knowledge there were no improprieties or irregularities surrounding the tendering for, and letting of, some of the contracts for the installation of a sound reinforcing system at Mirabel airport.

Can the minister answer that question today?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the Social Credit party is more interested in finding out the truth than is the hon. member for Central Nova. It may be that he knew the answer, as all the information I am about to give was supplied to a representative of the Progressive Conservative party's research staff sometime last January. At that time they said that they were satisfied with the information they had received. We asked for tenders and the closing date was July 3, 1974. Later the closing date was extended to August 28, 1974 and all the firms which had been invited to tender were warned of this extension.

On August 28, therefore before the closing date, the RCA company sent in an envelope bearing the original date of July 3 as well as the tenders number. Due to a clerical error, this envelope was misplaced and when the tenders were opened there was only one, namely General Sound and Theater Equipment Ltd. The RCA tender was

unsealed and accepted on the next day, as internal regulations state no tenderer shall be penalized on account of our own errors. The RCA tender was accepted because it was the lowest. This decision was accepted by the General Sound in a letter—

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

EFFECT OF ANTICIPATED INCREASE IN FOOD PRICES ON ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—DATE OF BUDGET

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Now that the Prime Minister has confirmed that we are stuck with controls for two and a half years, apparently certain in his attitude that they will work, much in contrast to his view on May 3, 1974 when he said he was quite certain that they were not the right approach to fighting inflation, and considering that the Anti-Inflation Board expects food prices to rise by 3 to 4 per cent over the next two months, does the Minister of Finance agree that this development would reverse the recent deceleration of prices increases, and does the minister now feel he may have to retract the statements of both the Prime Minister and himself to the effect that the anti-inflation program has already had some effect in reducing inflation?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): No, sir.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance who today indicated that our inflation certainly will not be down to 6 per cent this year, be it fiscal or calendar year. As our future inflation rate depends on the administration's fiscal and monetary stance more than the effect of the controls program, would the minister indicate when we might expect his budget which hopefully might better acquaint the people of Canada with the administration's current budgetary views, bearing in mind the last budget was 10 months ago and was brought down by a former minister of finance who has since had a falling out and has run away?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, may I just say that I think the hon. member's last several remarks are rather unfair to my predecessor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I would hope to be able to confirm within a week or so the actual date of the budget.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

ALLEGATION EGG MARKETING AGENCY CIRCUMVENTING LAW IN CONNECTION WITH IMPORTATION OF EGGS

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I want to return to a matter that is very important to both consumers and producers. Has CEMA been importing eggs or otherwise obtaining eggs from the United States through intermediaries and offering them to Canadian firms while recommending to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce that Canadian firms not be allowed permits to import eggs themselves directly from the United States? Secondly, is CEMA trying to do indirectly something that the cabinet has not yet given it permission to do, that is, control the importation of eggs into Canada?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have already answered this question. CEMA is not doing anything that anybody has told me is illegal; they are operating within the law. They are supposed to be in the position of supplying the need for eggs in Canada. If they cannot supply the eggs needed in Canada by the consuming public, the breaking trade, etc., then they have to turn to some other source. In essence, they are using a perfectly legitimate broker bringing eggs into Canada and CEMA is paying them only the brokerage fee. The big dollar was coming from the importers who were but are not now making a rip-off on the importation of eggs from the United States. As far as I am concerned, it was an unwarranted rip-off. Certainly the consumers did not get any benefit from it but the importers were, and now somebody has infringed upon their territory they do not like it.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

FRASER RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR ACTION ON THE BRIDGEVIEW-SOUTH WESTMINSTER SECTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. The government of British Columbia has said it is ready to proceed immediately, with federal participation, on the Bridgeview-South Westminster section of the Fraser River flood control program. Could the minister give assurance that the diking and draining of this area will receive high priority so that the health and safety standards for this community can be brought to standards that all of us want to enjoy for ourselves?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the last time I met with Mr. Nielsen we discussed this problem, and he knows we are giving high priority to this item and are providing money for it.

* * *

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

PROPRIETY OF ALLEGED STATEMENT BY ADMINISTRATOR ON WAGE SETTLEMENTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Does the minister believe that it is proper for the anti-inflation administrator, who should be impartial in judging labour-management wage disputes that are referred to him, to express views such as those he expressed in Edmonton, where he warned unions that his role as enforcer of the government's control program may require him to set

tougher limits on wage increases than those allowed by the Anti-Inflation Board, and who said that unless their case is strong the parties seeking a reference run the risk of ending up with less than the Anti-Inflation Board was willing to grant?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have read the remarks of the administrator. I think he made it very clear that he is in the position, as the Anti-Inflation Board is not, of making a decision which is of a legal, binding nature, and he was merely making clear in his statement that because his order might be reviewable by the courts in due course he would have to proceed with much less flexibility than is possible for the Anti-Inflation Board. I do not think in any sense that it would be fair to characterize his explanation of the statute as a warning to anyone.

Mr. Orlikow: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider pointing out to the administrator that statements such as he made will only increase the skepticism of the public. As a CBC poll indicated, two-thirds of the Canadian people believe the program is not being applied equitably now.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the administrator, indeed for the Anti-Inflation Board itself, to make things clear to the public so the public has a better understanding of the exact nature of the provisions of the law passed by this parliament under which they operate. I would think that the objection of the hon. member is a totally unreasonable one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Moose Jaw.

● (1500)

Mr. Neil: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has left the House.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the government House leader the business for the balance of today, tomorrow and the early part of next week.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we shall continue discussion of the report stage of Bill C-89 with the expectation that votes on the motions would be taken this afternoon. We shall then call Bill C-68 and continue debate on the report stage until the end of the week unless, of course, it is disposed of earlier. On Monday it is the government's intention to call, for the first time, Bill C-81, the members of parliament pay bill. When that bill is called, the responsible minister will announce that the government will propose an amendment to freeze expense allowances as well as pay during 1976.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Sharp: There is an informal understanding, Mr. Speaker—or perhaps it is better to say, a hope—that the bill will be considered in committee of the whole. There is also the hope, rather than an understanding, that the bill can be passed through all stages in a single sitting. I know this will require unanimous consent of all members in order to permit such a serious departure from the rules, but I am hopeful that hon. members will co-operate in disposing of this matter expeditiously.

Tuesday, May 4, and Friday, May 7, will be opposition days. On Wednesday, which is the first government day after we have disposed of the pay bill, we will call Bill C-84, the bill on capital punishment.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the government House leader that I am delighted to see that the government has finally screwed up its courage and decided to come clean with the House of Commons. I hope it does not fall into this unfortunate position again.

There are two matters I should like to mention in respect of House business, both of which arose today during the question period and one of which is the budget debate. It does seem to be quite unusual, having regard to the statement of the finance minister, that we are left, some two weeks before the time the Minister of Finance indicated the budget would be brought down, without knowing the date. I think knowledge of that date is extremely important, not only in respect of the government but certainly in respect of the operations of the House in terms of choosing opposition days and a number of other things. That is the first point.

The second point has to do with an announcement which, in view of the question period today and the question period yesterday, would seem to be imminent, and that is the announcement regarding the purchase, or not, of a long-range patrol aircraft. This matter has occupied the question period of the House for a long time—a great many days—and the attention of the Canadian people. This is not the usual sort of thing such as a sale of wheat or grain to China or Russia. Will the government House leader assure the House that the announcement, whatever it is, in respect of this matter will be made in this House on motions?

We are prepared to give an indication of co-operation regarding priority, if necessary. That announcement should be made during motions in the House, rather than before the television cameras somewhere else in this building. I would ask for that assurance on behalf of all members of the House.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the government has not yet reached a final decision on the time of the budget, but my colleague the Minister of Finance has said that he expects to make an announcement within the next week or so. On the second point, the contract with Lockheed, if one is signed, I think I can give the undertaking, on behalf of the Minister of National Defence, that the announcement, whatever it is, will be made in the House of Commons.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Thank you very much.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the fact that the government has at last come

to the position we took on December 18, 1975, the night the restraint program was announced, to the effect that a freeze on the incomes of members of parliament should be complete. The minister expressed the hope that this could be dealt with at all stages on Monday. I see no problem in respect of that, which leads me to ask a question about that day. In view of the fact that Bill C-81 ought not to take very long on Monday, what else will we be doing that day?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, there is no difficulty in filling in the time. If, by chance—and I share the hope of my hon. friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—Bill C-81 can go through all stages in a matter of a few minutes or hours, then I would propose, as I indicated much earlier, calling the bill on capital punishment so that it can be disposed of as quickly as reasonably possible. I note there is a disposition, if I might add this, to come to a decision on this bill and I am hopeful we can have some discussion about limiting the length of speeches so that a maximum number of members can express their views.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government House leader to indicate the status of Bill C-72 in this session, the bill having to do with discrimination?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, if the House is able to dispose of the matters I have indicated the government hopes can be disposed of before June 30, I will give consideration to opening the debate on that bill. However, I have come to the conclusion that it is the general wish of all members of the House that we conclude this session by June 30. I have heard my friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, express himself very strongly on this matter from time to time. I would not want to disappoint him by bringing forward other legislation which I have not forecast.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Seventh and eighth reports of Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, in both official languages—Mr. Collenette.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

TARIFF BOARD ACT

TABLING OF BOARD REPORT ON PLEASURE CRAFT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 6 of the Tariff Board Act, I wish to table a copy, in English and in French, of a report of the Tariff Board in respect of pleasure craft,

reference No. 149, together with a transcript of the proceedings on the reference.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,830, 3,863, 4,093, 4,129, 4,598, 4,969, 5,010, 5,018 and 5,036.

[*Text*]

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AUGUST, 1975

Question No. 3,830—**Mr. Bawden:**

1. How many persons in Canada were reported to be unemployed in August 1975 by Statistics Canada?

2. How many persons were receiving unemployment insurance benefits in August 1975?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following. 1. 623,000 persons were reported to be unemployed in August, 1975.

2. 634,839 persons were receiving unemployment insurance benefits in August, 1975. See attached explanation of differences between Statistics Canada's unemployment statistics and data from the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

Comparing Unemployment Statistics with Data from the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

The monthly Labour Force Survey (LFS) is the source of the official measure of unemployment in Canada. Comparisons are frequently made between the number of unemployed persons as reported by the LFS and the number of unemployment insurance claimants or beneficiaries. The numbers in the series seldom coincide, and misleading inferences are often drawn about the accuracy of the measures. However, the series are not intended to measure the same characteristics or identical populations and therefore, direct comparisons are not valid. The populations to which the LFS and Unemployment Insurance Commission (UIC) data refer are somewhat different in several respects. The Labour Force Survey covers the civilian population 14 years of age and over, including self-employed persons but excluding the institutional population and persons living in the Yukon, Northwest Territories and Indian reserves. The insured population comprises the paid worker segment of the labour force (1), including members of the armed forces. Further problems in comparing the LFS unemployed and the UIC claimants and beneficiaries result from the fact that there are significant differences in the meaning of the terms "unemployed", "claimant" and "beneficiary". Not all the LFS unemployed are UIC claimants (beneficiaries) and conversely, not all UIC claimants (beneficiaries) are included in the LFS unemployed. According to LFS definitions, some UIC claimants may be "employed", while others may be "not in the Labour force". The LFS unemployment estimates

include primarily, persons who were without work and seeking work. To be entitled to receive UIC benefit, a claimant must have had an interruption of earnings, and be available for and capable of employment. A UIC claimant may work part-time and still be eligible for benefit while in the LFS such a person would be considered as employed. Although a claimant may meet the condition of availability and capability, he may not be actively seeking employment and, therefore, would be treated by the LFS as not in the Labour force. Thus, in addition to persons who would be classified as unemployed according to the LFS, the UIC claimant count includes persons with some earnings (employed) as well as persons not actively seeking employment (not in the labour force). For example, most claimants eligible for UIC sickness, maternity and retirement benefit are probably not included in the LFS unemployed.

PEI FISHING SECTOR

Question No. 3,863—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. With reference to the fishing sector of the Prince Edward Island Comprehensive Development Plan, have any measures been taken since the Plan's inception to encourage a longer inshore fishing season and, if so (a) what were they, (b) on what dates, (c) at what total and yearly cost, (d) with what specific effect on the average number of weeks spent fishing by inshore fishermen?

2. Are any new measures planned or under consideration for Phase 2 and, if so (a) what are they, (b) do they represent a change in objective from Phase 1, (c) for what reason were they deemed necessary?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. No specific measures have been taken.

2. An examination of the harvesting and marketing potential of such species as silversides and quahaugs is currently underway. Development of these species, and others, could extend the inshore fishing season.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—MINISTER'S OFFICES

Question No. 4,093—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. Does the Minister of External Affairs have an office in the Jackson Building and, if so (a) on what date was it opened, (b) for what purpose?

2. Does the Minister have other offices within public or rented buildings in the National Capital Region and, if so (a) in what location, (b) on what date was each occupied?

3. What was the cost of decorating and furnishing the offices assigned to the Minister in (a) the Jackson Building, (b) other buildings?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes. (a) February 9, 1976. (b) The Secretary of State for External Affairs is responsible for the Canadian International Development Agency, which occupies the Jackson Building. It was recently decided that it would be more efficient for the Minister to have an office in the same building; this would facilitate a closer working relationship with CIDA.

2. (a) (i) Room 418-N, Centre Block, House of Commons. (ii) On floor A-10, Lester B. Pearson Building, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa. (b) (i) Upon becoming Secretary of State for External Affairs on August 8, 1974, the Minister remained in the Parliamentary office which he had previously occupied in other ministerial capacities, beginning in early 1968. (ii) August 8, 1974.

3. (a) $6,800. (b) During the Minister's tenure as Secretary of State for External Affairs, the amounts expended for decorations and furnishings have been as follows: (i) For Room 418-N, Centre Block: Nil; (ii) On Floor A-10 of the Pearson Building: $23.30.

[Mr. Roy (Laval).]

COLLÈGE NOTRE-DAME, MONTREAL

Question No. 4,129—**Mr. Lachance:**

1. Has the government rented the *Collège Notre-Dame* facilities in Montreal to accommodate members of the Canadian Armed Forces detached for security purposes during the Olympic Games and, if so (a) for how long, (b) for what amount, (c) who will be responsible for the cost, (d) how many personnel will be accommodated?

2. Will the Canadian Armed Forces members have exclusive access to the sports centre near the College and, if so, for what reason will the public who ordinarily have access to the centre be denied entry for this period?

3. Have agreements been entered into with other sports centres for the exclusive use of the Canadian Armed Forces during the Olympic Games?

4. How many private establishments have been so requisitioned to accommodate members of the Armed Forces during the Olympic Games?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Solicitor General and the Department of National Defence as follows: 1. No. The Government of Canada has rented the Collège Notre-Dame facilities to accommodate members of the RCMP detached for security purposes during the Olympic Games. (a) 80 days, i.e., June 1, 1976 to August 20, 1976. (b) $374,200. (c) RCM Police Olympic Budget. (d) 228 beds, plus a contingency factor of up to 272 additional beds.

2. No. The RCMP will have exclusive use of the Sports Centre connected to the College. These facilities were obtained to assist in keeping the members morale high while away from their families and provide physical conditioning equipment and training areas. For security reasons these facilities will not be available to the public during the rental period.

3. No.

4. None.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CANADIAN MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

Question No. 4,598—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

What is the government estimate of the unemployment rate in the Canadian motion picture industry in each year from 1965 to date for (a) the industry, (b) each major class of workers within the industry?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by several Departments as follows: This information is not know to the Government.

INFANT AND MATERNAL MORTALITY RATES

Question No. 4,969—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. For each of the past five years, by province and territory, what were the rates of (a) infant, (b) maternal mortality?

2. For the same period, by province and territory, what were the rates of (a) infant, (b) maternal mortality by major ethnic groups including Indians and Metis?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Statistics Canada reports the following: 1. The following tables A and B show the following: Table A: The number of Infant Deaths and Infant Mortality Rate for Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1970-1974. (Infant Mortality Rate is defined as the number of Infant Deaths per 1,000 Live Births). Table B: The number of Maternal Deaths and Maternal Mortality Rate for Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1970-1974. (Maternal Mortality Rate is defined as the number of Maternal Deaths per 10,000 Live Births).

NOTE: It may be observed that the trend has been one of appreciable and general decline in the above mortality rates over the period under review.

2. Unfortunately, the data by ethnic origin are either not available or very incomplete; the only major ethnic group for which the requested mortality figures are available is for Indians; these data are confined only to six provinces and Territories. The tables C and D show the following: Table C: The number of Infant Deaths and Infant Mortality Rate for Indians for six Provinces and Territories, 1970-1973. Table D: The number of Maternal Deaths for Indians for six Provinces and Territories, 1970-1973; The Maternal Mortality Rates have not been worked out because of the very small number of deaths.

Table A
Infant Deaths and Infant Mortality Rates—Canada and Provinces

	1970		1971		1972		1973		1974	
	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
Canada	7,001	18.8	6,356	17.5	5,938	17.1	5,339	15.5	5,192	15.0
Newfoundland	273	21.8	293	22.9	267	20.7	230	19.3	181	17.7
Prince Edward Island	43	22.0	46	21.9	39	19.4	30	15.9	34	17.5
Nova Scotia	245	17.3	265	18.6	228	16.8	206	15.5	185	14.3
New Brunswick	227	19.7	204	16.7	204	17.3	173	15.1	173	15.1
Quebec	1,888	20.6	1,640	18.4	1,500	17.9	1,378	16.4	1,291	15.1
Ontario	2,271	16.9	1,990	15.3	1,908	15.3	1,740	14.1	1,666	13.4
Manitoba	344	18.9	316	17.5	329	18.9	278	16.4	272	15.7
Saskatchewan	368	22.4	325	20.2	300	19.4	261	17.6	313	20.7
Alberta	612	19.1	548	17.9	511	17.5	416	14.2	449	15.1
British Columbia	623	16.9	653	18.7	580	16.8	575	16.7	572	16.1
Yukon	16	35.5	13	25.7	12	26.6	7	16.7	12	24.2
North West Territories	91	68.1	63	49.0	60	48.4	45	37.4	44	42.2

Rate per 1,000 Live Births

Table B
Maternal Deaths and Maternal Mortality Rates—Canada and Provinces

Canada	75	2.0	66	1.8	54	1.6	37	1.1	35	1.0
Newfoundland	5	3.9	1	0.8	2	1.6	2	1.7	1	1.0
Prince Edward Island	—	—	—	—	1	5.0	—	—	—	—
Nova Scotia	2	1.4	7	4.9	1	0.7	—	—	1	0.8
New Brunswick	2	1.7	—	—	1	0.8	1	0.9	1	0.9
Quebec	22	2.4	20	2.2	18	2.2	10	1.2	12	1.4
Ontario	27	2.0	25	1.9	14	1.1	14	1.1	12	1.0
Manitoba	4	2.2	2	1.1	1	0.6	—	—	—	—
Saskatchewan	3	1.8	2	1.2	5	3.2	1	0.7	3	2.0
Alberta	4	1.3	3	1.0	4	1.4	4	1.4	1	0.3
British Columbia	5	1.4	6	1.7	4	1.2	5	1.5	3	0.8
Yukon	—	—	—	—	1	22.2	—	—	—	—
North West Territories	1	7.5	—	—	2	16.1	—	—	1	9.6

Rate per 10,000 Live Births

Order Paper Questions

Table C
Infant Deaths and Infant Mortality Rate—Indians

	1970		1971		1972		1973	
	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
Prince Edward Island	—	—	3	214.3	—	—	—	—
Nova Scotia	—	—	4	32.5	2	15.3	4	33.3
New Brunswick	7	50.4	2	14.7	5	33.6	—	—
Quebec	33	50.5	25	34.0	33	54.9	35	56.7
Saskatchewan	103	52.8	88	45.6	93	48.1	58	31.9
British Columbia	117	61.7	95	53.6	73	41.9	70	40.8
Yukon	5	47.2	3	30.6	5	57.5	5	70.4
North West Territories	18	55.6	14	44.6	11	36.9	9	34.5

Per 1,000 Live Births

Table D
Maternal Deaths—Indians

Prince Edward Island				
Nova Scotia				
New Brunswick				
Quebec	1			
Saskatchewan		2	3	
Alberta	3			
British Columbia				1
Yukon				
North West Territories			1	

FATTAH REPORT

Question No. 5,010—**Mr. Brisco:**

Was Dr. Ezzat A. Fattah's report entitled "The Canadian Public and the Death Penalty—A Study of a Social Attitude" his first report prepared for the government on the subject and, if not (a) on what date was the previous one undertaken, (b) on what date was it finished, (c) how much did it cost?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Dr. E. A. Fattah's report entitled "The Canadian Public and the Death Penalty—A Study of a Social Attitude" was not the first report prepared for the Ministry of the Solicitor General on the subject. Previously, he had prepared a similar report entitled "A Study of the Deterrent Effect of Capital Punishment with Special Reference to the Canadian Situation". However, the latter report did not contain any analysis of public attitudes per se. (a) June 15, 1971. (b) November 1, 1971. (c) $4,990.

RCMP—PENSIONS

Question No. 5,018—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. How many retired Royal Canadian Mounted Police personnel are receiving pensions, including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the following brackets (a) less than $20.00 per month, (b) $20.00 to $29.99 per month, (c) $30.00 to $39.99 per month, (d) $40.00 to $49.99 per month, (e) $50.00 to $59.99 per month, (f) $60.00 to $69.99 per month, (g) $70.00 to $79.99 per month, (h) $80.00 to $89.99 per month, (*i*) $90.00 to $99.99 per month, (j) $100.00 to $149.99 per month, (k) $150.00 to $199.99 per month, (l) $200.00 to $249.99 per month, (m) $250.00 to $299.99 per month, (n) $300.00 per month and over?

2. How many widows of RCMP personnel or of retired RCMP personnel are receiving pensions, including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the brackets indicated in the above question?

3. What is the number of retired RCMP personnel and also the number of widows of RCMP personnel or of retired RCMP personnel presently residing in each province?

[Mr. Roy (Laval).]

4. In respect of how many orphans of RCMP personnel are pensions being paid and what is the average amount thereof?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): 1. (a) 1. (b) 8. (c) 61. (d) 3. (e) 12. (f) 44. (g) 43. (h) 11. (i) 32. (j) 110. (k) 191. (l) 281. (m) 331. (n) 2,091.

2. (a) 6. (b) 7. (c) 7. (d) 8. (e) 5. (f) 13. (g) 10. (h) 17. (i) 6. (j) 50. (k) 50. (l) 36. (m) 33. (n) 78.

3. Province	Retired RCMP Personnel	Widows
Newfoundland	58	7
Prince Edward Island	21	2
Nova Scotia	264	19
New Brunswick	128	8
Quebec	213	19
Ontario	665	79
Manitoba	154	17
Saskatchewan	169	19
Alberta	458	44
British Columbia	989	103
Yukon	14	—
North West Territories	26	3
Outside Canada	60	6

4. Total Number of Children—142. Average monthly payment to children—$47.19.

DREE—NUMBER OF COPIES AND COST OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1969-1975

Question No. 5,036—**Mr. Jarvis:**

How many copies of the Annual Report of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for (a) 1969-70, (b) 1970-71, (c) 1971-72, (d) 1972-73, (e) 1973-74, (f) 1974-75 were printed for or by the Department and, in each case, at what cost?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):

	Quantity	Approximate Cost
(a) 1969-70 Annual Report	5,000	$6,000
(b) 1970-71 Annual Report	5,000	6,000
(c) 1971-72 Annual Report	15,000	12,000
(d) 1972-73 Annual Report	10,000	7,000
(e) 1973-74 Annual Report	10,000	7,400
(f) 1974-75 Annual Report and Review	35,000	33,000

[*English*]

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO ADD NEW DEFINITIONS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, April 28, consideration of Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have a long-standing arrangement to appear at 3.30 before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs in respect of my estimates. For that reason I will have to leave the chamber then, but my parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Montreal-Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), will be present and will be following the debate.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for the annoncement about his busy schedule. I think an answer to the question asked today in the House is of great pertinence, particularly to the Atlantic area. The target for the reduction of the inflationary rate in Canada is much lower than the target and the anticipated rate of reduction of inflation in the United States. I suppose no area of Canada is more affected by such a situation than the Atlantic area. Our dealings, to a very large degree, depend not only upon the success of the economy of Canada as a whole, but upon our competitive position in relation to producers in the markets of the world and in the United States. Every time the economy of Canada is not in pace with that of the United States, the Atlantic area suffers much more than the rest of Canada.

● (1510)

Whether it be in respect of wood products, agricultural or any other products, we are constantly in competition either in United States markets or world markets with products produced there. If, for instance, one is involved in the paper industry, one finds oneself in competition with that industry in the state of Maine and throughout the eastern coast of the United States as far south as Georgia. Every advantage they can obtain from a declining rate of

inflation is detrimental to our forestry and agricultural industries, at least in the Atlantic area. It is, therefore, the plea of that area that the government improve its target. The government must reduce the time-span required to reduce the inflationary structure and prevent the undue hardship which would fall on the Atlantic area.

If they, per chance—and I hope they do—reach the 2 per cent rate in the target time mentioned today in the United States, this certainly will place an undue cost on the Atlantic area. I think this is particularly pertinent in view of the fact that Anti-Inflation Board rulings already have decreed that workers in the Atlantic area are not entitled to wages equivalent to those of workers in other parts of Canada. Two instances have been cited. The first is in respect of the pulp and paper industry in the city of Saint John, which had been closing the gap but had not completely closed it in respect of the wages received by comparable industry in central Canada and on the British Columbia coast. They were also not allowed by the board to attain the wage level paid in the sugar industry.

It has been extremely difficult for this particular industry to obtain help at the rates of pay that have been paid. While the industry had tried, in the negotiations with its workers, to apply a rate which would provide stability with regard to the work force, this was rolled back by the Anti-Inflation Board. When one couples this with the policy of the government of Canada concerning regional wages in different parts of Canada, and when the same wages under certain agreements between the government of Canada and the unions are not paid in the Atlantic area, there is a discriminatory structure which does no good to the Atlantic area on an economic basis.

The basic structure, of course, requires co-operation among the government, management, and all other facets of our society. This is an aspect which has been lacking while the government has been trying to administer this bill. Therefore, the quicker the government gets out of its present posture in respect of price and wage controls, the better it will be for the amenities of the various groups in Canada, and the better it will be for Canada as a whole.

We cannot conduct ourselves on the basis of confrontation with labour. We cannot conduct ourselves on the basis of confrontation with industry. We cannot conduct ourselves on the basis of confrontation with the provinces. We must change the pattern and talk about the things this government intends to do, so that there will be some accord when the government comes up with a final policy.

Like so many other pieces of legislation, this bill was not presented to parliament by a government which had had proper discussion with all the other forces in Canada or which had properly explained the legislation, or its necessity, to the people of Canada at any stage and explained to the manufacturer and the labourer the real need and necessity for such a program. Instead, there has been confrontation.

The government of Canada suggested it borrowed this policy from the opposition. Mr. Speaker, it must be made abundantly clear, in spite of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said in answer to a question today, that although he may have borrowed the semblance of a policy, obviously he did not borrow the policy of the opposition. While there may be an element of relationship between the anti-infla-

tion legislation we have on the statute books and what the opposition would have brought in, it is not the policy of the opposition which has been brought in.

I believe the time has come when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) should not confront and challenge the people. Government speakers, as they go back and forth across the country, should not tell the people what to do. Instead, they should show leadership by giving information and by answering questions in this House. They should give forthright and full information to the voters across Canada concerning the implications and complications of our economic structure. If this were done, the amendment presently before us should be accepted, because it would not take more than 2½ years to bring about the changes that are required in our economy.

The Canadian people in Saint John and other areas of Canada should not be kicked around as they are by this government. Canadians are good people. They can, and will, take good advice. They will follow when they are well led, but they cannot accept confrontation as we have it. This legislation is directly responsible for the approach taken by labour, whether it be at the level of the school teacher or of the janitor, not because these people are not prepared to make their contribution to our society but because they have been confronted. This is what is wrong. This is why the adoption of this amendment would be good for the government, would be good for the opposition and would be good for the whole of Canada.

Legislation has continually hurt the Atlantic area. Whether it be in respect of transportation, fishing or agriculture, it would seem that the policies of this government, through Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance, have been to look at dollars and how to save them, but not to look at the consequences of saving money in particular fields. This is but another example of the inequities and inequalities which have existed and which will continue to exist in the Atlantic area until we have a total policy presented by the government of Canada to bring the whole of Canada ahead at once without neglecting any part of Canada.

This piece of legislation gives no consideration to the exceptions which invariably will be necessary in one part of Canada or another. This legislation does improve the basic principle of the Anti-Inflation Board; there is no question about that. Without the recognition by government of exceptions, without the recognition by government of the requirements in certain specific areas, without a cost-benefit study of the impact of legislation upon certain areas of Canada, this country cannot go forward as a country but will only go forward in those parts in which the government is particularly interested and apparently in which it holds most of its seats.

● (1520)

I appeal to the government to accept this amendment. Let us not confront the people; let us publicly consult them. There was a reference by the Prime Minister today to consultation, but there was no indication that the nation would have any idea of the type of consultation that would take place. There was no indication that the public would ever know what was said in the private and secretive type of consultations which he implied would take place. This is not the way in which a government should govern. It should be for what is right and fair in its policies.

I ask that when this legislation passes, as it will, unquestionably, with the weight of the government, that the minister give careful consideration—as he directs those controlling the anti-inflation program—to the impact of the individual agreement upon an individual area before he lowers the boom and says "No." Let us try to create an element of equality of earning opportunity across this nation. Let us not deny those in the east the privileges which are enjoyed in the extreme west, the prairies and the centre of Canada. We do not need to be treated as exceptions—we just want to be treated as Canadians!

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for a few minutes in response to some remarks that were made yesterday. I want to remind the House that this bill is before parliament because the NDP, both at the time of the passage of the original legislation and as a result of Standing Order 26 in a special debate, insisted on the necessity for legislation to provide for appeal procedures for workers and salary earners in Canada against decisions made under the anti-inflation program.

I noticed yesterday that none of the members of the official opposition mentioned that that happens to be the main purpose of the bill, that is, to provide some justice and fair play to workers in Canada. They spent a great deal of time weeping and wailing for insurance companies, corporations, etc., but they forgot to mention the main purport of the bill, that is, to establish an appeal procedure for wage and salary earners in Canada, many of whom have already been unjustly treated as a result of the decision of the AIB and the administrator.

Yesterday, a spokesman of the official opposition stated that these kinds of controls should have limitations, that they should expire next year. The amendment reads, "May 1, 1977". They tore the program to shreds and, as my leader said earlier in the debate, they damned the progress from stem to gudgeon, then moved an amendment to keep it going for another year. I have not yet seen any proper reconciliation of that kind of nonsense.

Mr. Stevens: Sit down and I will tell you.

Mr. Benjamin: The issue is not how long the controls should be in place. Surely the issue is what kind of controls there should be, to whom they should apply, and how people will be affected by them. If the controls had started with those on high incomes, those who make high profits, those who have incomes from high interest rates, and if they had begun at the top and worked downward, whether it be incomes from profits, interest rates, investments or wages and salaries, then surely that would have been some kind of justice and equity in a program to fight inflation.

I heard the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) complain yesterday about the "poor" banks, insurance and finance companies that will be brought under the control program. He shed tears for them. Surely that is precisely where the program should have started, with banks, insurance and finance companies. Surely they should have been the first to come under a program to

fight inflation. One of the spokesmen of the official opposition cries for the "poor" banks, insurance and finance companies, but I did not hear a word from the official opposition yesterday about any guarantees that old age pensioners should get what is allowed as a minimum under the anti-inflation program, that is, $600 a year. I would have hoped the official opposition would have taken action to impress upon this government the importance of bringing in immediately a $50 a month increase for old age pensioners.

People on low wages and salaries and people on pensions are not the ones who cause inflation; they are the first victims of inflation. But the whole program attacks these people first. The hon. member for Edmonton West worries about what will happen to the banks, insurance and finance companies when they are brought under the controls. That is the evidence the people of Canada have as to where the Conservative party stands when it comes to fighting inflation. They will look after their friends, the rich and the "barefoot" boys from Bay Street and James Street. They talk a good fight about workers, but when it comes to the crunch, when it comes to proposing legislation or moving amendments to legislation, they worry about banks, insurance and finance companies. It is not the people whose wage increases have been rolled back or whose bargaining process has been interfered with who cause inflation. They are the ones who are attempting to keep up with and to catch up with inflation. But the program picks on them first.

Another member of the official opposition yesterday was worrying about the "poor" professionals, the "poor" doctors, lawyers, accountants, architects and engineers whose average income is at least double that of the average wage and salary earner in Canada, those poor fellows, including colleagues in my caucus—who, by the way, do not practice law while they are members of parliament—

Mr. Stevens: Nobody would go to them.

Mr. Benjamin: —those poor professionals! A maximum of $2,400 a year is not enough for them, according to members of the official opposition. I suggest it should be the other way around. Those on high income should receive $600 a year, and those on low income should receive $2,400.

Mr. Friesen: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: But I did not hear a word on that from the official opposition yesterday. Let us go on to some more remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton West. He said that the insurance and casualty companies will be withdrawing from Canada because of their poor cash flow under this program. I interjected at that point and said "Good". The hon. member for Edmonton West thought it was terrible of me to suggest it would be good if the casualty insurance companies withdrew from Canada.

We in the NDP, and in the CCF before that, under the leadership of my colleague, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), have acted on the principle that there is something immoral about making a profit from the misfortunes of others. We have had a compulsory automobile insurance program in Saskatchewan since 1947, and it works. I would tell my friends from British Columbia that in Saskatchewan, in the first two or three years, we had problems—I think we even lost money—but we provided insurance coverage at cost and we protected innocent victims of automobile accidents. The objective was not to make profit. But when Saskatchewan government insurance made a profit, that profit stayed in Saskatchewan and was invested in Saskatchewan industry and in Saskatchewan municipalities.

● (1530)

Where do these private auto insurance and casualty companies, about which the hon. member for Edmonton West is so concerned, get their money? They get it from the premium dollars they collect from the people of Canada. Where does it go? Does it go to the provinces or cities where the insurance is sold? No way! These are the kind of corporate citizens we do not need. In our opinion, profit taking and profit making at the expense of the misfortunes of others has no place in society.

The government of Canada is very reluctant to bring these corporations under the controls program. Their whole history is a crime against humanity. The percentage of the premium dollars they have paid out is not half of that in the province of Saskatchewan or, before too long, in the province of Manitoba. If the program is not totally ruined in British Columbia by the present government, the experience there will prove to be the same.

Yesterday the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) pointed out that the government is ignoring its own program and increasing passport fees, airport landing fees, and so forth. That is true. I should like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) to reconcile something for me. Yesterday he interjected when the hon. member for Fundy-Royal was speaking. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) says that with regard to transportation the key is that the user shall pay. He is worrying about the $143 million in subsidies to rail passenger service. There is in the order of $500 million in losses in the operation of air services which taxpayers must make up. There is a $51 million loss in the St. Lawrence Seaway, $15 million in the National Harbours Board, and according to the latest figures I have, for 1972, the moneys which had to come out of general revenues, after collection of licence fees, gasoline taxes, excise taxes, and so forth, for streets, roads and highways in Canada amounted to over $1 billion.

If we follow the logic of the Minister of Transport to its conclusion and make the user pay, that will obviously mean increased rail, air and bus fares and increased licence fees, gasoline taxes, and so forth. That may help the Minister of Finance in terms of not having to put up so many tax dollars for those programs, but I should like to ask him what that does to the accessibility and availability of an essential service, namely, transportation. Everyone has to use transportation. What does that do to people who are on low incomes, and people who live in isolated areas?

If the Minister of Finance had a fair tax law and raised revenues to subsidize all modes of transportation based on ability to pay, we could equalize freight rates and passenger fares in all modes of transportation. We could cease discriminating against people in this country because of where they happen to live. We could put an end to the policy of the Minister of Transport as a result of which, if it is implemented and carried out, only the rich and those

on expense accounts will be able to travel. I should like to ask the minister how he reconciles that with his anti-inflation program and how that principle is humane and civilized.

I would also point out that the failure to have a fair tax law is one of the things which has put the government into its difficulties. It has failed to apply an anti-inflation program to those who cause inflation. That has caused the people of Canada to be cynical about it. The hon. member for Fundy-Royal spoke about this at length yesterday. There is a great deal of cynicism. When a doctor can get a $2,400 increase in his income from fees, and another $2,400, $2,500 or $3,000 more income by way of what he calls increased costs of operation, and any income he gets from increased productivity, so-called, which means seeing more patients, and that is exempt under the anti-inflation program, let us not ask wage earners and pensioners to support the program or to pat the minister or this government on the back for it. There will not be that co-operation.

I am very pleased that the government of Saskatchewan has not signed an agreement with the federal government. I am pleased that the government of Saskatchewan saved our public employees from the tender mercies of this government and the Anti-Inflation Board and its administrator. We in Saskatchewan are going to allow increases which are fair and reasonable, and we are going to take into account regional differences, historical relationships and catch-up, whether the Minister of Finance and the government of Canada like it or not.

My final point is that I do not see the logic in wanting a program to end a year from next May 1, a year from this Saturday. I ask my Conservative friends why they want to set that kind of early deadline when they know full well, like everyone else in the country, that the rich and the powerful can sit and wait out that deadline, just as they did in the United States. Here they knew when the freeze would end. They knew when phase one, phase two, phase three and phase four would end, and they waited out each phase. In fact, the meat packing industry in the United States made it clear publicly. They were perfectly frank and honest. The day after the previously announced end of the controls, up went their prices.

Mr. Stevens: Your leader wants to end it on Saturday.

Mr. Benjamin: That is right, because the whole program is no good—and that is exactly what the official opposition has been saying. They want to keep for another year a program that is no good.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They want to suffer some more.

Mr. Benjamin: If you set a deadline of May 1, 1977, those who can afford to wait can reduce their inventories, operate on their cash reserves, sit on their savings and high current incomes and wait until May 1, 1977. Then they can raise their incomes through prices, profits, dividends or fees.

However, those who are on wages, salaries and pensions cannot afford to wait until the program ends, whether it ends on May 1, 1977, or a year beyond that, which is the way the government wants it. They cannot afford to wait, but the rich and powerful can. This anti-inflation program will have little meaningful effect on those who cause inflation, the profit takers and the profit makers, those who take all they can get and who take every fast buck they can—land speculators, professionals, corporations and financial institutions. I do not want anyone in this place to try to tell me that anyone whose income is less than $15,000 per year is causing inflation. Those people are victims of inflation, and they are still trying to catch up.

In typical free enterprise, old-line party fashion, the program started at the wrong end. It was backwards. It started with the poor and with wage and salary earners. It did not start with the rich and powerful. It did not start with corporations, profits or prices. I predict that however long this program last, the fight against inflation will be carried on the back of pensioners, wage and salary earners. People who earn incomes the size of the incomes of members of parliament will not really be sacrificing anything in the fight against inflation.

People who receive large incomes from interest, dividends, land speculation and house speculation are not going to be hurt. If this government had brought in a program which fought inflation and affected those who cause our domestic inflation, it would have had the support and good will of the people of this country and members of all parties in this House, with the exception of a few cry-babies in the official opposition who keep worrying about those "poor" insurance companies, finance companies, banks and trust companies. They would have had the good will and co-operation of the citizens of this country. They would have fought inflation in a fair and equitable manner by attacking those who cause inflation, not the wage and salary earners and pensioners.

● (1540)

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to support the amendment moved by my leader, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), that this program end on May 1, 1976; that is, this Saturday.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I recognize the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). I should like to suggest to the hon. member that he confine himself to the amendment as he has already spoken on motions Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to speak on the amendment proposed by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) that the program end on Saturday. I wish to speak on this matter because I feel there should be clarification in this House as a result partly of the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and partly of the remarks of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby and others.

The Minister of Finance indicated that he feels there are inconsistencies in the position of the official opposition with respect to controls and our anti-inflationary program. I challenge that statement, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I think we are the only party in this House that has been consistent for the past three or four years on the question of what is a suitable anti-inflationary program for Canada. When I look at the record, I find it most startling that the Prime

Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in particular, has vacillated so dramatically on this question of controls.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby which I would suggest is probably put forward on the recommendation of the president of the United Autoworkers Union, as I think they take most of their instructions directly from that union—

An hon. Member: Oh, come off it!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: When we look at the background of this question it is very clear why we in the official opposition take the position that we do today. We proposed three motions. Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are basically complementary and simply would have the effect of changing clause 46(2) of Bill C-89 so that the legislation would expire on May 1, 1977, as opposed to December 31, 1978. That change would simply bring the clause in line with the amendment we proposed at report stage when Bill C-73 was before the House last fall. That would, in effect, give the government 18 months to show that their controls program works, but if they felt that controls should be extended they would have to come back to parliament for authority.

As it stands, not only does Bill C-89 expire on December 31, 1978, but the government can at any time, by order in council, extend it for an indefinite period after three days' debate in this House. With the majority the government has, presumably it would simply endorse the order in council and we might find ourselves subjected to controls much longer than to December 31, 1978. Our position is clear, Mr. Speaker. We say that we will go along with an 18-month period. Let the government put their controls program into effect during that period, and then if they feel they need to extend the time, let them pass their order in council and come back to parliament. At that time we will examine the success or failure of the program.

Today, in answer to a question put by my leader, the Prime Minister confirmed once again that he intends to inflict these controls, presumably in their present form, on the nation for 2½ years. Mr. Speaker, 2½ years beyond today means they will be in place for three years. What a change in the attitude of the Prime Minister! On May 3, 1974, in answer to a question concerning wage and price controls, the Prime Minister gave this startling reply as reported at page 2004 of *Hansard*:

I am quite certain it is not the right approach to inflation.

On May 27, 1974, speaking at a nomination meeting in Etobicoke, Ontario, the Prime Minister said:

Well, we're going to bring inflation under control, that I pledge to you. It's not going to be any swift knockout, no 90 days of wonder and amazement, no NDP circus of slogans. But I'm confident we've got a grip on the problem and the continued implementation of selective measures, as we've been doing, will wrestle inflation to the ground.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I thought you warned the present speaker to confine his remarks to the subamendment. I think this should be done.

An hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I am basically giving our position on why we feel the control period should be only 18 months, as opposed to the NDP suggestion that it should end next Saturday and as opposed to the government position that it should last for 39 months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: On June 29, 1974, at a constituency meeting in Cumberland-Colchester North, the Prime Minister said controls were "a disaster looking for a place to happen". Mr. Speaker, have they found a place in which it can happen, now that the Prime Minister feels we should be subjected to controls for a further 2½ years? The point I want to make is that we believe that controls for a temporary period, with suitable monetary restraints, can be put together as a package to confine inflation. We believe that it is extremely important, however, that the controls not be left in a permanent stance.

On the question of whether the government has accepted or not accepted our controls program, I can only refer to the remarks of the Prime Minister at a Liberal party convention in Ottawa on November 9, 1975, where he quite candidly stated that their controls program was not our controls program. Surely, then, there is no suggestion that the controls program we are now living with is a duplication of the Conservative program—at least not as far as the Prime Minister is concerned, and I believe the Minister of Finance indicated that as well.

The turnabout in the government's attitude since the former minister of finance was in office strikes me as strange. On June 23, in his budget speech, the former minister of finance said categorically:

But there would have been—and are—immense difficulties and disadvantages in such a course of action. Government would have to interfere in every type of business decision and wage settlement. To a far greater extent than in a voluntary program, a new bureaucratic appartus would have to be set up. New types of inequity would be created. The flexibility of the market economy in directing resources where they are most needed would be impaired. Dislocations would occur.

These costs would be worth paying if direct controls could be successfully imposed. If this were the case, we might well achieve lower price and cost increases without higher unemployment. But the success of such a program would depend crucially on widespread public support. As I have said before, I believe that we can resort to direct controls only when there is a public conviction of the need for such action. That point has not been reached.

Some time between then and October 13 there was obviously a great transformation involving the Minister of Finance who, as recorded in *Hansard* of April 30, 1975, suggested that wage and price controls were pure foolishness. Our position was set out clearly on January 17, 1974, when the former leader of the opposition said:

● (1550)

Our position is to put into place an economic stabilization plan incorporating for a temporary period strict mandatory controls of prices and incomes. The time we envisage for such strict temporary controls is in the order of 18 months to two years. This would not require a massive new bureaucracy—

He went on to say:

The freeze period should be as short as possible.

We certainly would not have wanted to see it continued. Then he said:

Our approach calls for judiciously balanced monetary and fiscal policies, and it demands exemplary self-restraint on the part of the government and governments generally in relation to their own spending—

That was our position then, and it is our position now. That is why, when Bill C-73 was being debated, we proposed an amendment to shorten the time to 18 months. That is why we proposed motions Nos. 1 and 2 in connection with this bill, and that is why we shall vote against the leader of the opposition's suggestion to terminate the program on Saturday.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You mean the leader of the New Democratic Party. You said the leader of the opposition.

Mr. Stevens: I am sorry; I meant the suggestion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You mean the leader of the real opposition.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I expect we shall deal with motion No. 3 today. I conclude by saying that we shall vote against the subamendment proposed by the leader of the New Democratic Party. Actually, that is the amendment to motion No. 1.

Mr. Benjamin: But you have just finished convincing us that it is a good subamendment.

Mr. Stevens: If the hon. member of the NDP will read my remarks in *Hansard*, he will note the point I am trying to make. We shall vote in favour of motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, but we shall vote against Bill C-89 if our amendments are not carried, because we feel we cannot be party to a bill which seeks to inflict controls on Canadians until December 31, 1978.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) to motion No. 1 standing in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

And during the ringing of the bells:

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Why not defer this vote until we have dealt with motion No. 3?

An hon. Member: Too late.

The House divided on the amendment to motion No. 1 (Mr. Broadbent) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 126*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Firth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilbert
Hogan
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Leggatt
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Symes—17

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Alexander
Allmand
Andre (Calgary Centre)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blaker
Blouin
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Corriveau
Côté
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dick
Dinsdale
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Halliday
Harquail
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLean
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinnon
McRae
Milne
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Pinard
Portelance
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Roche
Rompkey
Roy (Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schellenberger
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stollery
Tessier
Towers
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner

Messrs.

Watson	Whittaker	Yanakis
Wenman	Wise	Yewchuk
Whelan	Woolliams	Young—161.

● (1640)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The question is now on the main motion in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens).

The House divided on motion No. 1 (Mr. Stevens) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 127*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander	Elzinga	Mazankowski
Allard	Epp	McCain
Andre (Calgary Centre)	Fairweather	McCleave
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)	Firth	McGrath
Baldwin	Forrestall	McKenzie
Balfour	Friesen	McKinnon
Bawden	Gauthier (Roberval)	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Beatty	Gilbert	Murta
Benjamin	Halliday	Neil
Blackburn	Hnatyshyn	Nowlan
Brewin	Hogan	Nystrom
Caouette (Villeneuve)	Horner	Oberle
Clark (Rocky Mountain)	Jarvis	Orlikow
Coates	Jelinek	Paproski
Crouse	Johnston	Patterson
Darling	Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Peters
Dick	Lambert (Edmonton West)	Roche
Dinsdale	Leggatt	Schellenberger
Dionne (Kamouraska)	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Stanfield
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	MacLean	Stevens
Ellis	Macquarrie	Symes
	Marshall	Towers
		Wenman
		Whittaker
		Wise
		Woolliams
		Yewchuk—70.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott	Duclos	Lefebvre
Allmand	Dupont	Lessard
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Dupras	Loiselle (Chambly)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)	Duquet	Lumley
Béchard	Faulkner	MacDonald (Cardigan)
Bégin (Miss)	Fleming	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Blaker	Flynn	MacFarlane
Blouin	Foster	MacGuigan
Breau	Fox	Mackasey
Buchanan	Francis	Marceau
Bussières	Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)	Marchand (Langelier)
Caccia	Gendron	Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Cafik	Goodale	McIsaac
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)	Goyer	McRae
Caron	Gray	Milne
Chrétien	Guay (St. Boniface)	Munro (Hamilton East)
Clermont	Guay (Lévis)	Nicholson (Miss)
Collenette	Guilbault	O'Connell
Comtois	Haidasz	Olivier
Corriveau	Herbert	Ouellet
Côté	Hopkins	Pearsall
Cullen	Isabelle	Pelletier
Cyr	Jamieson	Penner
Danson	Kaplan	Pinard
Daudlin	Lajoie	Portelance
De Bané	Lalonde	Railton
Demers	Lang	
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Langlois	
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)	Laniel	
	Lapointe	
	LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)	

Raines	Sauvé (Mrs.)	Tessier
Reid	Sharp	Trudeau
Richardson	Smith (Saint-Jean)	Trudel
Roberts	Stanbury	Turner
Robinson	Stewart (Cochrane)	Watson
Rompkey	Stollery	Whelan
Roy (Laval)		Yanakis
		Young—107.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 1 lost. In accordance with the agreement previously made by the House, I also declare motion No. 2 lost. Therefore, the question is on motion No. 3 in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). Mr. Stevens moves:

That Bill C-89, an act to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, be amended in clause 11 by striking out lines 27 to 38 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(6) Where, at any time after August 31, 1976, and before July 1, 1978, a motion for the consideration of the House of Commons, signed by not less than 50 members of the House, is filed with the Speaker to the effect that this act shall expire on a date before December 31, 1978, that is specified in the motion, the House of Commons shall within the first fifteen days next after the motion is filed that the House is sitting, in accordance with the rules of the House, take up and consider the motion.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment which I wish to move to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The House may wish to deal with the amendment or to debate it. I want to suggest that the way the amendment reads now, it denies in fact the rights of two other political parties in this chamber.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benjamin: The hon. member who said "Hear, hear" surely agrees that his rights are the same as the rights of all other members of the House. Also, he should consider the well-being of his own party in some other provinces when it comes to the rights of members of parliament. This amendment, by specifying the number "50," in fact denies the rights of two parties in this House.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benjamin: Since there was a precedent, where 10 or 20 members of parliament on the signing of a motion may bring forward a matter for debate, and on a prior occasion that was agreed to in the House by all parties, or certainly all opposition parties, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That motion No. 3 be amended by deleting therefrom the phrase "50 members of the House" and substituting therefor the phrase "10 members of the House".

Some hon. Members: Question.

● (1650)

Mr. Speaker: The question, therefore, is upon the amendment to motion No. 3 by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Is the House disposed to proceed with the taking of the recorded division without the necessity of calling in the members?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the amendment to motion No. 3 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 128*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allard
Baldwin
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Caouette (Villeneuve)
Dionne (Kamouraska)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Firth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilbert
Hogan
Johnston
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Leggatt
McCleave
Orlikow
Peters
Symes—19.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Alexander
Allmand
Andre (Calgary Centre)
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blaker
Blouin
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Clermont
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Corriveau
Côté
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Darling
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dick
Dinsdale
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Francis
Friesen
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Halliday
Herbert
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Horner
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle (Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLean
Macquarrie
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McGrath
McIsaac
McKenzie
McKinnon
McRae
Milne
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nowlan
Oberle
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Paproski
Patterson
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Pinard
Portelance
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Roche
Rompkey
Roy (Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Schellenberger
Sharp
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stevens
Stewart (Cochrane)
Tessier
Towers
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Wenman
Whelan
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yanakis
Yewchuk
Young—155.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The question, therefore, is on motion No. 3 standing in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens).

The House divided on motion No. 3 (Mr. Stevens) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 129*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Andre (Calgary Centre)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Brewin
Clark (Rocky Mountain)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dick
Dinsdale
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Firth
Forrestall
Friesen
Gilbert
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Hogan
Horner
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Leggatt
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacLean
Macquarrie
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle
Orlikow
Paproski
Patterson
Peters
Roche
Schellenberger
Stanfield
Stevens
Symes
Towers
Wenman
Whittaker
Wise
Woolliams
Yewchuk—65.

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blaker
Blouin
Breau
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss) (South Western Nova)
Caron
Chrétien

Messrs.

Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Faulkner
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Herbert
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Mackasey
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
McIsaac
McRae
Milne
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Ouellet
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Pinard
Portelance
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Tessier
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—105.

● (1700)

Mr. Speaker: I therefore declare motion No. 3 lost.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-89, to amend the Anti-Inflation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair did not declare the motion carried on division. The Chair is inquiring whether the motion ought to be carried on division or whether the yeas and nays should be taken. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Is the House agreed to the taking of the division without the necessity of calling in the members again?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 130)

YEAS

Messrs.

Abbott
Allard
Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaker
Blouin
Breau
Brewin
Buchanan
Bussières
Caccia
Cafik
Campbell (Miss)
(South Western Nova)
Caouette
(Villeneuve)
Caron
Chrétien
Clermont
Collenette
Comtois
Corriveau
Côté
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Daudlin
De Bané
Demers
Dick
Dionne
(Kamouraska)
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas
(Bruce-Grey)
Douglas
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Faulkner
Firth
Fleming
Flynn
Foster
Fox
Francis
Gauthier
(Roberval)
Gauthier
(Ottawa-Vanier)
Gendron
Gilbert
Goodale
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay
(Lévis)
Guilbault
Herbert
Hogan
Hopkins
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kaplan
Knowles
(Winnipeg North Centre)
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lapointe
LeBlanc
(Westmorland-Kent)
Lefebvre
Leggatt
Lessard
Loiselle
(Chambly)
Lumley
MacDonald
(Cardigan)
Macdonald
(Rosedale)
MacFarlane
MacGuigan
Marceau
Marchand
(Langelier)
Marchand
(Kamloops-Cariboo)
McIsaac
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
O'Connell
Olivier
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pearsall
Pelletier
Penner
Peters
Pinard
Portelance
Railton
Raines
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rompkey
Roy
(Laval)
Sauvé (Mrs.)
Sharp
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart
(Cochrane)
Symes
Tessier
Trudel
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—119.

NAYS

Messrs.

Alexander
Andre
(Calgary Centre)
Baker
(Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Balfour
Bawden
Beatty
Clark
(Rocky Mountain)
Coates
Crouse
Darling
Dinsdale
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fairweather
Forrestall
Friesen
Halliday
Hnatyshyn
Horner
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Lambert
(Edmonton West)
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacLean
Macquarrie
Marshall
Mazankowski
McCain
McCleave
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nowlan
Oberle

United Grain Growers

Messrs.

Paproski	Stanfield	Whittaker
Patterson	Stevens	Wise
Roche	Towers	Woolliams
Schellenberger	Wenman	Yewchuk—52.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

● (1710)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Floods—Souris River area—Possible declaration as disaster area; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Transport—Suggestion new policy be developed before elimination of rail subsidies on flour and grain; the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen)—Finance—Alleged importation of agricultural products from United States at below cost of production—Government action.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

[*English*]

UNITED GRAIN GROWERS LIMITED

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion) moved that Bill S-33, respecting United Grain Growers Limited, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on second reading of Bill S-33. The bill is not as contentious as the last piece of business the House just voted on, and I dare say it will enjoy the support of all parties and all members of this House.

It was both a pleasure and privilege to move second reading of Bill S-33, an act respecting United Grain Growers Limited, or UGG as they are commonly known across the prairies. It is a well known, well established prairie grain company which was originally set up by producers to buy and market grain. Since its earliest days it has expanded, as have other co-operative grain companies on the prairies, and become involved in the handling of chemicals, feeds and other matters related to the interests of grain producers.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The company was first organized by act of the Manitoba legislature in 1902, and later incorporated by the Senate and the House of Commons in 1911 under the name of Grain Growers Company Limited. The company has a long and illustrious history of service to western grain producers. It is organized on a co-operative basis, involving producers throughout the western grain growing region. Terms which have become widely used in the last few years in the cattle industry—"cross-bred" and "exotic"—apply, I think, to this particular company. It is a co-operative company with a corporate structure. At least, that is how it was to be set up under the original legislation, as I understand it. At present, UGG is led by a group of producer-elected directors under Mr. A. M. Runciman, president. The company has been not only active in doing an excellent job for its own members and shippers, but has performed good service for all producers of the prairie region.

The principles of the bill the House is considering are fairly simple and straightforward. Bills of a similar nature relating to UGG have been introduced in the House of Commons and passed, over the years. The bill requests an increase in the capital structure of the company from the present level of $12 million to $25 million. There shall be issued, altogether, 1.2 million class A shares at $20 each, and 200,000 class B or membership shares with a par value of $5 each. This will increase the capitalization of the company and enable it to perform the tasks it is required to undertake.

The bill also proposes to allow the company to increase the dividend rate on class A shares, which are in essence preferred shares, from the existing limit of 6.5 per cent to a new limit of 8 per cent, which represents an increase of 1.5 per cent in the interest rate paid. It also seeks to increase the number of shares which may be held by an individual from 2,500 to 5,000. I commend the bill to the House and ask that it be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to place on the record today a few brief comments with respect to Bill S-33. It is a pleasure primarily for two reasons: first, it is a refreshing change whenever this House gives its attention to agricultural legislation—and I regret that these opportunities are all too infrequent—and, second, as a personal comment it pleases me to have an opportunity, as a member from central Canada, to lend my support to a just and deserving cause in some other region of this country, in this case western Canada.

My research indicates that the United Grain Growers was first established and chartered by an act of parliament some 70 years ago, in 1906. My colleague for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. McIsaac) suggested that the company was incorporated by act of the Manitoba legislature. He may well be correct.

The United Grain Growers is a result of the encouragement and foresight of the territorial grain growers association, who with some imagination might be compared to a group similar in nature, namely, the Federation of Agriculture. From a small beginning, under good management and producer participation and support, it has grown and developed with remarkable success. With establishment in

Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, it lists some 475 manager units and operates some 700 grain elevators with terminals in Vancouver and Thunder Bay. It is an agent of the Canadian Wheat Board and, in addition, carries on business transactions in non-board grains, domestic feed grains, farm supplies, feeds and fertilizers. One would be remiss, when talking about the organization, if one did not mention its publication, "Country Guide". This agricultural magazine enjoys excellent readership and distribution throughout the entire country and well beyond our borders.

It is estimated that United Grain Growers handle approximately 16 per cent of the grain grown in western Canada. This bill is not unusual, nor is it unique. In 1941 and in 1965, and perhaps on other occasions, similar bills have been presented with respect to changes deemed necessary and desirable. The bill of 1941 amended the charter of the United Grain Growers to provide for two types of shares. First, it created $20 investment shares to be placed on the exchange, and second it created $5 membership or voting shares, the latter to be held only by members who could be regarded solely as producers or legitimate farmers. This was a desirable amendment because it ensured that this farmer-owned co-operative remained in the hands and under the control of producers. The 1965 amendment enabled the United Grain Growers to pay greater dividend or interest on their shares, up to 5 per cent, with the option of paying an additional 1.5 per cent.

Bill S-33 proposes another suitable revision, if that is allowed: first, an increase in capital from the present $12 million to $25 million; second, the right to increase dividends on some shares by a maximum of 3 per cent, giving a total yield of 8 per cent ; and third, an increase in the number of shares to be held by an individual from 2,500 to 5,000.

● (1720)

The record of this co-operative clearly demonstrates a steady growth and a sound financial position both now and over the years. It is a fine example of a united effort by producers successfully to establish and manage a commercial enterprise. It has served the interests of producers in western Canada over the years and I am confident that with these changes it will continue to do so for generations to come.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate the support of my party for this bill and to further indicate our full support and anxiety for its speedy passage.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, we agree that this legislation should receive speedy passage in this House, in the other place, and royal assent. However, this is an opportunity to make a few points that are appropriate considering the co-operative with which we are dealing. The history goes back to 1906 and involves some of the patron saints in western agriculture, people like George Mothewell, E. A. Partridge and other old-timers in the co-operative movement of the prairies. Some are still alive and are active members of the United Grain Growers, the various wheat pools and farm unions. Hon. members will agree that they deserve full honour, credit and tribute.

United Grain Growers

Co-operatives came into existence as a result of economic tribulations caused by private enterprisers in the so-called free and open market—the grain speculators. Farmers were forced to ban together into co-operatives and start their own elevator companies. As a result, organizations such as the United Grain Growers have grown and expanded. They are the vehicle by which many thousand grain producers in western Canada market their grain. They know they can have confidence in their organization to work on behalf of their best interests.

As the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. McIsaac) pointed out, the legislation allows the United Grain Growers to increase its capitalization from $12 million to $25 million. Not only the United Grain Growers, but the wheat pools as well, will be faced in coming years with the necessity of further modernizing their country elevator system and enlarging their operations. This will be necessary because the pools and the United Grain Growers handle the overwhelming majority of grains marketed in the three prairie provinces. They will obviously need many millions of dollars for these expanded operations. Both the United Grain Growers and the pools have programs to construct new country elevators which will be more modern and efficient. In addition to doing a better job of cleaning, drying and mixing grain, they will have a larger capacity which will allow them to better utilize unit train systems.

The legislation provides that a producer member may hold up to 5,000 class A shares instead of 250. I am confident the additional capital will be used to expand United Grain Growers in the way in which it presently operates. I am confident that none of the money will be used for something like an inland terminal of the nature and kind being promoted by the multinational and international grain dealers such as Cargill and Continental. I know the board of directors, shareholders and members of United Grain Growers will join with the farmers of western Canada in opposing that kind of development. The capital they raise through this legislation will be used to expand their country elevator system. It will serve their organization in many hundreds of shipping points in the three prairie provinces and the Peace River district of British Columbia.

I hope the United Grain Growers, its members, shareholders and board of directors will begin not only to accept but to welcome its employees becoming part of the trade union movement. I speak in particular of the elevator agents, construction and maintenance crews. I hope the shareholders and the board of directors of the United Grain Growers will not just acquiesce but will encourage their country elevator agents, as well as their maintenance and construction crews, to join the Grain Services Union which now has in its ranks all elevator agents, construction and maintenance employees of the Saskatchewan and Manitoba pool elevators.

I know that some individual members have made inquiries and that there have been some quiet meetings and discussions. I am confident the management of United Grain Growers will not throw up any roadblocks or make any threats that will hinder or impede their employees becoming members of the Grain Services Union.

United Grain Growers

In the course of acquiring additional capital from the operations and modernizing their country elevator system, United Grain Growers, as well as the three prairie pools in servicing their members, are running into difficulty because of impediments imposed partly by the federal government and partly by our transportation system. Only today we were informed of a decision by the cabinet which will do a great deal of harm to organizations such as United Grain Growers and will have a direct as well as an indirect interest in not only rapeseed but rapeseed oil and rapeseed meal. The decision by the government came after an appeal by the co-operatives of the three prairie provinces, the Farmers' Union and the three prairie provincial governments to the cabinet against an order by the Canadian Transport Commission to keep freight rates on rapeseed oil and meal at the level at which they were compared to rapeseed.

Even with the rates as they were, 100 pounds of rapeseed crushed in Saskatchewan into 38 pounds of rapeseed oil, and shipped in a jumbo car at the lowest possible rate to Montreal, cost $1.10 a hundredweight. For 62 pounds of meal, made from 100 pounds of crushed rapeseed, it cost 23.5 cents a hundredweight to Thunder Bay or 59 cents a hundredweight to Montreal. However, if that rapeseed were crushed at Montreal, the statutory rates to Thunder Bay of 23.5 cents, and Thunder Bay to Montreal of 44 cents, makes a total of 67.5 cents, compared to a total of 93 cents if the grain is crushed in Saskatchewan. That is the difference. Under the old rates the 25½ cents per hundredweight favoured crushing rapeseed in Montreal or any other point east of Georgian Bay. That is a severe handicap for the rapeseed mills and crushing plants of Western Canada.

● (1730)

When United Grain Growers raise this further capital as proposed in the bill, they will be faced with a further handicap. Let me refer to order in council P.C. 1976-894 of April 13, which was passed by this cabinet:

> His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Transport, pursuant to section 64 of the National Transportation Act, is pleased hereby to vary the following orders and decisions of the Canadian Transport Commission:
>
> (a) Order No. R-16824 dated June 27, 1973;
>
> (b) Order No. R-17016 dated August 2, 1973; and
>
> (c) any other order or decision of the Canadian Transport Commission that is inconsistent with paragraph (d) hereof
>
> to provide
>
> (d) that the following rates or portions of rates for domestic and export movement of rapeseed meal and rapeseed oil from the four rapeseed crushing plants at Altona, Nipawin, Saskatoon and Lethbridge, be established annually at minimum compensatory levels:
>
> (i) rates for rapeseed meal and rapeseed oil moving west;—

That is to Vancouver.

> (ii) rates for rapeseed oil moving east; and
>
> (iii) the portions of rates pertaining to the movement of rapeseed meal east of Thunder Bay or Armstrong, Ontario.

This will mean that the United Grain Growers, Sask Wheat Pool and any other privately owned rapeseed plant in the three prairie provinces will be faced with an even greater differential when it comes to processing rapeseed into rapessed oil or rapeseed meal. I suggest that investment of any of the additional capital that will be raised under this legislation in a rapeseed plant will be difficult to justify or merely to break even on. That is because they will be faced with what in polite language can be called an historical anomaly but which is really outright, rank discrimination, which western Canadians have been facing in terms of our freight rate structure for many decades. After raising this additional capital, if United Grain Growers want to go into rapeseed crushing they will continue to be treated as hewers of wood and drawers of water, as we in the three prairie provinces always have been.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

Historically we have always had difficulty with freight rates in western Canada when it comes to raw and finished products, whether beef or hogs and the processing thereof, or whether processing wheat into flour. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), that great friend of the farmer, has another bill on the order paper, Bill C-87, to remove the freight rate subsidy on flour. Our grain co-operatives in western Canada own a flour mill. In the middle of negotiations with the Russians for the sale of 275,000 tons of flour, they found they could not give the Russians a price because of this bill to remove the freight rate subsidy on flour. So the Russians said to these Canadian millers "Tough cookie, we are going somewhere else since you cannot give us a price. You cannot tell us what the freight rate is going to be other than it will be higher, and since you want a higher price for your flour we are going somewhere else".

The same thing is going to happen with rapeseed oil and rapeseed meal. Our traditional customer, Japan, bought four shiploads from France last month because the Government of Canada sat. The Minister of Transport and the railroad want to do something to the statutory grain rates. What have they done to protect these traditional markets, Mr. Speaker? Not only have they done nothing to protect them but they are making efforts to endanger those markets further.

When the four western premiers met in Medicine Hat yesterday they called the decision of the cabinet on freight rates, on rapeseed oil and rapeseed meal, a doublecross. I say it is more than a doublecross, it is a betrayal. The Liberals in the last election, as well as after the election, promised that the anomalies in our freight rate structure would be removed. Yet exactly the opposite has happened, and it is happening again today. As if the United Grain Growers were not having enough trouble serving their own members and protecting them from the tender mercies of the international grain companies, the CPR and the Minister of Transport, we now have this sort of decision from the government which is going to make their difficulties even worse.

All members of the House support this bill and will see it through parliament quickly. But I remind the House that some of the motherhood remarks that came from the other side are more like crocodile tears. All of the other moves the government is making are going to do nothing but harm the western grain producers and co-operatives. The United Grain Growers and the other grain co-operatives are trying to raise capital to modernize and enlarge their country elevator system and their capacity to move our grain quickly, thus serving their members even better. Yet they have been continually kicked in the face.

Who was it, Mr. Speaker, who raised the subject of the Crowsnest rates? It was not the farmers, the wheat pools

or the United Grain Growers. Certainly the CPR has been complaining about them since 1899, but aside from that, who was it who raised the matter in recent years? It was the present Minister of Transport, the farmers' friend. He raised the subject two or three years ago in a speech in Winnipeg when he said possibly it was time to review the Crowsnest rates. There is only one way they can be reviewed, Mr. Speaker, and that is upwards. Certainly I cannot fathom the farmers asking that they be reviewed downwards.

Who was it, Mr. Speaker, who took feed grains out of the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board? We all know these fellows who say that the Canadian Wheat Board is the greatest thing since sliced bread, and they tell us how they support orderly marketing under the Canadian Wheat Board. But who was it who removed feed grains from the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board? And, by the way, they were supported by the Tories. It was the Minister of Transport again, the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. All of these actions have handicapped the United Grain Growers as well as the wheat pools of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta, for decades.

I remind the shareholders and members of United Grain Growers that battles won do not necessarily stay won. So long as there are those who propose an antiquated, so-called free enterprise and open market system for grain, the gains and battles won by United Grain Growers, Sask Wheat Pool and the Farmers' Union to get orderly marketing, to build their own co-operatives and to market their own grain, will always remain in jeopardy. They will always have to be on their guard, fighting the same old enemies. Many of those same old enemies are still in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker. We had a good example of this today when we found out what the cabinet has done about freight rates for rapeseed oil and rapeseed meal.

Historically we are not supposed to be able, according to successive Liberal and Tory governments, to manufacture and process our own production in western Canada. We are supposed to grow the raw product and send it to eastern Canada or the Pacific coast for manufacturing and processing. Then we buy it back, and it is very expensive. We are not going to stand for that in the prairie provinces, and the four western premiers made that very plain yesterday when they called this a doublecross. I am sure they did not use those words idly. The Premier of Alberta, speaking on behalf of the four premiers, last night made it very plain how western Canada feels about this kind of treatment.

● (1740)

What good are massive expenditures by the United Grain Growers or other wheat pools to improve even more their capacity to handle grain and process our agricultural products when we continue to get treatment in respect of transportation and orderly marketing such as we have been getting from this and previous governments? I hope this legislation not only passes but that the members and shareholders of the United Grain Growers repeat again the message they have been trying to get through to successive national governments regarding freight rates and orderly marketing. The overwhelming majority of grain producers in western Canada are unanimous about these issues. This is the message we have to get through to this government, and as long as we continue to have a so-called free enterprise government of either of the old line parties the grain producers will have to continue to fight.

I commend this legislation to the House. I support it, my party supports it, and we will continue to support the co-operative movement set up on behalf of grain producers in western Canada and the producers of other agricultural commodities who have continually been having a job done on them. This is discrimination that we are sick and tired of, and we want to assure this parliament and this government that they have not heard the last from us and many others about this kind of discrimination.

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a very few words about Bill S-33, and I certainly do not intend to take as long as the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) in pointing out a gloomy picture as he did. I should like to talk for a few minutes about the company we are dealing with, namely, the United Grain Growers. I can probably say without too much fanfare, if you like, that I am probably the only person to speak during this debate who is actually a permit holder and has actually delivered grain to this particular elevator company.

It goes without saying, certainly on the part of most people in western Canada, especially farmers, that this company is viewed as one of the most progressive elevator companies and one of the most progressive farm companies in western Canada, and perhaps even in Canada itself. Certainly one of the good things about the United Grain Growers, which has been mentioned earlier, is the structure of that organization. It operates in some respects like a pool and in other respects like a private company. Because of this UGG has been able to get top-notch people into the top echelon of the company, bringing them up through the ranks to operate the day to day workings of the company.

This top echelon has a great deal of influence not only within the elevator system in which they operate but also in respect of farm policy which affects the farmers and, I suppose, ultimately all Canadians. The company has been instrumental in almost every progressive organization in western Canada in that its members of the board of directors hold prominent positions outside that board. I say this just to illustrate the influence that this particular elevator company has in western Canada.

Bill S-33 will be of great benefit and is certainly supported by the majority of members in the House. The increase in the capital is one of the major aspects of this piece of legislation. That additional capital will be required in the future because, whether we like it or not, there is going to be a drastic revision or change in elevator policy in coming years. There will be fewer elevators and they will be in all likelihood further apart. When the Hall Commission recommendations are implemented in western Canada there will be a tremendous change in our elevator or grain collecting system. The extra capital will definitely be needed, and I certainly recommend the passage of this bill to hon. members.

Let me take this opportunity to congratulate the United Grain Growers for the work it has done in western Canada and for being partly responsible for introducing competition to our grain handling system.

United Grain Growers

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I want to take only a couple of minutes during the debate on this bill. In spite of not coming from western Canada I am aware of the background of the United Grain Growers and the fact that it was started by a number of farmers co-operating among themselves many years ago. They developed this company long before there was an act in respect of co-operatives. If that were not so this measure might be dealt with in a different manner.

I was concerned, when reading the bill, to ascertain exactly what the United Grain Growers wanted to accomplish. If there are still more Class "B" shares than Class "A" shares and there is a desire for an expansion which is not greater than the co-operative's responsibility to its membership the company should have had someone other than the hon. member who is introducing this bill to sponsor it here and in the other place.

I am interested in a couple of sentences that I wonder whether western farmers understand, and I raise this matter because this is common to our legislative measures. These sentences are confusing. In the explanation to Clause 1 it is stated:

> Notwithstanding subsection (2), the directors of the Company may, for any fiscal year, declare an additional dividend of one-half of one per centum, or any multiple thereof to a maximum of one and one-half per centum, of the par value of the Class "A" shares—

What is "per centum"? For many years in this country, since we stopped the compulsory study of Latin, we have dropped most of the Latin terms. It would be quite easy, I am sure, for the purposes of this bill to amend at least that explanation by saying "per cent" rather than "per centum". I am sure there are some people who understand what that means, but I wonder how many—

Mr. McIsaac: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Having regard to the old Latin that was used years ago to which the hon. member has made reference, perhaps it has been used in that passage because what he was quoting from is the previous section on the explanation side of the bill. That is not what is in the bill now. If the hon. member would turn to page 2 of the bill he will find it says "a dividend at a rate of one-half of one per cent." We have done exactly what he has suggested and changed that old word.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I was just suggesting that we should not be using that type of term. Perhaps the hon. member has a different explanation for what appears at the top of page 3 which states:

> (c) The right to rank in a winding up of the Company pari passu with the Class "B" shares.

We may know what "per centum" means and, as he has suggested, the bill has dropped that, but what the hell does "pari passu" mean to a western farmer? Well, Mr. Speaker, they may be educated. Perhaps in western Canada the people use a different language going back to the old Latin. However, I do not find them to be that anti-modern. Most of the people there use modern language. I know what this means. It is in the English dictionary. I wonder whether the sponsor knows what this means.

[Mr. Murta.]

• (1750)

I should like to bring to the attention of the legal advisers to both the House of Commons and the Senate that in writing bills—and this is a very important bill I am sure to the members of the United Grain Growers' Association—they should use the vernacular, a language which can be understood.

As I have said, this is an important bill. It concerns a company which is owned co-operatively by the farmers of western Canada. Those who have spoken have lauded the value of the company and the least we can do is have the language in English or in French, one of the official languages, and quit playing around with a third one.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate. Perhaps I might interpret this for the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). This phrase "pari passu" means to the farmers that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, parachutes in on them with programs and suggestions in which they are not too co-operative.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House the comments of the president, Mr. Runciman, and the vice-president Mr. Smith of Red Deer, of the United Grain Growers concerning the well-being and community life of Canada. Certainly we should support this bill because of the fact that it is required by this company which is deserving of the continued support of the House of Commons in its endeavour to promote the development of a proper system of moving and handling grain in western Canada. There is no doubt there have been problems, but I am sure the problems will increase in the future because of the fact that energy now costs more and more as time passes causing problems for the grain industry.

I think that if there is one shortfall in the whole system it is the fact that the Minister of Transport is not measuring up to his responsibility of making the job of the United Grain Growers Limited and similar bodies easier in respect of the movement of grain through the provision of proper facilities. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to lend my full support, and also I am sure the support of members on this side, including that of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn), to this legislation. We certainly are in favour of the passage of this bill at the present time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock, the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired and I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At 5.58 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Paul Yewchuck (Athabasca) moved motion No. 1:

That Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Medical Care Act, be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 1 to 16 at page 2.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have spent quite some time on this bill which originally was debated last fall, if I recall correctly. I spent a good deal of time last summer getting ready for it because we thought it would be one of the first items of business, but here we are at the end of April and the bill is still before the House.

The reason for taking such a long time on this bill is that it has been subject to a substantial amount of controversy. We on this side of the House felt that it was a rather strange way of conducting federal-provincial relations in this country. At the time that the bill was first brought in last June during the budget debate, federal-provincial negotiations were in progress which were intended in some way to rearrange the cost sharing programs between the federal and provincial governments in so far as health care is concerned. Strangely enough, at that time it appeared that the provinces were satisfied that negotiations were being carried on in a satisfactory way.

A working committee was established to study the problem and bring in a report. While this committee had almost completed its work and was going to meet some time last September, the former minister of finance announced that the federal government had decided to take this unilateral and arbitrary action without further consultations with the provinces. It struck us as being a rather arrogant way, to say the least, of dealing with the provinces since, as I said, negotiations were being carried on at that time.

● (2010)

The minister has since made it quite clear in committee on many occasions that in his view the presentation and passage of this bill do not in any way interfere with the conduct of negotiations which are still continuing. The minister assured us in committee that he feels that satisfactory progress is being made in terms of renegotiating the cost sharing agreements between the federal government and the provinces, and this led me to believe that this bill was a little premature and perhaps completely unnecessary.

However, evidence which was presented by the minister to the committee suggested that the provinces are not necessarily unhappy about the first two years. We also received evidence from the Medical Association of Canada suggesting that it is not all that unhappy about the first two years of the bill since it calls for increases of some 13 per cent in the first year following its passage, and 10.5 per cent in the following year.

In both cases those figures are perhaps sufficiently high that at least the medical association is not very concerned about it, although I think the provinces are concerned. They did not like the bill in the form in which it was passed at second reading. However, in view of the fact that the minister claims that this bill will not interfere with continuing ongoing talks with regard to readjusting the cost sharing agreements, we on this side of the House felt that if that is the case, then the bill is really unnecessary beyond a certain period of time. Given the fact that there is a real desire on the part of the provinces to conclude these talks and negotiations in a fairly reasonable time, and given the minister's stated desire to do the same, we felt that there was no need for this kind of legislation lasting beyond a period of two years. For that reason the amendment which I am now proposing calls for the termination of this legislation following that two year period.

In committee the minister expressed some reservations about the amendment, on the one hand stating that negotiations were moving along fairly well, but on the other hand suggesting that he did not think any significant progress would be made by the time two years went by. That led one to be somewhat suspicious with regard to the seriousness with which he is conducting these negotiations. That took me right back to the beginning of our attack on the federal government for putting forward such legislation in the first place, which takes the approach that the provinces are not very important in so far as their opinions are concerned, that the federal government will play God, set the rules unilaterally and impose them on the provinces whether the provinces like them or not, and impose them on the people providing medical care whether they like it or not.

I think this method of approaching unity and federal-provincial relations is contrary to the spirit upon which this country was built. It seems to me that in a country such as ours consisting of a number of provinces and territories with their own governments, each with its own areas of responsibility, and a central government which also has its area of responsibility, where there is a situation involving cross-jurisdiction in certain areas, in order for Confederation to work adequately and in order for unity to be strong between the provinces or between the various regions of the country, there has to exist a feeling of mutual trust between the federal government and the provinces. In saying this we have to keep in mind the fact

that this medicare program, to be kind, was imposed upon the provinces against their will a number of years ago.

Virtually all of the provinces, except for one, I think, objected to it when it was first introduced. They did not want it. They felt that they were already providing adequate medical insurance and that the introduction of the medicare act at that time was interfering with their own priorities. The provinces were forced to readjust their priorities quite drastically, and at that time they foresaw what was going to happen. They wondered how they could be sure that the federal government, once it imposed this program, realized the cost of it and realized the difficulty in controlling the cost, would not try to back out and leave them saddled with the burden of the whole cost. Indeed this is what appears to be happening. The feeling of trust, which I think once existed, has been severely damaged, and I am concerned about that because I do not want to see any more strain on Confederation than is absolutely necessary.

However, unfortunately we have a government before us, temporarily occupying the other side of the House, which has always taken this kind of approach to federal-provincial relations, the approach where consultation usually means making a unilateral decision and telling the provinces about it later. Sometimes it does not even do that; sometimes it makes a unilateral decision and issues a press release about it, and the provinces find out, by watching the 11 o'clock news or perhaps reading the local newspapers, what are the plans of the federal government.

I want to place this serious concern I have before the House and before the people of the country. If unity is to be maintained we must accept the fact that the feeling of trust which must exist between the various governments is something which should be protected. I am afraid the action the minister took in this regard did anything but protect that feeling of trust. Indeed I think that feeling was damaged quite substantially.

The minister still has an opportunity to recoup lost graces, if he wants to be graceful. He has an opportunity to tell the provinces that he has confidence in his own ability to negotiate with them and confidence in their desire to try to reach agreement with him through negotiation and consultation, and if he has that kind of confidence I am sure he will accept this motion which would have the effect of terminating the bill after a two year period.

I think I will just leave it at that. I have clearly outlined the reason for this motion. We debated this bill for a long time at second reading, and there was a reason for that. We have found, through long and difficult experience, that regardless of how good a point we want to make or how right we may be, generally speaking nobody on the government side listens to what we say. Either they do not listen or perhaps their skulls are rather thick. I am not sure which it is. In any case, we find that by repeating something over and over again ad infinitum, sometimes it eventually sinks in. So here we are once again repeating things which have already been said. I know the minister sometimes listens while he is doing other things. He assured me at one time that he can talk to two or three people and listen to a speech at the same time.

Mr. Lalonde: That depends on the speech.

[Mr. Yewchuck.]

Mr. Yewchuk: If he is as bright as *Weekend Magazine* made him out to be a month or so ago, perhaps he can do all those things, but he has yet to prove to me that he is as bright as *Weekend Magazine* said, because so far nothing I have said to him on this bill during the course of the past few months seems to have sunk in very well. I am not sure whether the reason is a refusal to acknowledge a good suggestion when it is presented, or whether it is simply a refusal to acknowledge that he might have been wrong in the first place in presenting this.

● (2020)

Perhaps when the minister speaks he will tell us why he has so stubbornly pursued this unilateral and arbitrary course of action. He has pursued it virtually against the advice of everybody involved, against the advice of the provinces, against the advice of the medical profession, against the advice of other people providing health services and finally, and by no means least, against advice from this side of the House.

We get the impression that this particular government always takes the position that it alone represents the views of the people, that it alone can come up with ideas beneficial to Canada. For some reason it takes the position that parties on this side of the House have never come up with a good idea. I take objection to that position of course. Every member on this side of the House has fought an election, as have members on the other side. Every member on this side of the House represents the views of a certain segment of the Canadian people; every member does his job by presenting the views of the people who elected him to this House.

I can never comprehend why we have so much difficulty making the government understand that improvements to legislation are always possible. We know it is easy to criticize and we know too that in our parliamentary system, where the adversary system is in effect, that we have a duty to criticize legislation put forward by the government and to point out any pitfalls that might exist. We know, of course, that members of the government would never do that. We know from experience that they stand up and repeat the same old drivel about how great they are, what good ideas they have, and what their legislation will do for the country. In the face of that we have an obligation to point out the truth and to offer suggestions on how legislation can be improved.

I think we have fulfilled that task over and over again in regard to this bill. We have offered many suggestions to make it more palatable to the people who would be affected by it. We have offered suggestions which would lead to a greater feeling of unity in the country, a feeling that the federal government is truly interested in co-operating with the provinces and, through the democratic process, reaching a solution acceptable to the largest number of Canadians.

I will conclude by saying again that if the minister is sincere in his desire to consult meaningfully with the provinces, this bill will be totally unnecessary by the time two years have expired. In view of the fact that acts are almost never repealed even when they become redundant, we might as well build into this one a "self-destruct"

mechanism which will remove the litter from the books when the time comes.

I hear a suggestion that the bill be given to the minister to hold in his hand while it self-destructs. Perhaps that is a good suggestion. The minister seems to have seen the light—he seems to acknowledge having heard what I have said so perhaps he will let this motion go through without too much objection.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) pointed out that this debate has been going on for a long time. It really started last June when the then minister of finance, Mr. Turner, gave notice of the government's intention to impose ceilings on the amount that the federal government would pay to the provinces in respect of medical care. The bill itself, of course, came in later.

There was a long debate at second reading which was brought to an end by the imposition of closure. We have since debated the bill in the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. In that committee certain amendments were made, and I notice that in addition to the report stage amendments proposed from this side of the House there is now a further amendment by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) also being proposed at report stage.

I have to say, sir, that even with the amendments that the government made in the standing committee and with the amendment that the minister would make at this stage, Bill C-68 is still totally unacceptable to us. In our view one of the important advances that was made in Canada—and it took an awfully long time for that advance to be made—was when we established the principle of medical care for all our people, and when we made it a Canadian plan in the sense that the federal government would share the costs of medical care faced by the provinces in such a way as to provide equality of treatment and relative equality to the provinces right across Canada.

Now the government has come along and given notice that it is backing away from principles in this area and related areas which were forward steps. It is not only backing away from the formula for the financing of medical care which is represented in the bill now before us, it has also given notice to the provinces that at the end of this decade it will seek to renegotiate agreements regarding hospitalization. It is also in the process of cutting back on the funding of scientific research generally and medical research in particular.

No matter how much the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) might preach the need for restraint, no matter what problems we face in this country, we do not accept the idea of taking backward steps with respect to the provision of medical care for the people of Canada.

The bill that is now before us, as amended on the motion of the government in the standing committee, provides that in the first two years covered by the bill there are fixed limits as to the amount of increase that the provinces can expect from the government with respect to medical care.

Spokesmen on the government side like to make the point that these very increases indicate that the government is not paying out fewer dollars for medical care but is, rather, prepared to pay out more dollars and that therefore those of us who cry havoc about this bill and try to contend that it involves a cutback are not "telling it as it is".

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that one has to compare what will happen under this bill with what would happen if it were not enacted at all. If this bill were not enacted the federal government, under the Medical Care Act, would be required to pay the provinces roughly 50 per cent of their medical costs. Under this bill, with costs going up, the government will pay the lesser of two amounts, either 50 per cent of what it costs the provinces, or the number of dollars that were paid to them last year, plus a certain additional amount.

● (2030)

Since medicare started the provinces have been able to count on 50 per cent of those costs being paid by the federal government. I say 50 per cent, although I recognize that there is a formula that results in some provinces getting a little more, and some a little less; but the average is 50 per cent. The provinces that have been able to count on that will in future, if this bill is passed, not be able to count on getting 50 per cent of the costs of medical care. This bill fixes a precise limit in the first two years of the operation of this law. After that it is left to the government to decide by order in council.

The original bill brought before the House had precise figures in it for the next three years as well. The minister contended that he was doing something generous by taking out those figures and putting in the provision for the decision to be made by order in council. It means, if this bill goes through, that we have no way of knowing, and the provinces will have no way of knowing, what limits the government will impose after the first two years have gone by.

It is well established, both in the language of the bill and in the minister's statements made in this House and in committee that, although there will be consultations with the provinces—and consultation is defined one way in the dictionary and in quite another way by this government—the provinces will have no real say. In the end the federal minister will make the decision and put it into effect by order in council.

So we have this picture: for two years the provinces will know the limits; they will also know that they will get less than the 50 per cent they have been getting. The provinces know that after that they will be completely at the mercy of the federal minister, who will be free to act by order in council.

The hon. member for Athabasca did well tonight, as he did on second reading, in pointing out that this is hardly the way to carry on federal-provincial relations. It is hardly the thing to do to get the provinces to come into a plan like this, get their system built up as it were, and then undercut them by making changes in the formula of the kind being proposed. We think it is wrong and unfair to the people of Canada who deserve the benefits of health care; we think it is wrong to treat the provinces this way. I suspect the minister knows better than we do, because he was at the conference, of the unhappiness of provincial

ministers of health because of the way the government has treated the provinces in the last number of years.

We do not like Bill C-68. We are against it, lock, stock, and barrel—all the way. Even so we are going to vote for the motion just proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca. It is a compromise. We would rather not have the bill at all, with its limitations; but if the motion proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca were to pass, and I hope it will, there would be the ceilings the provinces already know about for the first two years, but after that this limiting bill would have no further effect. After that we would return to the provisions of the original Medical Care Act.

As I say, Sir, we would much rather not see the limitations imposed by the government in those first two years; alternatively, it certainly would be better if the legislation could go only that far, if there could be limitations for only two years after which we could return to the principles laid down in the Medical Care Act itself. In other words, if the motion proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca is accepted by the House we would know what would happen for two years, after which we should be governed again by the principles of the original legislation. For this reason we welcome the proposal made by the hon. member for Athabasca. In this he would probably agree with me; I expect he would rather not have limitations in those two years; he would rather see the whole bill treated as I have suggested, made into a bill which would self-destruct, so to speak, and put into the minister's hands for that process. I hope that the minister and the House might consider that as a compromise.

If we cannot persuade the government to drop the idea altogether, that is, of walking away for the 50 per cent provision in the Medical Care Act, the compromise at least would impose those limitations only for the first two years. For this reason I shall be glad to see lines 1 to 16 on page 2 of the bill deleted. The proposal moved by the hon. member for Athabasca calls for just that.

Sir, I have already referred to the important milestone which was reached when medical care on a national basis was established in this country. I must be careful not to make a speech I have made many times in this House, about the great Liberal party of 1919 and the great things to which it committed itself, old age pensions, unemployment insurance, and health insurance. One could find that speech of mine in a great many volumes of *Hansard*. It tells the story of the years it took to achieve these things to which the Liberals committed themselves in 1919. And if I condemned them for taking so long, I gave them credit for moving in the right direction.

I cannot for the life of me understand why the Liberals, who were finally dragged into doing those progressive things for the people of Canada, now want to water them down. Health care for the people of Canada on a free, universal basis is a good idea. It is one of the best things that marks life in this country. To jeopardize it in this way is to betray the people of Canada. Certainly it is a betrayal of those Liberals of bygone decades who dreamed of achieving this sort of thing.

We again appeal to the government to scrap this bill completely. If it is not prepared to do that, I plead with the minister to accept motion No. 1 proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca, and call a halt to imposing ceilings after the first two years. Mr. Speaker, we shall support the motion proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that there may be unanimous agreement for the vote on the bill we are debating to be deferred until Wednesday following the question period, after which we can proceed to third reading. I wonder if hon. members opposite would confirm that.

Mr. Yewchuk: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that would be acceptable to us. We could defer the votes until Wednesday afternoon, then perhaps terminate the debate with third reading of the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, yes, we are glad to agree to the proposal that any votes at the report stage be deferred until Wednesday, at three o'clock, and that the calling of third reading not take place until those votes have been taken on Wednesday. We agree to that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: We also agree, Mr. Speaker, that the vote be taken next Wednesday after the question period.

[*English*]

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is so ordered. Is the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) rising to speak?

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to participate in the debate at this time. I shall have something to say, perhaps after hon. members have had the opportunity to speak on the various motions. That way we can probably save some of the time of the House.

• (2040)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question on motion No. 1?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to Section (II) of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The House will now proceed to Motion No. 3.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What about motion No. 2?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): We cannot move to motion No. 2 because No. 2 hinges on the vote on motion No. 1. Therefore we will move to motion No. 3.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved motion No. 3:

That Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Medical Care Act, be amended by deleting Clause 1.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is almost too bad that arrangements were not made to tape the speech I just finished making because, with one or two additions to it, it could be played back as the speech to be made on this motion.

An hon. Member: Just make the additions and we will remember what you said.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If I could be sure that my friends would remember everything I have said, I would of course do that.

The main difference between the motion we were debating in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) and the motion now before the House in my name is that his motion would have permitted the bill to pass thus providing limitations on federal grants to the provinces for two years, but then would have the situation revert to the original provisions of the Medical Care Act itself. My motion on the other hand would eliminate completely any provision for limitations other than those in the Medical Care Act.

In other words, if my motion is accepted by the House, the federal government cannot, even in these first two years, pay to the provinces less than they are entitled to receive under the Medical Care Act. I feel that this is the position this House ought to take. As I have already indicated, if we cannot win this point we are of course prepared to go along with the compromise suggested by the health critic of the Progressive Conservative party to the effect that we allow this action by the government for only two years.

I certainly do not intend to impose on the House by repeating all the things that I said in the debate on the previous motion, but I do ask hon. members to give serious thought to the point that I tried to make.

There was a time when to refer to the 1919 convention of the Liberal party was to cause some annoyance around here. When I first started doing it, there were persons in the House who had been at that convention. They are not around now, so it is like talking about the Battle of Waterloo to mention what happened in 1919. I want to say that that, of course, was before there was a New Democratic Party or CCF. Somebody had to have some progressive ideas. The Liberals at their 1919 convention here in Ottawa did have some of those progressive ideas.

Mr. Orlikow: They have been trying to forget them every since.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): My colleague from Winnipeg North says they have been trying to forget them every since.

That was a great convention. It was the convention at which Mr. Mackenzie King was elected leader of the party. In the main speech he made at that convention, not a speech in the leadership contest itself, but in terms of dealing with policy matters, he dealt with the resolution that had been brought in calling for the three things I mentioned a while ago; old age pensions, unemployment insurance and health insurance. Mr. King called on the Liberal party of that day to commit itself to these things and to set out to make the Canada of the post-war world—that was after World War I—the better place it could be if we had old age pensions, unemployment insurance, and health insurance. It took a long while to get them.

It was not until 1926 that the old age pension law got on to the statute books so that it could come into effect in 1927. I was not until 1940 that unemployment insurance was passed. It looked for a time as though the third of those three things was going to be forgotten altogether. However, every once in a while we would remind Mr. King of the speech he made in 1919. He always came back and said he was going to see it implemented all the way, but things could not be done overnight.

It was not long before he quit being Prime Minister—I think it was about 1947 or 1948—that this place was a-buzz one day because an announcement on health was coming from the Prime Minister, one of those statements on motions. We even dared to believe that it was the beginning of health insurance. It turned out not to be that. However, it did turn out to be a program of hospital grants which he said would lay the foundation of health insurance later on. Well, that later on still had some years to come.

It was not until just before the Liberals went out of office in 1957 that they got hospitalization on to the statute books. Even so they had a provision or rider that prevented it from coming into effect. Of all things, it took the Progressive Conservatives to amend that bill so that hospitalization could come into effect. A few years later the Liberals came back and, in the days of Mr. Pearson as Prime Minister, we finally got health insurance, the Medical Care Act, on to the statute books.

That is a long story. I think I can be given credit for telling it in such a few minutes. I was telling the story of the period from 1919 to the middle sixties. That is the time it took to get this legislation on to the books. I was critical through the years I was here about how slow the process was, and how inadequate some of the provisions were that got enacted. However, these were all moves in the right direction of a better Canada for those who count, namely, the people of this country.

One of the hallmarks of that legislation is the provision for medical care. As I have already said, not only is it medical care that has been provided, but it has been provided on a basis that fits the Canadian scene in that the federal government pays half the cost and the provinces do the administering.

● (2050)

We now have before us legislation stipulating that despite the provisions of the Medical Care Act there will be this limitation that provinces will get 50 per cent, though not if their costs go up to the point where they exceed so many dollars more than they got the previous year. We think that this is an unfair way to treat the provinces. It is not the way to bring about co-operation. We also think that if it is done in this way some of the poorer provinces will be faced with special problems and will either have to cut back on the amount of medical care they can provide, or institute deterrent fees, extra taxes, or one thing or another, and then we will soon have the situation where the provision of health care is unequal across Canada, being better in some parts than in others.

We think the whole concept of a limitation as contained in this bill is wrong and ought to be stopped in its tracks. We said that right away last June when Mr. Turner brought in his budget. I can tell the House, if one is permitted in this place to refer to political conventions, that at the national convention of the New Democratic Party held in Winnipeg last July one of the things that concerned our delegates most was the Turner threat to cut back on hospital and medical care. Certainly I speak for my colleagues in our party when I say we do not want this to happen.

Having admitted that the Liberals have brought us to a certain point which was worth while, I simply cannot understand why they now want to reverse the situation. One of the arguments that is used is that if it is an open-ended situation, as it is now, then the provinces will spend money hog wild on medical care. But they have to pay the other 50 per cent. I point out that they are as concerned about achieving economy as is the federal government, and they have made the point to the minister that there are better ways than this.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we think the whole idea of imposing limits that result in the provinces getting less money than they would get under the Medical Care Act is wrong. My hope is that the House will accept this motion of mine which in effect wipes out the whole idea contained in Bill C-68. If we cannot do that, I hope we will at least accept the proposal that is made in the previous motion No. 1 and stop this process of cutting off funds for medical care after two years have gone by.

I have already said, and perhaps my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), may develop this a little more, that this, to us, is frightening when there is associated with it cutbacks in funding for scientific and medical research. To us, Mr. Speaker, the government seems to be moving in so many directions to make life harder for people. Using the excuse of restraint not to increase family allowances is part of the picture. Cutbacks in social services that are being made in the provinces because of the government's attitude toward federal and provincial fiscal arrangements are wrong. Therefore all down the line we are opposed to Bill C-68. My motion No. 3, which we are now discussing, if it passes would take out of the bill the whole of that part of the bill that imposes limits on what the federal government can pay to the provinces. Therefore I hope the House will vote in favour of this motion.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I have no intention of repeating at length the arguments that I put forward at earlier stages of this bill. I rise mainly because, despite all of the protestations of the minister, the facts are exactly as they were when the bill was discussed months ago.

The provinces, which will be so adversely affected by the unilateral decision of the government as outlined in the bill and by other proposals that the government is going to make, are still adamantly and unanimously opposed to the basic principle contained in this bill. Indeed on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week the provincial ministers of health were in Ottawa meeting with their federal colleague and I know—and I am sure the minister will not challenge my statement—that they are still unanimously opposed to this bill.

If one looks at this bill and at the other proposals that the government has announced it will implement in the very near future having to do with estimates in various fields, it is not surprising that the Conservative provincial governments of Newfoundland, Ontario and Alberta, the Liberal governments of Prince Edward Island and Quebec, the NDP governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the Social Credit government of British Columbia all oppose the principle of this particular bill as well as the other proposals to which I have referred. They do so because what they see is a pattern that has ominous implications for the provinces. After all, Mr. Speaker, with respect to virtually all of the social legislation we have and virtually all the other legislation in the field of health and welfare—I would use the term "blackmail" except it may be unparliamentary—the pressure for implementation mostly came from the federal government.

What do we see now, Mr. Speaker? In this bill the federal government is proposing to place limits on specific increases for the next two years which it will pay under the 50-50 sharing arrangement of health care costs. The federal government has given notice that it will opt out of the 50-50 cost sharing of hospital insurance in 1980, which is the first time it can get out of the present agreement.

The federal government is proposing a social services act which will wipe out the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan, and although the provinces do not yet know all the details this will mean that the provinces will be saddled with a substantially larger part of the costs. I see the minister shaking his head. It is easy for him to shake his head in this House when he has a big majority behind him, but I know that he has not convinced his provincial counterparts that this will not be the effect of the social services act. The minister can shrug his shoulders and wave his hand at me, but I have talked to some of his provincial counterparts and they all tell me the same thing.

Mr. Pearsall: Give them the bucks, that is all they want.

Mr. Orlikow: Someone says "Give them the bucks, that is all they want". Of course that is all they want, because the bucks come from the same source—the pockets of the Canadian people.

Whether we are dealing with federal, provincial or municipal financing, the question is: which level of gov-

ernment has the constitutional and practical authority and ability to raise taxes in the most equitable way? Any member of parliament with any common sense, and I exempt the member who interjected a few moments ago as he has demonstrated he has very little common sense, and any member who can look at problems objectively will admit that the level of government least able to meet its expenses is the municipal level.

● (2100)

The next level of government least able to meet its expenses in any field is the provincial level, whether it be the have-not provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia or Quebec, or the have provinces such as Ontario or British Columbia. If the hon. member does not believe me he ought to listen to what the Liberal premier of Nova Scotia has been saying about costs and the impossible task of the people of Nova Scotia in paying their extremely high electric power costs because of the high price of oil. If the hon. member does not believe me then let him wait to see what happens to the Liberal party at the next provincial or federal election.

The government which is most able to find money for necessary programs is the federal government because of its ability to tax those who have the money, yet it is the federal government that is getting out of these cost-sharing programs as fast as it can. I could go on talking about how the federal government is cutting back on services which it has provided over the years to the native people who move off reserves. There is no member here who can deny that. The federal government is doing everything possible to get out of its constitutional and moral obligation to provide health and welfare services to our native people.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggests I might say a few words about the record of this federal government in the field of medical research. This is obviously an important aspect in the total cost of medical care. If our medical researchers can make a breakthrough in respect of one of the major illnesses that strike so many Canadian people, be it cancer, a stroke, or any one of the many, this would mean a very sharp reduction in the cost of health care.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) is putting a freeze on the very small amount of money the federal government provides for medical research. This is not the time to put the entire case on the record, but what is it that our medical researchers are asking? Are they talking in terms of billions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars, or even tens of millions of dollars? Our medical researchers are talking about the tremendous amount of $4.5 million. But the Minister of National Health and Welfare has the gall and the audacity to tell our medical researchers that the Canadian people cannot afford that kind of money.

Let us look at some of the things we have been able to afford. We might consider the $2 billion we have spent on Mirabel, and we might consider the $1,275 million the Canadian people will have spent on the Olympics before we are finished. We might also consider the tremendous increase in the number of civil servants who are at the top level of our bureaucratic system receiving from $30,000 to $65,000 a year. This number has almost tripled in a half a dozen years. The minister and his colleagues have been able to find the money for these things, but not for medical research.

We have the spectacle of the federal government saying to the provinces that it simply cannot afford to continue the 50-50 sharing of health care costs. Indeed the federal government is making an effort to get out of the 50-50 sharing of hospital insurance costs as soon as it can, in spite of the fact it has been obvious for many years that in the field of hospital insurance Ottawa has been more than willing to pay 50 per cent of the most expensive kind of hospital care, and that is for the active care hospitals. The federal government has not been willing until now to pay any share of the cost of health care in nursing homes, convalescent homes, and other similar types of institutions. As a result the provinces have carried that cost alone. This is the least costly form of medical care. The federal government has been willing to pay for the more expensive care.

I am sure there is not a member of parliament who has not come in contact with individuals who are occupying active or acute hospital beds when they really do not need to remain under active treatment. They could very well be at home, in a nursing or convalescent home, but very often the city in which they live does not have that kind of facility. In any event, that kind of care is not covered by insurance.

It would be much less expensive for taxpayers as a whole to provide for that alternative type medical care. This is not the case now because under the present schemes the individual or his family must pay the entire cost of that type of care. I am sure there is not one member of parliament who has not known of a constituent who has said at some time that he or his mother, or his father, or his cousin, or his aunt, should not be occupying an active bed in hospital. They will tell you that the alternative service is not available or, that if it is available they persuade the doctor to let patient stay in the hospital because the individual or the family would have to pay for that alternative service. The federal government has not had the will or the flexibility to co-operate with the provinces in meeting the alternative.

I have said in earlier speeches, and I repeat again, that the provinces are even more concerned about spiralling costs of health and hospital care services than the federal government because they do not have the ability to meet the increased costs like the federal government has in Ottawa. The provinces are not undertaking expensive luxury programs that the federal government has undertaken, some of which I have referred to already.

The provincial authorities know what it means to go to their citizens when costs of medical care increase by more than 13 per cent, which is what will be permitted under the provisions of this bill. All of these provincial levels of government are trying very seriously to find ways to slow down the growth if not the actual expenditures, and they ought to have the co-operation of the federal government in this regard. Experts in this field working for the federal government should sit down with provincial authorities to work out ways of cutting down on expenses.

If there are some governments which have been slow in beginning to look at ways of reducing increasing costs, surely the minister's department should have been willing and able to provide those recalcitrant provinces with the expertise to find ways. We have seen none of this co-operation from the federal government. What we have seen is simply a unilateral decision on the part of Ottawa to cut its share of increasing health care costs.

The allowed increases are to be 13 per cent in the coming year and 10 per cent the year after that. Following that, what the minister proposes is that the increase in succeeding years will be left to the tender mercies of the federal government. In light of the experiences the provinces have had with the federal government it is not surprising that, to say the least, they have been loathe to leave this decision to its tender mercies. As I have indicated, they have unanimously rejected the federal government's proposal. They have called on the minister to stand his bill over and wait until the next couple of months when the provincial ministers concerned meet with their federal counterparts in order to work out a program that is mutually agreeable to all the provinces and the federal government, whereby co-operatively the increases which have taken place can be moderated.

● (2110)

It is because I believe the arguments put forward by the provinces are justified that I, and other members of the NDP, have opposed this bill from the day it was suddenly announced. It was announced unilaterally and without any consultation. Indeed it was announced really in violation of the spirit of the discussions which had taken place between the minister and his provincial counterparts just a few months before the infamous budget of June, 1975.

All the discussions which have taken place since last June between the minister and his provincial counterparts, and all the discussions which have taken place here have demonstrated to me that the provinces were right, and that the provinces have been much more aware and concerned about the needs of the people who are citizens not only of the provinces in which they reside but also of Canada. Because I am convinced the provinces have been right and the federal government has been wrong I intend to vote for this motion. If the motion should be defeated, as I suppose it will, I propose to oppose the passage of Bill C-68, as I have from the beginning, in the belief that eventually even this government will realize its mistake.

I wish to conclude by saying that in the spare time I have had I have been re-reading some Canadian history. It seems obvious to me that when the history of this era comes to be written, historians in assessing the Canadian governments which have been in office since 1940 will find that this Liberal government led by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been the most reactionary, conservative government we have had in the last 50 years.

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at length on this motion.

An hon. Member: Go ahead.

Mr. Halliday: Having spoken earlier in the debate on Bill C-68 I have said many of the things I might have said at this time. However, there are one or two things I have previously indicated to the minister during the committee hearings which I think he has thoroughly overlooked. In a sense I think he is defrauding the people of Canada by not looking at some of the serious aspects of payment for medical care.

We have heard quite a bit tonight about the history of health care in Canada, both from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and more recently the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). I am sure both members have much to be proud of in a sense at this stage in history, but I say that history will tell an entirely different story in 50 or 100 years when we have the virtual collapse or decay of our society because of the way in which we are spoiling people by not giving them an opportunity to exercise responsibility and self-reliance.

I wish to refer to the action of the government over the years in which this legislation has been in effect. As I mentioned previously, it was introduced by the Liberal government of five or six years ago contrary to the wishes of some of the provinces. Certainly from the viewpoint of the province of Ontario it represented an insidious tax which would have taken a lot of money from the province if it did not agree to go along with the scheme. Now, having been taken in with respect to this medical care bill, the province finds itself in the position of being forced to pay more because the federal contribution is to be drastically cut in the future. This appears to be a unilateral action on the part of the government which I believe is uncalled for. As the previous speakers have said, there is not one province at this time which is in agreement with this. It seems too bad that this is being forced on them once again.

What I wish to speak about mainly has to do with what I believe is one of the principal deficiencies in the thinking and the philosophy of the minister in respect of the provision of health care in Canada. It is obvious that he is attempting to save costs, particularly for the federal treasury. I do not fault the minister for that. However, we should look at the four criteria set down by the government. The first is universality. The second is comprehensiveness. The third is portability, and the fourth is public control of costs.

I submit that the government has omitted one very important aspect of control. I refer to patient control. Having been a practising physician for a number of years it is obvious now to me, having worked under medical care for years, that the best control of cost in respect of health care is not the computer in the local insurance office in the provincial capital but rather the patient himself or herself. It is the patient who is the best monitor of the cost of health care services. If we recognize that, not only will we keep down the cost but we will also provide a social favour to the people of this country which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, in my view, fails to recognize in his deep concern for humanity.

I suggest there is no reason why the government could not institute another criterion in the provision of medical care services which would include the involvement of the patient in his own health care, in a way in which this is not provided for at the present time. One simple way to provide this kind of involvement is for the physician to bill

the patient directly and have the patient pay the physician. That happens to be the official policy of the Ontario Medical Association, the largest association of its kind in this country. It is a very wise policy. Unfortunately for various reasons very few physicians across the country like to adhere to that policy, sometimes for selfish reasons. The same is true sometimes in respect of the patient, the consumer.

● (2120)

It has been my experience and my confirmed belief that if we could somehow involve the patients in their own health care, they would appreciate the cost of these services. As it is now the patient seldom realizes the bill that is being incurred on his or her behalf when patients visit their physician. This is certainly unfortunate and does not lead to any kind of control.

I am concerned about the way society in Canada is going. One can see a gradual decay, an internal rot setting in which I think stems from a number of factors, but one of the principal factors is that we do not encourage our people to provide for themselves. We tend to think that a big government can do things better than individuals can. I would be the first to agree that there is a small number of people in our society who are unable to provide for themselves, and of course we need to have appropriate health care and medical plans which will give those people the kind of services they need. By the same token, with the rising cost of health care and the increasing availability of more esoteric types of medical services, and the fact that we all feel we are entitled to them, there is no doubt health care costs are rising.

When one is sick it is difficult to meet bills, and I would be the first to agree that we must have some type of insurance scheme available. If it is provided by the state I see nothing wrong with that, although there have been many private plans that have been equally good and perhaps better, and run at much less cost to the consumer. So I feel that if we are going to do any kind of favour for the people of Canada as they progress into future generations, we must do something to provide an independence for people and to teach them how to look after themselves.

For some reason there is a notion around the country, which I think has been propagated mainly by politicians because they find they can get votes by advocating comprehensive, universal types of plans, that health care is some God-given right that everybody has, as if the individual had no responsibility to provide it for himself. There are many other essential services that all of us need and which we are continually using, as essential as health care, and yet few of us think they should be supplied in total by the state. Who would ever think that we should all have housing provided at no cost to ourselves except through a small premium or taxation?

Mr. Orlikow: Where would we be without housing?

Mr. Halliday: It would be absurd to expect housing to be provided for all of us at the expense of the government. Or let us consider footwear. Who in this country can survive in the winter without some kind of footwear? It is obviously essential—

Mr. Hogan: Or pyjamas.

Mr. Halliday: Yes, or pyjamas. For some reason we do not think they should be provided through some kind of state controlled insurance plan. Why can we not all have the shoes we want? It is an essential, we all must have them, yet we do not do that. There is an emotional attachment to health care. It is a holy sort of thing that we cannot question. Everybody must have health care provided by the state. I submit that health care should be available to everybody, but I like to think that the time has come when we can start to make people responsible for providing some of their own needs and services and at the same time make them available so that people can obtain those services if in fact they cannot provide for themselves.

One could go on to point out other defects in Bill C-68. Much has been said about medical research and the fact that the government has been picayune and miserly about supporting medical research. One only has to look at the figures for Canada and compare them with the figures for the United States, compare on a per capita basis the amount of money that is spent by governments on medical research, to find that we should be ashamed of ourselves.

Mr. Orlikow: It is the first thing you said with which I agree.

Mr. Halliday: The hon. member for Winnipeg North only now realizes there is some truth in what I have been saying. It is about time. I do not know what we have to do to convince the government that we need to spend more money on medical research. It is a crying shame when all the countries around us such as the United States, Great Britain and so on, find they can spend a lot more money per capita on medical research, and somehow we have to live off the work they do and the money they spend for research. Perhaps I have pointed out some of the more glaring defects in this bill and the fact that motion No. 3 in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, is indeed a good motion. Perhaps his philosophy for introducing it is not the same as my philosophy for supporting it, but I am glad to see his motion before the House and I urge all hon. members to support it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There has been some discussion in the House on the ruling of the Deputy Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the debate on motion No. 2. It is true that motion No. 2 would fall and be lost if motion No. 1 were adopted by the House, but motion No. 2 could logically have been dealt with tonight if it had been called for debate before motion No. 1. I believe you will find a disposition on all sides of the House to return to motion No. 2 now, and to debate it as if it had been called for debate before motion No. 1.

Mr. Yewchuk: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, without being critical of a ruling that was made earlier, perhaps rather hastily, it does seem to me that we should have dealt with motion 2 before motion No. 1. After all, if motion No. 1 carries, there is nothing left to amend as proposed in motion No. 2. We can correct that now by having a debate on motion No. 2 and perhaps by taking a vote on it first when we reach that point on Wednesday. We agree with the suggestion of the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. As the hon. member said, the House would not wish to reflect on the previous decision of the Chair. I want to say at this time that these orders of discussion are merely suggestions. I do not take them as a strict ruling by the Chair. Maybe the point should have been made immediately at the outset of the debate. The Chair is always co-operative and it will co-operate in this case and allow motion No. 2 to be considered now. I think it would be worth while between now and the time when the recorded division is taken for the Chair to take a second look at the order in which the votes should be taken, and the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) will be taken into consideration in due course.

● (2130)

We will proceed at this time with motion No. 2 standing in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco).

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (for Mr. Brisco) moved motion No. 2:

That Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Medical Care Act, be amended in Clause 1 by striking out line 14 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"Governor in Council, subject to affirmative resolution of Parliament, for insured services".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is one which has been put forward by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), and it is the next suggested compromise following motion No. 1, which I moved myself. Essentially it is moved on the assumption that if motion No. 1 is defeated—motion No. 1 calls for termination of this bill after a two year period—then motion No. 2 is a further compromise, calling for a parliamentary review of the percentages which may be set by order in council from the third year and onward.

The House may have noticed a suspicious resemblance between motion No. 2 and motion No. 4, which we will be dealing with a little later, and the resemblance is not necessarily coincidental. It seems to me that motion No. 4 embodies motion No. 2, and that makes it difficult to debate one without the other because the motion put by the minister himself will indeed achieve the result which the hon. member for Kootenay West wanted to achieve in placing motion No. 2 on the order paper.

The only comment I want to make at this point is to question why the minister chose to take this route rather than simply to accept motion No. 2 and perhaps to offer an amendment to it, taking a long and circuitous route and proposing an entirely new motion. I do not know whether there is a specific personal reason for his wanting to do that. One might suggest that he wants to enhance his own image after he was so ruthless during the debate on this bill and to suggest that perhaps he was listening to some of our recommendations. Whatever his motivation, I want it to be quite clear that we on this side of the House interpret his motion as perhaps, at least in part, accepting the suggestion in motion No. 2, rewording it to suit himself and putting it as his own motion.

We, of course, would have supported motion No. 2, and when the time comes to talk about motion No. 4 we will make comments on it at that time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, once again I want to indicate our readiness to support the motion which has been put before us by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) on behalf of his colleague.

If I may come to the end of my remarks first and then go back to the beginning, I have to say that I think the hon. member for Athabasca is buying too quickly the alternative proposal made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde). The hon. member for Athabasca suggests that the minister is accepting in part the idea in motion No. 2. I do not agree. I think that what is set out in motion No. 4—I will say more about that when we get to it—is the very opposite of what is in motion No. 2, and that my friends to the right should not buy motion No. 4 so readily.

I think I have to take a moment to summarize the whole position which is before the House tonight, as I see it. We have a bill which provides for the limiting of the contributions of the federal government to the provinces in respect of medicare, commencing now. The bill, as we now have it, provides for precise limits for two years, and then for limits to be determined by order in council unilaterally by the government after those first two years. I have already said that in my view the whole bill should be ditched. I think that these limits should not apply even in the first two years. That is the first position, and I have taken it by putting down my motion, notion No. 3.

The second course is that contained in motion No. 1 in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca which accepts the cuts for the first two years and then wants no more cuts in succeeding years. That is not as good as my motion, but it is the next best position.

However, then we have two other propositions: the one which is before us now in motion No. 2, and the one which will be before us later in motion No. 4. The proposal in motion No. 2, which is now before us, is that if the government by order in council sets any limits after the first two years, year by year that order in council cannot come into effect until the House of Commons has had a chance to vote on it. Motion No. 2 asks for an affirmative vote before that action takes place. That has some meaning, although not a great deal when there is a government with the majority this government has, and with the characteristics this government has, because it would simply mean a debate, and then the motion would carry. However, at least parliament would have a chance to decide on those limitations before they come into effect.

In a few minutes the minister will try to propose an alternative, namely, that if the government brings in an order in council setting limits, it should come into effect right away, but if 50 members sign their names to a motion, the minister will let parliament afterward debate whether it should have come into effect, and only if a majority in parliament is against it can the order in council be declared to be without effect. I think the difference between the motion now before us and the motion which will come in the name of the minister is the difference between night and day. One would give parliament a chance to say something at a point where it might be effective. The other would give parliament a chance to try to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

The hon. member for Athabasca and I have been seeing eye to eye and saying the same things all night. I plead with him to toughen up a bit and not accept motion No. 4 as a compromise for his motion No. 2. If we cannot have my proposal to kill the bill completely, or if we cannot have the proposal in motion No. 1 that the cut-offs die at the end of two years, then I think the next best thing we should have is what is set out in the motion now before us, namely, that if there is an order in council in years 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7 down the road, before such order in council can come into effect it has to be brought before parliament for a decision by this House of Commons.

Therefore I am in favour of and we shall vote for motion No. 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

• (2140)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved:

Motion No. 4.

The said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after section 9 thereof, the following heading and section:

COMING INTO FORCE OF ORDERS IN COUNCIL

10. (1) An order of the Governor in Council made pursuant to paragraph 5(2.3)(b) or 5.1(3)(d) shall be laid before the House of Commons not later than fifteen days after the day on which it was made, or, if Parliament is not then sitting, within the first fifteen days next thereafter that Parliament is sitting.

(2) Where an order of the Governor in Council has been laid before the House of Commons pursuant to subsection (1), a notice of motion in the House of Commons signed by not less than fifty members thereof and made in accordance with the rules of that House within seven days of the day the order was laid before that House praying that the order be revoked shall be taken up and considered in that House at the first convenient opportunity within the four sitting days next after the day the motion in that House was made.

(3) At fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business on the second sitting day following the commencement of consideration of a motion of which notice was given under subsection (2), or at such earlier time as the House of Commons is ready for the question, the Speaker shall put the question forthwith without further debate.

(4) If a motion considered by the House of Commons pursuant to this section is adopted by the House, with or without amendments, a message shall be sent to the Senate informing the Senate that the motion has been so adopted and requesting that the motion be concurred in by the Senate.

(5) The Senate shall, within the first four days next after receipt by it of a request from the House of Commons pursuant to subsection (4) that the Senate is sitting, in accordance with the Rules of the Senate, take up and consider the motion adopted by the House of Commons that is the subject of the request and all questions in connection therewith shall be debated without interruption and decided not later than the end of the third sitting day next after the day the motion is first so taken up and considered.

(6) If the Senate, pursuant to a request from the House of Commons, concurs in a motion adopted by the House as provided in this section, the order of the Governor in Council to which the motion relates is thereupon revoked effective from the day on which it was made.

[*English*]

He said: I thank hon. members for having agreed to consider these various motions tonight and for their contributions to the debate. I realize that various amendments have been brought forward to ensure that the points cov-

ered in committee will once again be discussed by the House at report stage. They represent the views of the opposition parties on this bill. Although I do not agree and the government does not agree with the amendments, I am convinced they are brought forward in a constructive way and with the best of intentions.

If I were to take the points that have been raised on this bill tonight, there are three or four that I should like to spend a couple of minutes on and then say a few words about motion No. 4.

There has been a complaint of unilateral action by the government in this case because the decision was brought in by a budget in June, 1975, by the former minister of finance. I have already covered some of that ground in committee, but I would remind hon. members again that after this particular announcement was made I had extensive consultation with the provinces and with the Canadian Medical Association. Following those consultations several amendments were made to the bill. As a matter of fact the bill before us is substantially different from the bill presented for first reading. Those changes were made following consultations and discussions with the provinces and the Canadian Medical Association. Obviously they do not meet all the points raised by the provinces and the CMA but they certainly go some way to meeting some of the concerns that have been expressed.

In addition, motion No. 4 is a change that the government is ready to support in order to take account of some of the views expressed by members of the opposition. As the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) said, motion No. 4 is substantially in the same spirit, as the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco). In this particular instance, therefore, the government has shown a lot of consideration for the views expressed on this bill. Obviously we have not withdrawn the bill; we believe the bill is necessary and that it is appropriate in the circumstances.

The hon. member for Athabasca put forward a motion to the effect that we should have this bill only for the first two years, on the basis that the provinces and the Canadian Medical Association did not seem to object too much to that proposition. I will admit to the hon. member that possibly Bill C-68 might not be necessary after the first two years. Several eventualities might occur in the meantime which would render it unnecessary. As a matter of fact I would hope that the government would not have to use the provisions of the bill after the first two years. That is why, instead of putting in a specific maximum contribution by the federal government, we have brought forward an amendment which leaves it to be decided by order in council after consultation with the provinces.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is no requirement for the government to put such a limit on the increase of its contribution. It may very well be, therefore, that after consultation with the provinces we will find that their plans for the following year are reasonable in the circumstances and that there does not appear to be any need to provide for a specific ceiling on the rate of increase of the cost of medical care. If, together with the provinces, we can develop an adequate control on the rate of increase in costs, then recourse to order in council would not be necessary.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

It may very well be that in the next two years we and the provinces will have arrived at a general financing formula which will replace both the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act and the Medical Care Act.

For the past two days I have presided at a conference with my provincial colleagues. The feeling amongst the provincial ministers was that following the meeting of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with the premiers in June we should try to develop a new health financing formula to replace both existing pieces of legislation and bring in a new technique for cost sharing. If this were to be accomplished and there were early agreement between the federal government and the provinces, obviously Bill C-68 would disappear. Not only would it self-destruct to use the hon. member for Athabasca's expression, but the Medical Care Act would be replaced in such an eventuality.

I am not saying that after two years the federal government would necessarily adopt orders in council setting some ceilings on the rate of increase in cost of medicare; on the other hand, however, it would be inappropriate for the federal government not to provide for the possibility that such agreement on a new financing formula would not have taken place or the possibility that agreement would not be reached with the provinces on what should be an adequate rate of growth of the cost of medicare. If that were to be the case, we feel that there should be in the hands of the federal government some power, as is provided in the present act, to put a ceiling on the rate of increase of the federal contribution.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) felt that such a measure was extremely wrong and unfair to the provinces. I was rather surprised to hear him use such strong words, Mr. Speaker. In effect, since the inception of hospital insurance and medicare we have seen the provinces deciding on their own how much the federal government was going to pay without consultation with the federal government, and without the federal government having anything to say about how much the bill would be at the end of the year. We are committed to paying 50 per cent of whatever the provinces decide to spend, and at no time do we have an idea of how much we are going to be asked to contribute, until we have received the last bill from the provinces.

● (2150)

In effect we shall now know what kind of bill to expect from the provinces. We have never said it is wrong or unfair, or used the kinds of adjectives used by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in describing this bill. This bill pays more respect to the role of respective governments than present legislation does, no matter whether we talk of hospital insurance or medical care. Indeed, it provides for the ceiling to be set after consultation with provinces.

The provinces will know ahead of time what they can expect as a maximum contribution from the federal government. They therefore will be able to plan the expenditures they will incur and the kind of settlements they can make with the medical profession, as well as arrangements they will need to make for meeting the total expense of medical care. They can plan all this well ahead of time, something which the federal government has not been able

to do in the past, as we were asked to pay the bill afterwards.

An hon. member called this bill a backward step. It is some "backward step". I calculated quickly how much more, not less, the federal government is expected to contribute next year to medical care alone under the present bill. This bill calls on the federal government to cost-share with the provinces next year the small additional sum of about $250 million for medicare alone. If that is a backward step, I do not know what the hon. member would call a forward step. We are not talking about cutting or reducing our contribution to medical care. We say that we shall have better control of the rate of growth, of the rate of escalation of our contributions to medical care. Therefore in that sense many of the statements made in committee and on second reading are exaggerated, especially when you consider the choices this bill provides.

Some hon. members talked of the opposition of the provinces to this bill. This was also raised in committee. Indeed it would be surprising if the provinces were to welcome this provision since it will do away with the blank cheque arrangement of the past. Now the provinces will know ahead of time how much they can draw from the federal government for medical care. I suppose if most of us could choose between having a blank cheque to draw any amount, and being told ahead of time how much we can draw, most of us would choose the blank cheque. The provinces are reacting just as individuals would react in those circumstances. That is the change we propose.

Some hon. members mention medical research, an area of concern to me and the government. I said previously that I am reviewing carefully the whole situation to see if we cannot find funds with which to alleviate the present difficulties of medical research. That, of course, is not the subject of this bill. I understand that the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs is to consider the estimates of my department soon. Witnesses on behalf of the medical research community will appear, and we shall have the opportunity to consider this issue at greater length.

Finally, let me say that the government is not backing away from cost-sharing. As I have already mentioned, this bill does not reduce the contribution of the federal government. Next year, for medicare alone, it will increase it by as much as $250 million for both levels of government. The social services bill will be proposed later this year and I hope will further extend the contributions of the federal government in the field of this country's social services.

As recently as two days ago I proposed to my provincial colleagues extended cost-sharing under hospital insurance and medical care, a cost-sharing extension which would have made life relatively easier for the provinces. Actually some provinces were eager to proceed immediately with the extension of those cost-sharing services. Other provinces prefer to wait until the first ministers' conference before making up their minds on this subject. Therefore it has been agreed that we shall wait until October 1 before reaching any conclusion on the subject.

We are not backing out of cost-sharing, not reducing the total volume of our contribution. We want to make certain that the health of Canadians keeps improving. But for this to happen we must allocate our resources to the most efficient area and make sure that the taxpayers' dollars, the spending of which is our responsibility, are used for the best purpose.

Having heard representations in committee, and particularly the motion proposed by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), I recognize that parliament ought to be given the opportunity to consider orders in council which the government might pass pursuant to the provisions of this bill. I therefore proposed motion No. 4, which is identical to a provision contained in Bill C-89. It provides that, at the request of 50 members of this House, an order in council must be debated for two days, after which there is to be a vote. If the vote is negative, the order in council shall become null and void. That provision, as I say, is identical to a similar provision contained in the bill on which the House voted earlier this afternoon. I hope it will carry, as it will give hon. members the opportunity to debate particular government decisions for a specified time.

Those are all the comments I wanted to make on the motions before the House. I thank hon. members for their attention.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, in the 30-odd seconds left let me assure the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It's Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Yewchuk: —that we have made no commitment with regard to motion No. 4. We shall make no commitment until we see what happens to the other motions. It is difficult to debate the motion without knowing what will be the results of the votes on the preceeding motions. My present inclination is to say that we do not care for this bill one bit. Despite that we proposed three amendments. We do not know how they will be voted on. They are listed in order of decreasing acceptability, and motion No. 4 is less acceptable than all the others. Even so, if it passes it may improve the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could the acting government House leader tell us what business the House will consider if this matter is concluded some time tomorrow? What is to be the business tomorrow?

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I shall answer, not as the acting government House leader, but as deputy Whip. I can inform the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) that we shall continue debating Bill C-68. If we finish the debate on the report stage, the government House leader will consult the other House leaders in the morning and they may reach agreement on the legislation that is to follow.

Mr. Hees: Well said. Gus for mayor!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is another way of saying you don't know.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FLOODS—SOURIS RIVER AREA—POSSIBLE DECLARATION AS DISASTER AREA

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, on April 12 I raised a question with respect to flooding on the Souris River. This is not a new problem. It is one that has been with the settlers in this area from time immemorial. However, it so happens that each year the problem is becoming increasingly worse. This year we have had intensive flooding which has involved major communities like Melita, Hartney, and the town of Souris itself, as well as thousands of acres of fertile farmland under flood waters and made useless for the current agriculture season, as well as extensive damage to wildlife.

The Souris River rises in Saskatchewan, winds into the United States, and then comes back into the province of Manitoba. For any action to deal with the growing problem of flooding, it will involve combined action on the part of at least five different governmental jurisdictions.

This year the city of Minot in the state of North Dakota was severely hit. It is estimated that damages will rise as high as $10 million. As a result the Governor of the state of North Dakota has asked the government of the United States to declare the area a national disaster.

Just to show how serious the flooding is this year, the Emergency Measures Organization calmly forecast that the flood would keep at a foot below the 1969 level. As actually happened, it peaked about ten feet above the flood level. Only effective work by the troops brought in on a very quick basis from the nearby Shilo Canadian Forces Base saved the water treatment plant in the town of Souris and also in the town of Melita. I would also like to note that students from the high school were released from school and did valiant work on the dikes as well.

The compensation is going to run into millions of dollars. As I have already indicated, the state of North Dakota will be backed by the resources of the United States. It appears that the Manitoba government is to bear the total cost of emergency compensation in the province of Manitoba through its Flood Assistance Board.

I raised the question on April 12 that the circumstances this year indicate that some permanent flood control measures must be taken on this waterway. I am sure all members are aware that over the past two or three years there has been constant discussion on the possible impact of the Garrison diversion that is being developed south of the border in terms of pollution of the Souris River and the Red River, and the possible impact on Canadian territory as a result. The International Joint Commission is looking into this particular aspect of the problem of the Souris.

I strongly urge, as I did in my question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand) the other day, that when he meets with the officials of the United States government, as he indicated he will be doing in the immediate future, he make strong representations that the terms of the IJC investigation be expanded to embrace the possibility and plans for permanent flood control on the Souris River.

There is a co-ordinating body that will involve the levels of government already operating in Canada. It was established on October 28, 1974, with the signing of an agreement by the governments of Canada, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. These governments jointly agreed to study the "complex and troublesome Souris River" and they established the study objective, which was as follows:

> To carry out an assessment of the water and related resources of the Souris River Basin and of the demands being made and likely to be made on them—

Other objectives of the study were flood damage reduction—so this is specifically within the terms of reference—as well as water supply, water quality, agricultural matters, and water related resources. We have a body operating within Canada which has been gathering information now since 1974, so I suggest that Canada is in a very excellent position to make strong recommendations to the government of the United States in this respect.

I would also point out that there is an excellent precedent for the action on the part of intergovernmental bodies, at least on the Canadian level. In 1950 the city of Winnipeg was almost totally inundated by a disastrous flood. Following that flood, studies were undertaken which indicated that the only solution was permanent flood control. In the early 1960's—I will not mention the government that was in power at the time but it was a very effective government—the federal government started a program that we hoped would continue, but there has been no further development in this regard. Nevertheless the precedent was so effectively established with control of the Assiniboine River, the Shellmouth dam, the Portage diversion, and the Winnipeg floodway, that there is no longer any threat of flooding in the city of Winnipeg from the Assiniboine and Red Rivers.

I hope the minister will seize the initiative in meetings with United States officials. In light of the reaction of the Governor of the state of North Dakota, who has had to cope with a flood of the Souris River of unusual magnitude, the minister can be assured of the utmost co-operation from that level of government.

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the federal government at this time has not received any request from the province of Manitoba for cost sharing assistance in respect to spring flooding along the Souris and Assiniboine River systems. I am advised, however, that the province will be establishing a flood damage compensation and restoration program to deal with the aftermath of the flood and that the costs of the program could be substantial. It is therefore likely that the province will be seeking federal finan-

cial assistance. The hon. member may rest assured that, when it is received, Manitoba's request will be given every consideration.

As the hon. member is aware, it has been long standing practice of the federal government to assist the provinces financially in the event that the cost of disasters exceed an amount that the provinces could reasonably be expected to bear on their own. Although the province of Manitoba is thoroughly familiar with the terms and conditions of the federal disaster assistance program, it might be useful for the members present if I briefly reviewed the chief aspects of the program.

As I have already noted, the federal policy has been deliberately designed to deal only with the larger, more costly disasters. This is clearly reflected in the cost sharing formula which establishes a minimum cost sharing threshold of $1 per capita of provincial population. No federal financial assistance is given until the costs incurred by a province exceed this minimum threshold. However, as costs rise above this level they are shared with the federal government on a progressive basis. Under the formula, which has been in effect since 1970, the amount of the federal contribution payable to a province is determined as follows: 0 per cent of the first $1 per capita of provincial expenditure, 50 per cent of the next $2 per capita of provincial expenditure, 75 per cent of the next $2 per capita of provincial expenditure, and 90 per cent of provincial expenditures in excess of $5 per capita.

In addition to the formula, there is a set of administrative guidelines which define the types of disaster related expenditures incurred by a province which are eligible for cost sharing assistance. Generally speaking, eligible expenditures are those made to restore the essential personal property of private citizens, farmsteads, and small businesses to habitable or workable condition, and to restore public works to their pre-flood condition. This also includes the costs of coping with the immediate situation such as building dikes and providing emergency accommodation. On the other hand, insurable losses, crop losses, and damages sustained by larger commercial enterprises are not eligible for cost-sharing assistance with the federal government.

● (2210)

As the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) is aware, the Canadian forces personnel based in Shilo, Portage, and Winnipeg have been heavily involved this spring in combating the flood threat, particularly in the towns of Souris and Wawanesa. This is a clear indication of the federal government's concern over the emergency situation in Manitoba and of the federal government's willingness to assist Canadian citizens in this area of provincial and municipal jurisdiction.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, is there a possible point of order, because that was really not my question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is aware that the procedure is very strict in the adjournment debate. There is no point of order; questions are put and answers are given, and the Chair has no alternative but to listen.

Adjournment Debate

TRANSPORT—SUGGESTION NEW POLICY BE DEVELOPED BEFORE ELIMINATION OF RAIL SUBSIDIES ON FLOUR AND GRAIN

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I must say I can appreciate the dilemma you are facing at this hour of the night.

Over the Easter weekend I had the privilege of marching down two sheds in Halifax that were the length of about nine football fields, I think. They would have docked the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Queen Mary* end to end without giving them a chance to rub bow to stern. Imagine that! Loaded there as high as an elephant can reach, and much higher than I can reach, and I am not exactly small, were bags of flour. This was the extent, as I saw it, of the flour trade that goes out through the Port of Halifax. It is a large trade. As a matter of fact I was rather surprised, and my colleague, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) can back me up, to find that it was larger than either one of us had thought was the case.

In any event, I am here tonight with a file of speeches that is about four inches thick which I have made on the late, late show. I think that in itself has to be a record. I do not think anyone has made more speeches on the late show on any one single subject, with the possible exception of the merry member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) who tangled some years ago with a former Postmaster General, Mr. Kierans. They used to joust here I think about once a week, if not twice a week on occasion.

In any event, I have pursued this with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). Even the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) has not escaped my eagle eye on this subject.

I gather that our dear friend, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), is going to reply as best he can to this continuous thunder I am bringing up. I am not going to burden the House at this late hour with a lot of figures. What I am trying to burden the House with is a couple of arguments.

The first argument I hope I will be able to make successfully, and I will be backed up by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), and others who are going to join this debate later on if it gets to that, is that I am going to prove brilliantly, conclusively, and beyond a reasonable doubt that the transportation subsidy in Canada is not in respect of Crowsnest Pass rates or maritime freight rates, but in respect of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In looking around I see there are five people present, plus the ubiquitous member from the Canadian Press; one person on that side, one person by the clock, and our protective staff so I am protected from God knows what, and yourself, Mr. Speaker. This number will be increased because before this debate is over, and I guarantee this if not threaten it, people are going to know that the fattest subsidies in transportation in Canada are not paid to westerners or maritimers but to those who live along the St. Lawrence system from Quebec City to Thunder Bay.

That having been said I wish to mention one further point the Minister of Transport deliberately has dragged into this debate late in the day. After I believe the fourth occasion on which I raised this matter in the Chamber the minister said would it not be nice if we had a unit train from western Canada to Halifax. The fact is that the roadbed is not strong enough to handle it now. I say that one should not throw out an old policy until one has tried the new policy.

My view is that the Minister of Transport is not justified in attempting to bring in the red herring of the unit train between western Canada and Halifax, which will not work unless a great deal of money is spent on it. He is not justified in throwing out a policy which now works. This is a matter which affects every eastern port. It affects the port of Halifax, the port of Saint John, the port of Montreal, and it affects the St. Lawrence River, Toronto itself, Thunder Bay, Port Colborne, and all the grain growers, at least in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Until the minister does something about this I, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East, the hon. member for Halifax, the hon. member for Vegreville, and the Lord knows how many other members from Ontario and Montreal will be involved in this. There will be a fight. That is the reason why I am standing up tonight.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I believe it has been suggested by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) that the work of the federal-provincial-industry group currently studying the potential for unit train operation for grain from the prairies to Atlantic ports be completed before the Atlantic and East rates are lifted. I hope I am dealing with the point he raised.

Mr. McCleave: Right on.

Mr. Francis: I am pleased to report that the development of the unit train concept is progressing well. In the case of Halifax, the CNR is now developing the rate quotations on movements from inland points such as Saskatoon and Rosetown. A further meeting relating to unit train movements to St. John via CP rail is scheduled for May 5 with the object of producing rates applicable to such origin points as Moose Jaw, Weyburn, and Elm Creek.

Mr. Forrestall: That is not the point.

Mr. Francis: I am sorry but I did not get the point of the hon. member.

Mr. Forrestall: The point is that the speed of the train is 25 miles an hour as opposed to the speed of 40 miles an hour which it should be.

Mr. Francis: The hon. member is making a point on which I really am not competent to comment. I simply want to put on the record what is taking place. I feel that what I am saying will be of interest to the two hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am happy to note that they are nodding their heads at this point.

In developing these rates a number of factors such as volume, type of grain, car cycles, season versus year-round movement, load and unload capacity, shift working and so on are being taken into consideration. It is anticipated that all parties involved in this evaluation process will be in possession of the relevant rate quotations before the end of May. Subsequently, the prospects will then be reviewed by the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (2220)

The railways are aware of the potentialities that exist for long haul unit train movement, and it is the minister's hope that the current assessment may do much to sustain the viability of the grain transfer role of the Atlantic ports.

FINANCE—ALLEGED IMPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FROM UNITED STATES AT BELOW COST OF PRODUCTION—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the century a great American orator made the comment, prophetically I believe, that if we destroy the farm it will not be long before the grass grows in the streets of every city of the country. But if the cities should be destroyed, they will grow again so long as we preserve the farms. Nobody wants to see either cities or farms destroyed, but I am concerned that in Canada we are not looking after the farmers, and in the future we will pay dearly for that.

Farmers are facing problems from every direction. Tonight I am speaking specifically about farmers in my riding of Surrey-White Rock who are facing distress, partly because of flooding which results from the urbanization of the area next door to the farms, which creates an increased run-off problem, flooding the flat lands where the best farmland is. Also they are facing the problem of high labour costs, and the most important subject of my comments tonight is the matter of imports that are competing, I believe unfairly, with the production of farmers in Surrey and, as a matter of fact, in the whole of Canada.

On April 12 I raised the matter in the House, first addressing myself to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). I spoke about the fact that at the time when fresh vegetables are ready for the market in the lower mainland of British Columbia fresh vegetables also happen to come in from the United States. It so happens that the American farmers can raise three or four crops a year, and with that kind of production it is easy for them to compete with the Canadian farmers and to maintain a high price all year long, and especially at the time when Canadian farmer's products are coming on the market when they can lower their price and still sell their product at above the cost for them. So they are not really technically guilty of dumping, but it is a matter of distress to Canadian farmers who cannot compete with that kind of import.

At the same time I mentioned to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) the fact that the processor of Canadian farm goods in Canada is facing competition from what is called distress selling of the product coming in from the U.S. As I understand it, distress selling is not really dumping, but it is providing again the kind of competition that is unfair to Canadian farmers.

For example, the frozen foods coming in from the U.S. are a commodity which can be preserved and does not have to be sold at any specific time. The large producer and the

large processor in the United States, with the volume they have, can easily bring that product to Canada and thus create unfair competition which is destroying Canadian farms. The U.S. can dominate in that way.

We had ten vegetables coming in from Taiwan at 20 per cent to 40 per cent below the market price of the Canadian product. We have mushrooms coming in from Korea and Taiwan. Recently Taiwan has been exporting frozen mushrooms. Until recently the mushroom farmers in Canada were selling mainly on the fresh market, and what they could not sell on the fresh market they froze and then sold. But now they are facing competition from these imports from Taiwan. You cannot blame farmers in Taiwan or the exporters, but we have to look after the producer in Canada.

What distresses me about this is that the consumer is caught in a bind. We cannot blame the consumer for that, but what will happen in the long run when smaller farmers are driven out of business and cannot compete any more? It will not be long until all we will have will be consolidated farms which will be similar to a monopoly and once that monopoly has been established, the consumer will get it in the neck anyway. It is only a matter of time.

All we need to do is to have a floating tariff which the Minister of Agriculture says is very simple. He is negotiating all the time but he does not seem to get around to providing that protective tarrif for our farmers in time so that our product is protected. All we need to do is raise that tariff in time so that the Canadian product finds shelter from the cheaper import from the United States. The Americans do that. They look after their own.

We have a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States, and there is supposed to be something like a 35 per cent or 37 per cent tariff on potatoes, for example. The Americans reciprocate, but they are shrewd enough and sharp enough to impose a quota on that part of the reciprocal trade agreement, and beyond that they impose a 75 per cent tariff. The quota is low enough so that it does not even pay Canadians to export, so we are defeated before we begin.

All I am asking of the Minister of Finance is that he consider the Canadian farmer and the distress under which he is operating and the kind of competition he is facing, and protect him so that in the years to come we will have production in our country and consumers will be protected in the long run. When a monopoly is established the consumer will be grabbed by the throat, and we will be paying, and paying in a way we cannot afford. All we are asking of the minister is that he look into the future so that our farmers will be protected, and in the long run our consumers will also be protected.

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) raised several interesting points. One I do not intend to comment on is the flooding he referred to because on the previous flooding issue I think I was washed out to sea.

I will try to be very specific with regard to the question of April 12 which the hon. member raised as to tariffs. I wish to advise that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) wrote to the president of Royal City Foods Limited on March 25. In his letter the minister pointed out that the Tariff Board is currently reviewing the tariffs on fresh and processed fruits and vegetables. He also made reference to the procedures already available under the Anti-dumping Act to deal with any imports Royal City Foods Limited believes are being dumped on the Canadian market.

I might add that in response to representations the minister later received from the Canadian Food Processors' Association, senior officials of the Department of Finance and of other interested departments met with representatives of that association to discuss the difficulties which have been encountered recently in certain segments of the processed fruits and vegetables industry in Canada. Representatives of the industry have undertaken to provide certain additional information concerning the impact of import competition on their operations which will assist the government in reaching a decision on the request of the industry for additional protection against imports.

I hope this information will satisfy the hon. member. His concern is shared by many hon. members of this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 30, 1976

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REFERRAL OF FARM BROADCASTS TO COMMITTEE FOR STUDY—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 regarding CBC farm broadcasting, which recently has become the subject matter in many parts of the country of some controversy, complaint and uncertainty. In anticipation that all hon. members are anxious that this important form of communication with farm producers and consumers alike be of the highest reasonable calibre, I move, and I am honoured to have my motion seconded by my colleague opposite, the vice-chairman of the standing committee on broadcasting, the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas):

That this matter of CBC farm broadcasting be referred for study to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion which is moved by the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Jarvis) and seconded by the hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SUGGESTED PROTEST TO UNITED STATES AGAINST CONSTRUCTION OF TRIDENT NUCLEAR BASE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. It concerns the construction of the Trident nuclear base in Bangor, Washington, immediately south of the city of Vancouver. In view of the tremendous size of the Trident installation, its close proximity to Canadian territory and the danger to Canadian lives and property posed by the existence of this base in the event of a nuclear fallout following a nuclear attack and in view of the long standing friendship, close relationship and atmosphere of goodwill between Canada and the United States, which Canada is presently demonstrating by her commitment to spend $1 billion of Canadian tax dollars to prop up the financially-troubled American Lockheed Corporation by its failure to either consult in respect of or protest such construction of the Trident base where Lockheed happens to be the prime contractor, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That this House go on record as condemning the construction of the Trident nuclear base and request the Canadian government to protest to the United States that construction in the strongest possible terms and, to request immediate consultation and discussion with the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be presented at this time only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Trudeau: Paproski said no.

Mr. Paproski: Trudeau said no.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

● (1110)

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

JURISDICTION OF BOARD TO REVIEW PRICING POLICIES OF GOVERNMENT BOARDS AND AGENCIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the pricing policies of the federal public sector have been removed from the direct jurisdiction of the Anti-Inflation Board, yet the board reports that almost 10 per cent of their complaints involve government matters, can the minister tell the House whether persons affected by federal price increases have any practical opportunity on a day to day basis to appeal the price policies of federal emanations and, if so, to what body?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's premise is incorrect. The federal government, and indeed provincial government bodies which recover most of the costs of the services provided by way of user charges, are subject to the Anti-Inflation

Board. As the House has been told many times, other federal tribunals such as the National Energy Board and other boards which govern the provision of services to the public are applying anti-inflation guidelines. In the situation where much of the cost is covered by a subsidy from the federal Treasury and only part is recovered by the user charges, the department or the Treasury Board applies the price and income guidelines in determining the extent to which there should be an increase in the user charge.

The hon. member has said very often that there should be a reduction of the federal government expenditure in this country. We have acknowledged that in the sense of saying that the absolute subsidy provided, for example, to the airlines through the air transport charges, should not be increased and where costs go up the user should be expected to pay rather than have the cost borne by the general taxpayer.

SUGGESTION BOARD BE REQUESTED TO REVIEW PRICING POLICIES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND MONETARY POLICY OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): My question is directed again to the Minister of Finance. In order to prevent any possible doubt concerning this question of undue price increase at federal levels and considering that section 12(1)(e) of the Anti-Inflation Act gives the board the authority to comment on any inflationary activities at the federal government levels, will the minister encourage the Anti-Inflation Board to review all pricing decisions of federal emanations and to condemn publicly any price increase which the board finds unjustified?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): The membership of the board is of such quality and so concerned about the effectiveness of the program that they do not require encouragement from me. I notice that they have been fairly active in this regard without my intervention.

Mr. Stevens: My supplementary question is again to the Minister of Finance. Noting that the C.D. Howe Research Institute has released a study claiming that the federal monetary policy has been inflationary in recent years and that a major villain of the piece has been the ravenous cash requirements of the federal government, will the minister ask the Anti-Inflation Board as part of its effort to promote public understanding of the inflationary process, as is contemplated under the act, to review developments in monetary policy and government expenditure and to report to the Canadian people as to whether these developments are consistent with the goals of the anti-inflation program?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it does dot seem to me to make a lot of sense to have the Anti-Inflation Board go back to 1972, 1973 and 1974 when the primary concern of the government at least, if not of the hon. member, was the high rate of unemployment in Canada and to review the policies being followed by the Bank of Canada at that time. The Bank of Canada has made it clear that under current circumstances it will run quite a tight monetary policy, and I think this is recognized as much by the Anti-Inflation Board as by anyone else, certainly by the vice-chairman.

ADDITIONAL STAFF NECESSARY TO COPE WITH BACKLOG OF WAGE SETTLEMENTS

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the staff of the Anti-Inflation Board has increased three-fold over the minister's original estimate, and in view of the fact that as of April 9 there was a backlog of 3,900 wage settlements before the board, will the minister say, first, when the backlog will be eliminated and, secondly, how much additional staff he expects will be necessary to cope with the situation?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the board that much of the backlog arises from the reports which have been required from the corporate sector, including the reports with respect to the wage settlements of their particular employees. The vast majority of those, as has often been stated in public, should be cleared in the relatively near future. Of course, there will remain a backlog of some of the more difficult cases, particularly where the question of historical relationship is involved.

ALLEGED STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR THAT CONTROL PROGRAM SHOULD BE DISMANTLED—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jim Balfour (Regina East): Does the minister agree with the statement of the administrator of the Anti-Inflation Board that the wage and price control program should be dismantled as soon as possible?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): That is the position I have taken in this House right from the start, but the hon. gentleman seems to support the view that even if we have 6 per cent inflation next year, at that point we should accept it and live with it. This government has not taken that position.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): We think the program should run until inflation in Canada is drastically reduced.

* * *

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTO PACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO REDUCE DEFICIT

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Finance. Given the report this morning that a body of United States politicians wants to continue with an unchanged Canada-U.S. automotive agreement—not unusual considering that they had a $2 billion trade surplus in their favour for last year—I should like to ask the minister if he would confirm for the House that in the automotive parts trade for the first quarter of this year we are running a deficit of $600 million in automotive parts alone. I believe that to be the case. Would the minister tell the House what plans the

government now has to turn around this unacceptable situation.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think I should like to confirm the accuracy of the figure, from a purely statistical standpoint. The position taken by my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, has my support, namely, that his department has been carrying out an analysis on the current situation, both with regard to automobiles and parts, for the purpose of preparing a position for discussion with the United States on the subject of the auto pact.

Incidentally, the United States administration has been engaged in a similar analysis on their side. I think one would have to recognize that political events in the United States during the balance of this calendar year may make it difficult to complete negotiations for any changes in the auto pact.

Mr. Broadbent: For at least three years now the government has been saying that it has been undertaking studies as to what changes, if any, ought to be made in the Canada-U.S. automotive agreement. Would the minister finally give us some deadline for when the studies will be finished? Specifically, can he tell us what the government intends to do to ensure that Canadians get their share of investment which is at least proportionate to our consumption in that industry. Secondly, when does the government finally intend to make the automotive companies in Canada bring down their prices for Canadian consumers to at least the level at which they sell the same cars produced in this country to Americans?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As the hon. gentleman knows, during the history of the auto pact over the past decade there has been a variation of experience. Indeed, up until 1971 the performance of the pact for Canada had been very much ahead and was the subject matter of some complaint by the then secretary of the United States treasury.

As to whether we will give up our careful study of the program, of course we will not. I think it will be important to monitor the effects of the existing arrangements from time to time to make certain that the program is meeting the interests of the two countries. I agree, however, that it is appropriate that the two administrations should be in position to discuss this, to do a perspective on the auto pact and to see the manner in which it should be changed in the interests of both countries.

Mr. Broadbent: The minister cites 1971 as a favourable year.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Up to.

Mr. Broadbent: He says "up to". I remind the minister that in eight of the eleven years the pact has been in existence Canada has had a massive deficit. I should like to ask whether the government intends, during 1976, for example, to come forward with specific proposals in terms of investment requirements for the automotive companies on this side of the border and in terms of pricing decisions to ensure that at least fairness is built into the pact for Canadians.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I point out to the hon. gentleman again that there has been an ebb and a flow in this matter, and that at the time cited Canada was quite substantially ahead on the auto pact. As I indicated, we are putting ourselves in a position to commence discussions with the United States on the subject of the auto pact. I pointed to what may be some difficulty, from the standpoint of the United States, with extensive negotiations this year but we are putting ourselves in readiness for those kinds of discussions as soon as they can reasonably be held.

* * *

● (1120)

[*Translation*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

SUGGESTION OFFICIALS TRAVEL ECONOMY CLASS AND EXPENSE ACCOUNTS BE PUBLISHED

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to put a question to the Minister of the Environment but, in his absence, I believe the President of the Treasury Board, or even the President of the Privy Council could answer it.

As the government intends to reduce MP's expenses, is the minister aware that the chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board still travels first class by air, according to the newspapers? First, would he have the chairman practice what he preaches since hon. members will have to travel third class? Second, would he be willing to publish the expense accounts of all the members of the AIB to ensure that they are really setting the example?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, one incident was reported to the effect that Mr. Pepin had travelled first class; he explained that he had an economy class ticket but he had been invited to travel first class. I am not aware of other similar incidents.

As for the other question, if the hon. member wants that information, I believe he could have a question put on the order paper to which the responsible minister would give a reply. As for the hon. member's travelling third class, I wonder if he will be travelling by canoe.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to ask the minister—but first I want to tell him that I go by canoe in the woods only—if he is going to ask all officials to reduce their expenses and stop travelling in millionaire style.

Mr. Chrétien: We put out instructions last December forbidding civil servants to travel first class, unless circumstances are extraordinary; that is the principle we have adopted to prove to the people that restrictions are also applied to members of parliament, ministers and officials of the government.

Oral Questions

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the marriage breakup which took place last week-end in Toronto between the federal and provincial wings of the Liberal party, I wonder if the Prime Minister is planning to make any helicopter tours of Ontario this spring, as he did a year ago, when he will be dropping in on provincial Liberal picnics and other such festivities?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that such an experienced member has not learned to make the distinction between marriage breakup and women's liberation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: On the substance of the question, Mr. Speaker, the only plans I have for using helicopters in the near future is to reach those heights of Olympus on which the hon. member sits.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question. I should like to remind the Prime Minister that the view is infinitely better from this new and exalted position that I now occupy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: The view of the back of your leader's head is better?

Mr. Hees: I can assure the Prime Minister that the atmosphere is far fresher and purer up here than it is down on that mundane level on which he sits. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he would seriously consider taking one of those helicopter trips, and if he would promise to call in at Prince Edward-Hastings, because I always appreciate the extra thousand majority he adds to my vote at election time whenever he pays my riding a call!

Mr. Paproski: And try Edmonton Centre at the same time.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, as for the view, I agree with the hon. member. It is much better to see his leader from the back. I concede the telling point about the increase of votes. I believe they were brought about because when I visited the riding the hon. member made sure he was in every picture taken of me.

Mr. Hees: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. My only objection, after the Prime Minister's last visit to my riding, is this: for about a week after his visit I kept being asked, "Say, George, who was the little guy traipsing around behind you at the fair?"

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paproski: Touché, George.

Mr. Hees: You set them up and I'll knock them down.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ALLEGED INADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL CONTROL PROCEDURES FOR LEASES AND CONCESSIONS AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the Prime Minister's statement regarding the establishment of a pattern of inconsistencies with respect to tendering procedures, is it the intention of the minister to ask the Auditor General to look into the question of financial control procedures at all international airports in view of events recently brought to light with respect to the administration of leases and concessions and the fact that instances of inadequate controls were brought to the attention of the government by the Auditor General some time ago. Specifically, the 1971 Auditor General's report stated in part:

In audits of the international airports at Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, a number of irregularities were observed in the administration of leases and concessions. These irregularities indicate the need for a strengthening by the Department of Transport of the administration of its leases and concessions:—

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to ask the Auditor General to do his job. He is very well known for his excellent work and I am sure that if he sees any irregularities in the procedures he will inform me without any delay. However, I thank the hon. member for raising this matter. As far as I am concerned, I inquired of the department's officials and found nothing in particular to comment on. For the information of the hon. member, I could send him immediately the list of procedures to be followed by the departments before asking for public tenders.

* * *

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—REGULATIONS GOVERNING CHANGES IN CONTRACTS WITHOUT CALLING TENDERS

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed either to the Acting Minister of Transport or to the President of the Treasury Board. Can either hon. gentlemen indicate whether the consortium of consultants retained for Mirabel International Airport, namely Consultant en Aéroports Internationaux de Montréal Ltée have discretionary powers with regard to authorizing changes in tenders or procedures which would permit those who have submitted successful bids to receive "change orders" or additional payments up to several hundred thousand dollars without public tender. In other words, what are the terms of reference binding CAIM, the consultant firm, for allocating work and tenders?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give a full answer to this question. However, I take good note of it and I shall report to the hon. member later.

[*English*]

Mr. MacKay: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask him to consider, when he is looking into the matter, if the ceiling of $500,000 is relevant? Also, will he check to see if contracts exceeding the discretionary amount, if such there is, were severed or split into smaller amounts in order to bring them within the discretionary limit?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not have this information at hand, but I shall try to obtain it.

[*English*]

MIRABEL—REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF MR. STONER'S BEHAVIOUR IN CONNECTION WITH FOOD CONCESSION TENDER

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister? On Wednesday last my colleague, the hon. member for Vegreville, asked the House to approve a motion requesting that Mr. Gerry Stoner explain in writing his behaviour vis-à-vis the Mirabel restaurant matter. The motion having been defeated, I ask the Prime Minister to direct the Minister of Transport forthwith to ask for and table a written explanation of Mr. Stoner's behaviour, which includes various statements to indicate whether or not his minister of the day simply authorized the act of intervention or, indeed, ordered it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the motion, which I did not hear last week, was brought to my attention. It reinforces my view of the offer I made in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition. This whole matter should be brought before a parliamentary committee or committee of the whole so that these questions can be asked of the minister. He will be assisted by officials and is anxious to answer all these questions. I regret the nature of the motion and, indeed, of the question, because, by innuendo, they cast aspersions on one of our most distinguished civil servants. The man is beyond reproach and has served the government well for many years. I am sorry that not only ministers but civil servants now are being tarred with this kind of smear.

Mr. Clark: Apparently there is a limitless supply of red herrings available to the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister completely misleads the House with respect to that matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1130)

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The question related to an apparent conflict of statements made by the former Minister of Transport, now the Minister of the Environment, and the present Minister of Transport. I again ask if the Prime Minister is prepared to have the present Minister of Transport file an explanation with regard to the influence or intervention by the Minister of Transport of that day into this matter vis-à-vis Mr. Gerry Stoner who is indeed a respected civil servant.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, my answer to that would be a flat no. I would not want the minister to file any such statement. I hope the opposition will have the courage to challenge the minister and his officials in front of a committee or of the committee of the whole House, if necessary, because this kind of question that has been asked repeatedly is not meant to get to the truth of the matter. It is meant, as the hon. member for Central Nova indicated, to be mischievous and frivolous. He is not seeking the truth. He is seeking to distribute a lot of hot air. It is of no service to the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

IMMIGRATION

ALLEGED DIFFICULTY OF UNITED STATES MAGAZINES IN OBTAINING WORK VISAS FOR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, I will direct my question to his parliamentary secretary. Has the minister initiated a policy in which his department is telling companies owning United States magazines and reporting on Canadian public affairs to employ only Canadians for posts in Canada, in that organizations seeking to transfer non-Canadian correspondents to Canada have encountered difficulty in obtaining or extending work visas?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I shall take note of the hon. member's question and he will have an answer sometime next week.

[*English*]

Mr. Epp: In order to maintain freedom of the press, will the minister assure this House that non-Canadian correspondents working for foreign news services, newspapers or magazines will not be barred from working in Canada through the withholding of work visas, an action that borders on control of the press?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Portelance: As I have said, I take note of the question, Mr. Speaker. The minister will reply to the hon. member next week.

* * *

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF TOTAL EXPENDITURE IN 1976

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. The total outlay for unemployment insurance totalled over $3 billion in 1975 and caused the government's share of UI expenditure to increase by 90 per cent over that experienced in 1974. In view of the fact that Statistics Canada now reports that both net and gross benefit payouts for UIC have increased an additional 15 per cent in the first two months of 1976 over the first two months of 1975, does the minister

now believe that total expenditure for 1976 will exceed those astronomical figures we had to live with in 1975 and can he give us any indication as to what this total outlay will be in 1976?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

ALLEGED FAILURE OF BILL C-69 TO EFFECT REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In June of last year the former Minister of Finance announced a five point strategy to achieve restraint in unemployment insurance expenditures. This was followed by Bill C-69 which revealed in glowing terms how it would tighten up the Unemployment Insurance Act. In view of the fact that Bill C-69 has been in effect since January 1 and in that same period of time expenditures have continued to increase, is the Prime Minister now prepared to concede that Bill C-69 will not bring about the desired effects it was initially believed to accomplish and therefore call for immediate additional amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act, preferably early in the next session?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is an intention to bring in amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Commission Act. We are now looking at this matter. I hope the hon. member will make his views known on this before the bill is put before the House.

Mr. Alexander: In light of the fact that the Unemployment Insurance payout has considerably increased since the introduction of Bill C-69, is the Prime Minister now prepared to indicate that Bill C-69 has not had the desired effect?

Mr. Trudeau: The question sounds slightly argumentative, Mr. Speaker, but I will take note of it.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DISCUSSIONS WITH UNITED STATES ON BOUNDARY LINE DIVIDING FISHING BANKS ON ATLANTIC COAST—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Prime Minister. Since Canada maintains the equidistant principle in the seaward extension of the boundary dividing the land mass between Canada and the United States while the United States claims the Fundian channel divides the fishing banks on the Atlantic coast, has the Prime Minister or any of his officials held recent talks with the Americans on this topic? If so, can he inform the House on the progress being made in view of the valuable groundfish and scallop fishery, as well as possible oil, gas and minerals in this area?

[Mr. Alexander.]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will take note of the question on behalf of the minister.

Mr. Crouse: Since the ownership of this valuable offshore bank is obviously in question and is claimed today by Canada and the United States, can the Prime Minister inform the House if there is any informal agreement between our two countries on this bank and, if not, on what basis have exploration permits been issued to oil companies interested in probing the resources of this area?

Mr. Trudeau: I will take note of that too, Mr. Speaker.

ALLEGED OBJECTION OF UNITED STATES TO CANADIAN SUBSIDIARY OF PRATT-WHITNEY ENTERING INTO CONTRACT WITH ROLLS-ROYCE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I will direct my question to the Prime Minister. I presume the Prime Minister is aware of the decision by the United States justice department which prevents Pratt-Whitney Canada Limited of Montreal from entering into a contract with Rolls-Royce for the development of a new engine, thereby purporting to use extra territorial jurisdiction over a Canadian company, although it is an American subsidiary. What action is the government taking to protest the move by the United States justice department to prevent this contract from being entered into, a contract which would provide a thousand Canadian jobs over the life of the development contract for the Rolls-Royce Pratt-Whitney engine?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member flatters me when he assumes that I know the terms of this contract. I will take note of the question.

Mr. Leggatt: I was not suggesting the Prime Minister would know the terms of the contract. I thought he might know that the United States justice department was interfering in Canadian affairs. That is something he might like to take note of if he did not know before now. In view of the information the Prime Minister now has, will he take action to protest the extra territorial use of American law dealing with Canadian subsidiaries and drying up Canadian jobs? Further, will the Prime Minister advise if it is government policy to continue going to the United States to buy Lockheed aircraft without research and development because this new contract that is drying up has research and development for Canadians? What action will the Prime Minister now take?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if the justice department of the United States is indeed addressing Canada in that way, I will discuss with the Minister of National Defence what response will be necessary.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBILITY OF FORCE BECOMING INVOLVED IN JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Solicitor General a question. A few days ago I asked the Prime Minister to make certain that the RCMP do not become embroiled in a jurisdictional dispute. The Prime Minister said he would look into the facts and try to solve the problem. Would the Solicitor General now advise the House whether this question has been solved, so as to ensure that any wrongdoing will be subject to the judgment of the courts and not sabotaged by jurisdictional technicalities or political skullduggery?

● (1140)

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): As I mentioned in the House the other day, this matter will be discussed between myself and the solicitor general of Quebec very shortly.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sure the Solicitor General has read the morning papers and noted that the solicitor general in Quebec has said: Hands off. What is the attitude of the Solicitor General, the minister responsible for the RCMP, when the force is, really, embroiled in a jurisdictional dispute?

Mr. Allmand: I do not think we can rely on the press for a true representation of what is going on between Quebec and the federal government. All I can say is that discussions have been going on between officials of the police involving Ontario, Quebec and the federal government, and that very shortly I shall be meeting with the solicitor general and the deputy minister from Quebec. I am sure we can resolve these difficulties.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

ALLEGATION MINISTER'S STATEMENT INDICATED GOVERNMENT WOULD NOT PROCEED WITH MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the minister's statement earlier this week to the effect that it is questionable whether the proposed pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley will be proceeded with, can the hon. gentleman advise whether or not this statement indicates that the government now favours the proposal of Polar Gas and Panarctic Oil to build a pipeline from the high Arctic and/or a Y-line concept?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion did not point in that direction. It merely indicated that as long as the extractable reserves in the north, in the Delta area, are only in the order of three trillion cubic feet there was some question that the pipeline might not be in Canada's interest.

DATE OF ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS GOVERNING DRILLING FOR OIL AND GAS IN THE NORTH

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Can the minister advise us when he expects to have the long-overdue oil and gas regulations ready for promulgation?

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): It is the hope of my colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and myself that we shall be able to issue a statement containing the substance of the oil and gas regulations by the middle of May, that is, in the next two weeks.

* * *

ENERGY

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON PROPOSED PIPELINE FROM PRINCE RUPERT TO EDMONTON

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is intended for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In the light of serious studies presently being conducted in connection with a proposal to build a pipeline from Prince Rupert tying into the Trans Mountain Pipe Line, can the parliamentary secretary to the minister or the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources tell the House whether the government is making any input into these studies and whether the proposal is being considered by the department as an alternative to the Mackenzie Valley route?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Perhaps I might reply to that question as acting minister. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has been contacted by participants in the study, essentially in the private sector, who have indicated their interest in this proposal. The purpose of the project is to carry petroleum rather than natural gas, moving oil which has come down through the Alyeska pipeline into the Interprovincial system by way of Edmonton so as to make up for reduced exports of oil to a number of northern tier American states. It is an entirely private initiative. The department has been in touch with those who are interested but the federal government has taken no decision with regard to it.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSAL TO REFUSE NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY TO INDIA UNLESS AGREEMENT REACHED ON INSPECTION OF FACILITIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and it arises from a CBC report of last evening. Can the right hon. gentleman tell us whether in the course of the current negotiations between Canada and India to resume shipment of nuclear technology and fuel to that country agreement has been reached with regard to IAEA inspection of all nuclear facilities in India, not just those supplied by Canada, and, if not, will the government refuse to proceed with any resumption of nuclear supplies to that country as

has been strongly advocated by members on this side of the House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. The matter is to be before cabinet very soon; there have been recent discussions with the government of India.

RELATIONSHIP OF REFUSAL TO ALLOW ITALIAN COMPANY TO SELL NUCLEAR REACTORS UNDER LICENCE TO POLITICAL SITUATION IN ITALY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary involving a question which the Secretary of State considered too complex to answer yesterday. With regard to the licensing agreement allowing an Italian company to build CANDU reactors, if the report of April 24 was correct in stating that that company would not be permitted the resale of nuclear technology to other countries, was that decision in any way related to the unsettled political position in Italy?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. lady is talking about a report and a company. I do not know what she is referring to in either case. But I will refer her question to the minister.

* * *

FISHERIES

EXCLUSION OF NEWFOUNDLAND FROM REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON LOBSTER FISHING—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of State for Fisheries I will direct my question to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the fact that the minister has made concessions to maritime lobster fishermen while excluding the Newfoundland lobster fishermen who find themselves in the same difficulties, and in the light of representations which have been made to the minister respecting which an early decision was promised, can the parliamentary secretary now advise the House what decision or what action has been taken?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State (Fisheries)): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of State for Fisheries is presently in New York attending the Law of the Sea Conference. I know he was due to make a policy statement on the weekend so I might as well make it for him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Gander-Twillingate): The decision does not involve a major policy change as was the case in other maritime provinces. It involves, rather, adjustments to enable two things to be done. First, the fishermen helpers who worked with moonlighters in past years, and who are not permitted under the present regulations to obtain operators' licences, will now be permitted to obtain them; second, fishermen who had contemplated going out lobster catching and were refused a licence and who had made a commitment prior to December 30, 1975, will now be able to apply for a licence. I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree with these basic changes, two of which were suggested in a letter he wrote to me approximately a month ago.

Mr. Marshall: I may say to the parliamentary secretary that I certainly agree with the changes because they are two which I recommended to the minister. Can the hon. gentleman now tell us what steps the department has taken to advise the fishermen of these adjustments, in view of the fact that the lobster season is now with us in Newfoundland and the information needs to go out as quickly as possible?

Mr. Baker (Gander-Twillingate): I can assure the hon. member that I will communicate this policy immediately to the media in Newfoundland. As the hon. member knows, most of the fishermen who were, in effect, discriminated against had already appealed to the Appeal Board and the Appeal Board will be notified immediately with regard to this policy change. Obviously, some of the applications which were formerly rejected will now be accepted.

REQUEST FOR LIST OF THOSE REFUSED LOBSTER FISHING LICENCE

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I wish to congratulate the parliamentary secretary. Would he tell the minister when he comes back that members from the maritime provinces are glad to see he has finally got some sense into this policy regarding lobster fishing licences. Will he also ask the minister to allow the members who represent the maritime provinces to get the names of those to whom lobster fishing licences were originally refused? I have been trying for weeks to get the names of those concerned in my constituency.

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Fisheries)): The hon. member's question, as I understand it, is to ask the minister to do this. The answer is, yes.

* * *

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE OF "ECONOMIC REVIEW" TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance who, I understand, will shortly be tabling the Economic Review, and who has indicated he will at least give some consideration to having the report referred to the Standing Committee on Finance. Will he be prepared to make such a motion of reference to the standing committee when he tables the report in the House?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): I do not have a motion before me but I would be quite prepared to discuss the matter with the House leader with the hon. gentleman's objective in mind.

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED MORATORIUM ON REPAYMENT OF FARM CREDIT LOANS BY DAIRY FARMERS

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. I am sure the minister realizes the disdain with which we regard the dairy policy. Notwithstanding this, since the policy is causing serious problems among dairy farmers, would he consider allowing dairy farmers to refrain in the next 12 months from paying back some of their farm credit loans until they can get the industry straightened out? I ask this because the situation is pushing some of them very close to bankruptcy.

● (1150)

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we had the Chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation at a meeting late last night and he said they would look at this with their usual charitable attitude. Farm Credit history has shown that they have never taken advantage of a situation that was not the farmers fault.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBLE REASSESSMENT OF METHOD OF DISTRIBUTING MILK QUOTAS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Last week, during the yearly convention of the Quebec Federation of Milk Producers, a resolution was passed severely censuring the Canadian Dairy Commission for the way it allotted quotas which, in its view, is most unfair towards the province of Quebec in particular. Therefore, would the minister prevail upon the Canadian Dairy Commission to review and even amend the method it used regarding quota apportioning in view of reducing production since, according to the resolution, it was very unjust particularly to Quebec?

[*English*]

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the industrial milk producers annual meeting in Quebec certainly has the right to pass any resolution it so desires. I am not saying what resolution should or should not be passed. The problem is that it is the province of Quebec itself that allocates the quotas for the producers in their own province. I did have a representative at that meeting. In fact, I had more than one representative there. The fact is that they are not happy at the present time with the way they are sharing the industrial or global quota or the quota of the whole nation. We have very little to do with how this is distributed between the provinces. The milk sharing quota committee, made up of provincial producers' organizations along with the Dairy Commission, decides how this is to be distributed. I do not make that decision.

SUGGESTION MILK PRODUCTION SHOULD BE CONTROLLED FEDERALLY

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he recently received representations from milk producer groups suggesting that milk production should be controlled federally, presumably under the Farm Products Marketing Council and, if so, what has his response been to those representations?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not remember receiving these representations in a formal manner. I have received them in conversation, but I have no recollection of seeing any written document of any kind making that suggestion. I think the only way we will be able to solve the problem is if there is more federal control, and I mean by that farmer control on a national basis. Every province runs its own quota system, and each one of them in Canada does it in a different fashion at the present time. However, if they are thinking along these lines I would be receptive to that kind of suggestion.

* * *

HEALTH

MEDICAL AUTHORITY FOR DECISION NOT TO VACCINATE CHILDREN AGAINST SWINE FLU

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the government planning to provide vaccine for immunization of Canadian children against the swine influenza virus and, if not, upon what medical authority was the decision made?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, at the present time the answer is no and the authority is that of the best immunologists in the country who constitute the national advisory committee on immunization agents. They advised the government on this matter and their report has been tabled in the House.

In addition, I might point out to the hon. member that there seems to be very serious second thoughts taking place in the United States as to the mass immunization program as far as children are concerned. Some opinion I have read in the papers is to the effect that they should not immunize children under five years of age. I have seen other information to the effect that they are now carrying on tests of children between age three and 11 in order to determine whether they should or should not give the vaccine to them. So this is an issue even in the United States that is far from being resolved or settled, although at first the United States announced it was going to carry out universal immunization. We are obviously following this particular situation very closely. If there is any scientific information justifying a change in policy we will be acting on the best scientific advice we can obtain and I would not hesitate to modify the announced policy.

Oral Questions

REASON FOR REDUCTION IN BUDGET OF MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in view of the need for very active ongoing programs in medical research to keep abreast of the production of vaccines and for other medical services, will the minister explain the rationale for cutting the medical research budget of the Medical Research Council to the point that it had to reduce the number of ongoing programs by 40 per cent, and could accept only 13 per cent of the new applications for the year ahead?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows very well that the production of vaccine in this particular instance has nothing to do with medical research as such. It is really a problem of industrial production which has to be met in a very short time. As to the broader question raised by the hon. member in which he suggests that I and the government are not concerned about medical research, I have already said to him and other members in the House that I was reviewing the situation and trying to find the funds somewhere along the line to put into medical research in this country.

SOURCE OF VACCINE FOR SWINE FLU

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of National Health and Welfare indicate whether he is now in a position to inform the House and the country what the source of the vaccine supply is to be? There have been varying reports about this, but we still do not know whether anyone will be able to produce a sufficient quantity?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we will have an ample supply of vaccine in ample time for distribution in the fall. We are having discussions with foreign countries, including the United States, but I am in no position to make a formal announcement at this time. As I have said before, as long as these negotiations are going on I think it would be very inappropriate for me to make a formal statement.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ALLEGED FALSE STATEMENT BY POSTMASTER GENERAL CONCERNING RATE INCREASES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I would ask whether he is aware of the announced plans of his colleague, the Postmaster General, to increase postal rates in Canada despite his assertion less than a year ago that postal rates would not rise until post office efficiency had improved, and will he tell the House whether the Postmaster General's comments constituted false and misleading advertising by the head of this giant monopoly?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Lalonde.]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the last time I tried to discuss this matter with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in my capacity as Postmaster General he was not speaking to me.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: I don't blame him.

Mr. Mackasey: As Postmaster General, I wrote him a letter and the answer came back—

An hon. Member: Has he got it yet.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: How did he get the letter?

Mr. Mackasey: I delivered the letter.

Mr. Mackasey: The increase we are suggesting in the way of first-class mail is very nominal and well within the guidelines, particularly in light of the deficit which exists in the post office. The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department congratulated the Postmaster General on the high quality and integrity of his advertising.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question also deals with the matter of postal efficiency, and it arises from the planned lottery by the post office which would include the grand prize winner being sent by the post office to any place in Canada served by the Post Office.

An hon. Member: By mail.

Mr. Beatty: I would like to ask the Postmaster General what assurance he can give the House that the winning entrant will arrive at his destination without being lost or mutilated en route?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

PROPOSED DELAY IN SIGNING SYNCRUDE AGREEMENT UNTIL NATIVES GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT ON PROJECT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and I am sure all members of the House are sorry to see him limping and walking with a cane. We did not expect such a violent reaction from his colleagues regarding his statement that we should not proceed with the Mackenzie Valley pipeline because there is not enough gas. I should like to ask the minister about the report that the signing of the Syncrude agreement has been postponed due to his intervention, an action for which I commend him.

● (1200)

The report is that the Government of Canada is insisting on some guarantees that the native people will be given

employment, not only on the construction but in entrepreneural services. I wish to ask the minister, or the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, whether the government has received such assurance, and if so in what form and whether or not he has been able to convince both the Government of Alberta and the Government of Ontario, which have objected to this course of action, that such guarantees should be given. If they are not given, can he assure the House that the agreement will not be signed until some provision, either by way of a clause in the agreement or a letter of intent, has been received by the Government of Canada.

Hon. Judd Buchanan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I last discussed this matter a couple of hours ago with my colleague the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who is in Edmonton. We had been working on a draft of a letter which would be acceptable and which we felt would protect the interests of the native people. It was acceptable to the government of the province of Alberta and I believe my colleague has worked out the arrangements with the other interested parties as well. I have not heard from him in the last couple of hours.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, has the Syncrude consortium also agreed to a guarantee to employ native people.

Mr. Buchanan: Mr. Speaker, this letter is in the form of a direction from the participants to the Syncrude Corporation to negotiate and enter into such an agreement.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FINANCE

TABLING OF "ECONOMIC REVIEW", APRIL, 1976—REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies, in both official languages, of the *Economic Review*, April, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the question raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) I have a motion to the effect that the *Economic Review*, April, 1976, be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. I wonder whether the House would be prepared to give unanimous consent to such a motion?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion, of course, can be put only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent that the motion be put?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the *Economic Review*, April, 1976, be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

Order Paper Questions

CONSTITUENCY RECORDS ACT

MEASURE REQUIRING MPs TO PASS ON TO SUCCESSORS FILES RELATING TO CONSTITUENCY PROBLEMS

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-436, respecting the preservation and surrender of constituency records.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require members of parliament to pass on to their successors any files they possess dealing with matters relating to constituency problems. The bill, in effect, provides that a member of parliament is holding any records, documents or correspondence in trust for the constituent to whom they pertain. The bill also provides for the arbitration of disputes arising out of the operation of the act and imposes appropriate fines for non-compliance.

The intent is do away with the existing practice where frequently a member vacates his office and disposes of constituents' files in the garbage can.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,109, 5,012, 5,034, 5,037 and 5,199.

[*Text*]

RENTAL—LA CITÉ PROJECT, MONTREAL, QUEBEC

Question No. 4,109—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Has or will the government rent space in La Cite project in Montreal and, if so (a) how many floors, (b) how many square feet, (c) what government departments will occupy the space and what functions will be performed by the offices in question, (d) what is the estimated cost of furnishing the offices, (e) what is the (i) annual rental on all space, (ii) length of the lease, (iii) lease renewal conditions, (f) how many square feet of carpet have been or will be ordered for the entire area and, what is the (i) cost per square foot, (ii) total cost?

2. (a) What are the reasons justifying rental of the additional space, (b) will it replace other areas previously rented and, if so, what is the square footage and location of the space elsewhere that it will replace?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Public Works and Secretary of State as follows: 1. Yes. (a) Five floors; (b) 73,756 square feet; (c) Secretary of State, translation function; (d) Estimated cost of furniture as of March 31, 1975: $17,001.50; (e) (i) $626,926.00. (ii) Five years. (iii) Two one-year options, same terms and conditions. (f) (i) 73,798 square feet at $1.05 per square foot. (ii) $77,443.00.

2. (a) (i) The Secretary of State is to translate all working documents in government with special emphasis in the Province of Quebec thereby requiring a rapid increase in accommodation. (ii) The Secretary of State is to accelerate its efforts to establish in conjunction with the

University of Montreal a national terminology bank. (iii) Secretary of State has outgrown its existing accommodation. (b) Yes; replacing 26,350 square feet at 1260 Ste-Catherine St. East, Montreal, Quebec.

ANIMAL TRAPS

Question No. 5,012—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. What steps were taken in 1974 and 1975 to test humane animal traps, and (a) at what cost, (b) with what results?

2. What provision is in the 1976 budget for testing more humane animal traps?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): 1. In 1975-76 the Canadian Wildlife Service of the Department of the Environment entered into contracts with the Canadian Standards Association and the Ontario Veterinary College to develop testing procedures and protocols using the Conibear trap as a base on which to develop standards. Three traps chosen by the Federal-Provincial Committee on Humane Trapping are now being tested for biological and mechanical effectiveness based on those procedures. The contract with the Canadian Standards Association was for $12,500 and the contract with the Ontario Veterinary College was for $24,000.

2. In 1976-77 contracts will be negotiated to test four purported humane traps already on the market for mechanical and biological effectiveness. The Federal-Provincial Committee on Humane Trapping will be selecting three more traps for testing in the autumn of 1976. That committee will also be field testing those traps deemed to be biologically and mechanically effective.

DREE—1974-75 ANNUAL REPORT AND REVIEW COST

Question No. 5,034—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. What was the cost of the preparation and distribution of the 1974-75 Annual Report and Review of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion?

2. How many copies were printed?

3. What is the government's policy concerning the unsolicited distribution of the document during a time of austerity?

4. How many copies (a) were sent to persons or organizations who had not requested it, (b) have yet to be distributed?

Mr. Cliff McIsaac (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: 1. The cost of preparation of the 1974-75 Annual Report and Review was $49,000: $33,000 for printing; $14,000 for concept and design, and $2,000 for typesetting. In addition, distribution costs were approximately $6,000.

2. A total of 35,000 copies was printed.

3. In so far as the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is concerned, a widespread distribution of its 1974-75 report and review was undertaken as a method of better acquainting the recipients with DREE's aims and activities, thus improving the department's capacity for effective working relationships with other federal departments, other levels of government and the private sector, at this, the five-year point in its history.

4. (a) The majority, according to a prepared distribution plan. (b) Approximately 1,500 copies remain in Ottawa for on demand distribution.

SUBSIDIES TO MOTOROLA, INC. OF MONTREAL

Question No. 5,037—**Mr. Matte:**

Did the government grant subsidies to Motorola, Inc. of Montreal and, if so (a) on what date (b) in what amount?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by several departments as follows: None.

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION OFFICES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE

Question No. 5,199—**Mr. Scott:**

1. How many Canadian immigration offices were maintained in (a) Great Britain, (b) France in (i) 1972, (ii) 1973, (iii) 1974, (iv) 1975 and, in each case, in what city?

2. How many persons were employed in each office in (a) Great Britain, (b) France?

3. How many persons were approved to emigrate from (a) Great Britain to Canada, (b) France to Canada in (i) 1972, (ii) 1973, (iii) 1974, (iv) 1975?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):

	Year	Number of Offices	Cities
	Great Britain		
1. (a)	(i) 1972	5	London, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Belfast
	(ii) 1973	5	London, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Belfast
	(iii) 1974	5	London, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Belfast
	(iv) 1975	5	London, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Belfast
(b)	France		
	(i) 1972	3	Paris, Bordeaux, Marseilles
	(ii) 1973	3	Paris, Bordeaux, Marseilles
	(iii) 1974	3	Paris, Bordeaux, Marseilles
	(iv) 1975	4	Paris, Bordeaux, Marseilles, Strasbourg

[Mr. Sharp.]

Following are the number of Canada based Immigration Officers assigned to posts in Great Britain and France during the years 1972 to 1975.

2. (a)	Great Britain	1972	1973	1974	1975
	London	13	13	16	17
	Birmingham	3	3	3	5
	Manchester	3	4	5	6
	Glasgow	4	4	4	5
	Belfast	2	2	2	2
(b)	France				
	Paris	6	7	7	8
	Bordeaux	1	1	1	1
	Marseilles	2	2	2	2
	Strasbourg	-	-	-	1

3. Persons approved to emigrate (visas issued) to Canada from:

(a)	Great Britain	1972	1973	1974	1975
		18,382	29,004	44,683	34,475
(b)	France	2,185	3,304	4,286	4,690

* * *

[*Translation*]

STARRED QUESTION

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 5,211?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, given the length of the answer to question No. 5,211, I ask that this answer be put on record in *Hansard* as if it had been read in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

(*Editor's Note: The aforesaid answer is as follows:*)

*DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Question No. 5,211—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. Did the Secretary-General of the United Nations invite member states to participate in a disarmament conference and, if so, in what manner did Canada respond?

2. Did Canada suggest items to be included on the agenda of a disarmament conference and, if so, what were they?

Miss Monique Bégin (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): The answer to the first and second parts of the question is as follows: It is assumed that the questions refer to proposals to convene a world disarmament conference. The possibility of convening such a conference has been the subject of several resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly in recent years. The 28th General Assembly in 1973 established an ad hoc committee to examine all views and suggestions expressed by governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems.

The 29th and 30th General Assemblies in 1974 and 1975 received reports from the ad hoc committee and requested the committee to continue its work. Canada supported these resolutions and has been a member of the ad hoc committee since its inception. The deliberations and reports of the ad hoc committee have revealed a wide divergence of view among member states about the need for a world disarmament conference, the conditions essential to its realization, its main objectives, its agenda and other relevant considerations.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has not invited member states to participate in a world disarmament conference but has sought their views and suggestions on the convening of such a conference. In reply to a note from the Secretary General in 1975 and on other occasions the government of Canada has expressed its support in principle for the idea of convening a well-prepared world disarmament conference at an appropriate time but has also expressed its belief that it would not be fruitful to begin preparations or set a date for such a conference until there is reasonable assurance that it would in fact lead to concrete progress towards disarmament.

The government of Canada has stated that there can be little assurance that a world disarmament conference would lead to such progress unless all nuclear weapon states are prepared to participate and to assist actively in its preparation. As these conditions are not yet present the government considers it premature to suggest items that might be included in the agenda of a world disarmament conference. All states, however, continue to have the opportunity to express their views in the United Nations General Assembly itself which devotes several weeks each year to the consideration of arms control and disarmament questions and priorities.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Are the other questions allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

MEDICAL CARE ACT

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed, from Thursday, April 29, consideration of Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to the Order made yesterday, recorded divisions at the report stage of this bill will be taken as the first order of business upon the calling of government orders on Wednesday, May 5, 1976. Yesterday the Chair indicated that it would re-examine the order in which these deferred divisions would be taken. The Chair, at this moment, subject to any discussion which might take place between now and the time of the taking

of the division, would suggest that motion No. 2 be the first one taken, followed by motions Nos. 1, 3 and 4, if necessary.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by making a comment concerning the order of voting to which Your Honour made reference. As I see it, the four motions before us are to some extent predicated upon the previous one failing to pass. If we look at it from that point of view, I think the motion put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) perhaps should be the first to be considered, because essentially it calls for the complete elimination of the bill. If that motion should not pass, which I do not suppose it will, the next motion would be the one standing in my name, which calls for the bill to expire following a two-year period. That is a compromise which gives the government a little more leeway than the motion proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

If motion No. 1, in my name, should fail to pass, which I expect will be the case by virtue of the government's majority, then motion No. 2, in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco), could be considered. This is a further compromise which suggests that if motion No. 1 fails to pass, then motion No. 2 would enable the bill to continue to live its terrorizing life, but that orders in council put forward by the government in so far as percentages of increase are concerned in the third and subsequent years would be debated in the House of Commons and indeed voted on and passed before they are made. As I see it, that is the third compromise.

Finally, there is the motion of the minister, which is even less acceptable but which to some extent would improve the bill because it does call for a debate on the order in council and a vote on it, even though it would be a retroactive vote because the order in council would have been passed in any case. At the moment, my feeling is that that kind of motion would improve an otherwise completely unacceptable bill. It is still unacceptable to us, however, because the amendment does not change the essential intent of the bill. But at least it would enable parliament to express some views on the subject and perhaps have a vote, with the possibility of reversing the order in council if it should prove to be unsatisfactory to the House.

One of our main concerns in dealing with this bill is the view of many people that this is but the first step in the desire of the government to back out of its commitment to cost-sharing with respect to medical care premiums, as it is doing in the case of the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act. We have a situation where this government demonstrated extreme arrogance in the first place by introducing this bill in a unilateral way at a time when negotiations between the two levels of government were going on and, second, by its use of closure to cut off the debate on second reading.

● (1210)

Even though the government has a majority in the House at present, by this kind of technique they are abusing that advantage. I do not think the people of Canada felt, when the rule changes were introduced in 1969, that they would result in an abuse of government power. I think the use of closure when it is unnecessary, when members of the House, who represent the people of Canada, want to express their views on a subject which will in the long run affect every Canadian, should not be employed to close off debate and thereby take away the right of members of the House to speak on behalf of Canadians, whether Canadians as a whole or Canadians in certain parts of the country.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The minister, in spite of the fact that after the debate on motion No.1, which calls for expiry of the bill after two years, the bill may well be unnecessary after a two-year period, still wants it in place because he wants some power. That this bill will give the minister some power is probably the understatement of the year, because that power amounts to a spiked club which can be used to clobber the provinces over the head during the negotiations for the readjustment of cost-sharing arrangements.

Another matter which has concerned me very much, and which has already been referred to on a number of occasions, is that of research. In his statement on the bill before us, the minister expressed concern about the rising costs of health care, but he did not make the slightest suggestion as to how these costs might reasonably be reduced. He simply said that he will just not pay them if they go beyond a certain point, and he leaves it entirely up to the provinces to decide how the service might be streamlined and how the costs might be reduced without the destruction or degradation of the standard of service which is now being provided.

I think the minister's refusal to deal fairly with medical research in this country indicates, perhaps more than anything else, his lack of comprehension of the need for research and of the fact that there is no better way in the world to reduce health care costs than through research of various kinds, even research into how to reduce the cost of research in various disease processes which is now costing a great deal of money. If research produces better answers with regard to the causes and treatment of illnesses, we know that in the long run these costs will be substantially reduced. I could use, as an example, the advent of various drugs used in the treatment of mental illnesses and the result this has had in virtually emptying overcrowded mental hospitals across the country for so many years which were simply providing what was considered as custodial care for people who were not well. Through research, certain tranquillizers have been developed, and the majority of patients who had been in institutions for 20, 30 years, or all their lives, are now functioning in society.

It appears to me that the thinking of the minister, and perhaps even more so of his parliamentary secretary, has been shortsighted in the extreme with regard to health care costs and how they could be reduced through increased assistance to research. We believe, from having observed the minister and his parliamentary secretary, as well as this government as a whole, that they seem to be spending too much time thinking about how to get power and keep it, and they do not spend sufficient time thinking about how to exercise power to benefit all Canadians.

If there is any message I want to leave while I am on my feet on this occasion, it is that this government should not be totally absorbed with the question of taking power and holding it in perpetuity. It should devote at least half its energy and effort in deciding how to exercise this power in

such a way that Canadians benefit. When a government decides that a good way to save money in the area of health care costs is by destroying the research capability of this country, if it is not an abuse of power then certainly it is an improper use of power.

Another matter which has arisen as a result of this debate—medical research is certainly tied closely to this whole question—is that there has been no real dialogue between this government and the research community. I think that is a shameful situation, because we know that the research community is in a position to make suggestions to the government, not political suggestions but certainly suggestions on matters which may be very useful in terms of long-term planning when it comes to the relationship of man to his environment, and perhaps long-term planning related to various serious problems facing us today.

We know that the president of France, for example, has breakfast with representatives of the research community on a regular basis, perhaps twice a month. We know that members of the British government have a method of keeping in close touch with the research community of that country. We know that U.S. senators have their own "tamed" scientists, for lack of a better word, who keep them informed on various aspects of research in the country and how scientific information can be used for the benefit of Americans through proper application of funds by whatever government happens to be in power.

Therefore, I would like to emphasize the point that this government is failing the trust which has been placed in it by the people of Canada by neglecting, not only to speak adequately with the research community but, indeed, by destroying that community's position and research programs by putting a freeze on its budgets. I think that is totally unacceptable.

● (1220)

We know that in the scientific community the general policy which scientists follow, no matter in what part of the world they live, is to make their information freely available to scientists in all other parts of the world. It appears, therefore, that the policy of the Canadian government is that we do not really have to do research; we can let somebody else do it, and it is available to us. We can obtain it simply by reading scientific journals. That is the policy of this government. If I had anything to do with it, I would certainly not pursue that kind of policy. If Canadians were aware of the fact that this seems to be the official policy of this government, I think they would be ashamed.

The minister has put forward a couple of amendments. The additional amendment he put forward would result in the situation that after this bill comes into effect, and onward, there will no longer be an 8 per cent ceiling but it will be set by order in council. He put that amendment forward under the guise of improving the bill, but I am not satisfied that it will really improve the situation. As a matter of fact, that kind of amendment leaves the door open for the minister to set the percentage much lower than 8 per cent, and perhaps freezing it, as the government did with regard to the medical research budget. That is of significant concern to me because it will worsen the crisis the provinces may face if the government proceeds with the course upon which it has embarked.

The minister has indicated that motion No. 4 is based on motion No. 2, which was put forward by the hon. member for Kootenay West. That, again, indicates to us in the official opposition the fact that closure is an awful tool: it is destructive, to some extent, of the democratic process. It also indicates to us the usefulness of prolonging a debate ad infinitum if we feel strongly enough about a certain subject or a certain change which may be necessary. I am sure that had we agreed to let this bill pass last fall, the minister would not have accepted any suggestions to change it, least of all one which would allow for parliamentary debate on the order in council setting out the percentage which the minister may want to fix for the third year or after. It shows us that in spite of the fact that hon. members on the other side of the House do not listen very carefully, that their skulls, as I mentioned previously, seem to be very thick and that the noise has to be very loud and long before it gets through, if it is long enough, loud enough and repetitive enough, perhaps it does sink in.

The position we took has been justified. It has been shown that we spoke long enough and loudly enough to try to improve the bill, even though the improvement is very minimal and still does not make the bill any more acceptable in terms of its principle. However, it does introduce an element of democracy and for that reason I am not too unhappy about the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The Chair would like to thank the hon. member. The Chair will certainly take notice of his suggestion and take it under consideration before decision on the final order of the vote is made.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) has pointed out, this bill is a part of a total package which we do not like. Not only are ceilings being imposed on the amount the federal government will contribute to the provinces in respect of the costs of medical care, but there is also the notice that the agreements respecting hospitalization are to be renegotiated in 1980. As the hon. member just reiterated, added to that are the cuts in the funding of scientific research in general and medical research in particular. I say once again that we object to the course the government is taking in all these respects.

Last night the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) indulged once again in an argument, which we have heard from the government side a number of times, to the effect that we have no right to talk about the government cutting its contribution to medical care because it is actually prepared to pay more dollars next year than it paid this year, and even more the year after than it is paying this year. We have been over this a number of times both in the House and in the standing committee. I think perhaps it was discussed more clearly in the standing committee than has been the case on the floor of the House. However, the point is that even though the government may grant more dollars to the provinces next year than it did last year, under this bill that amount is still less than it would be if this bill were not brought in at all.

The present Medical Care Act calls for the federal government to pay 50 per cent of the costs of medical care which the provinces have to meet. Once this bill is in, there will be two choices. One of those choices hangs on the use of the phrase "the lesser of", so that in the end there is only one choice. The government will pay the lesser of two amounts, either 50 per cent of the total costs of the provinces or only so many more dollars than the provinces got last year. Even when the minister can stand up and talk about hundreds of millions of dollars more, the fact is that that sum of money will be less than would have been the case if this bill had not been brought in. We contend that this is a betrayal of the provinces and of the people of Canada. It is a going back on the principles which were established in the Medical Care Act after all the years it took us to get that legislation.

I join again with the hon. member for Athabasca in registering our protest against this legislation having been put through at the second reading stage by closure, and I join once again in saying that part of the trouble about this whole exercise is that it is a case of how not to conduct federal-provincial relations. The health ministers of the provinces have been most unhappy with the way they have been treated, especially since the announcement by Mr. Turner in the budget he brought down last June. We think the whole story is a sorry mess.

However, we have just about reached the end of the report stage of this bill, leaving the third reading stage to come later, possibly next Wednesday, although I understand that it may be shifted to Thursday, and in this final part of the debate on the report stage I think not only should I direct myself to the amendment proposed by the minister, but that I might once again summarize the choices which are before us right now. We have a government bill which proposes certain fixed percentages so far as the increases which can take place this year and next year are concerned. Then in that bill there is a provision that after that the government has the right, by order in council, to fix the ceilings. They can be anything. There could be consultation, but in the end the government makes the decision. That is the picture. This is a bill that in the first and second years has a precise limit, but in years three, four, five, six, seven and on is subject only to the dictatorial, unilateral decision of the government, which puts it into effect by order in council. That is the bill. I tried, by way of amendment, to kill the bill completely and leave the Medical Care Act as it stands. The voice vote was against my motion, and I suppose that may be the result when the recorded vote is taken.

● (1230)

The next position was that proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk), that reluctantly we accept years one and two with ceilings, but that the rest of the bill be cancelled; that there be no Bill C-68 after two years have gone by. That is not as desirable as my position, namely, that the ceilings should be cancelled altogether, but it is a compromise that we can accept if we must. Again, the voice vote was against the motion and the government has shown no willingness to go the other way.

We come to two more propositions. One was the proposal in the motion of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Friesen) that a government order in council fixing the ceilings in years three, four, five, six, seven, and so on, not come into effect until parliament has voted on it. Yesterday the majority said no to that as well. We now have the proposal of the minister that the government shall have the right to bring in its orders in council in years three, four, five, six, seven, and so on, and put those into effect right away, subject only to the right of 50 members of the House of Commons to sign a motion which would result in a debate. If that debate were to go against the order in council, then it would have to be cancelled. I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that there is a tremendous difference between having the right to vote on the validity of those orders in council before they are put into effect and simply being given the right to do that after the horse has been stolen, as I said last night.

I think the least acceptable of the propositions is the one before us in the name of the minister. If his proposition carries, we will have a bill that fixes contribution ceilings for years one and two and leaves the government free to fix the ceilings by order in council for all the years after. All that is left for parliament is the possibility of a debate if 50 members sign a motion requesting such debate. So long as the government that brought in the order in council has a majority in the House, it of course can expect to get its order in council approved. Mr. Speaker, I think we are being treated shabbily with respect to this whole matter.

I also want to say, as we have said on occasions similar to this one, that we think it is shabby treatment to say this matter can be debated only after 50 members sign the necessary motion. There are two parties in this House which have fewer than 50 members; we have 16 and the Social Credit party has 11. The "Moncton" party has only one, but he is not here just now. If this kind of motion is going to be made at all, I think instead of it being necessary for 50 members to sign such a motion it should be a number that would make it possible for any one of the recognized parties in this House to bring on a debate by itself. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we think the minister's motion should read "10" members instead of "50".

I have already said that I do not think the motion as a whole, as brought in by the minister, is worth very much. It gives the right to discuss the matter by trying to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. If it is going to be put on the books at all, it ought to respect the rights of all parties in this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that we are opposed to the entire bill. We would like to cut it off at some point, but if it is going to go through with this provision in it, the right—as I have just said—should apply to our party and the fourth party in this House. In order to bring this about, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That motion No. 4 be amended in subclause (2) of the proposed new clause 10 by deleting the words "fifty members thereof" and by substituting therefor the words "ten members thereof".

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on the amendment to motion No. 4, by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Pursuant to Standing Order 72(II), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in the debate on the resolution put forward by the minister. Before I do so, however, I should like to speak to the order in which the resolutions are to be voted on next Wednesday afternoon. As I understand it, the matter was taken under advisement by the Chair, and the Chair accepted responsibility by indicating the order.

I also listened to the point of view taken by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk). I can indicate that for our part we have no objection to the resolutions being voted on in the order which the hon. member recommended, or in any order which might appeal to the Chair. I want to be reasonable on that matter, as the government has been reasonable on every aspect of this bill which has been put before the House to deal with medicare. There is no doubt that when bills to pay for the programs of the government are put forward, it is the government of the day that takes the responsibility for the way in which the money taken from taxpayers is spent.

Over and over again I have heard hon. members opposite express regret that the provinces will now have to adjust their spending in accordance with the position which may be taken by the federal government, if they expect the federal contribution. No sympathy has been indicated by them for the taxpayers of Canada as a whole and the burden placed upon them by the present arrangements. As the minister has often indicated, these arrangements require the signing of a blank cheque by the federal government year after year for its share of the medicare program.

Blank cheques are fine during the maturing of a new program when medical services were rapidly becoming available for the first time to all Canadians. Surely the time comes, however, when it has to be recognized as a mature program. If it continues to grow at an ever-accelerating rate, it becomes obvious that in the interests of the taxpayers, measures have to be taken to restrain the rate of growth. This fact is recognized not only by this government but by all provincial governments. The Premier of Ontario, for example, has said repeatedly that what is required now are measures to restrain the rate of growth. It is conceded there will be growth next year, the year after, and indefinitely into the future. But how much is not a matter for decision.

● (1240)

I contradict what I think is the most outrageous allegation hon. members opposite have made, an allegation which we have answered repeatedly. I hope this is the last time it will be necessary to repeat that medicare and hospital care programs introduced by this government are programs of which we are proud and for which we intend to take continuing responsibility. But if these programs are to survive it is absolutely necessary for there to be control over how they develop. The hon. member for Athabasca criticized the minister for saying last night that the federal government wants some measure of control over these programs. What is wrong with the people of Canada exercising control over these programs? It is unreasonable to expect the people of Canada, through their elected government, not to exercise control over a mature program.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) objected to the third arrangement as being impractical because no specific figure is assigned. But he also objected to the arrangements for the first two years where specific figures are assigned. You cannot have it both ways. If proper responsibility is to be assumed, you must concede that the federal government must have some say about how much the people of Canada are to be committed to spend on medicare and hospital care. The opposition was irresponsible in alleging that the federal government has no proposals for low cost medicare.

Mr. Yewchuk: Let's hear them.

Mr. Kaplan: It was irresponsible to allege that we are prepared to put ceilings on, without developing lower cost alternatives. If the hon. member for Athabasca had followed the events of last week—

Mr. Yewchuk: I did.

Mr. Kaplan: —he would know that a federal-provincial conference, chaired by the minister, was held in Ottawa last Tuesday and Wednesday and that a package deal adding $300 million or $400 million to the federal commitment in medical spending was put forward to encourage provincial governments to adopt six specific, low cost alternatives some of which could be covered within the present medicare and hospital care framework. Those alternatives were not pulled out of a hat. They have been developed since 1970 after detailed consultation with all provincial governments which themselves have been turning to these low cost alternatives. Many provincial governments are already deeply involved in low cost alternatives. On Wednesday the minister offered to share provincial expenditures in those areas. In return for that offer he is asking for targets and a measure of restraint in the growth of medicare and hospital care programs. The hon. member said, "Let's hear it." Well, there it is.

The government is not only concerned about health care delivery alternatives. It has put forward a whole new perspective on health a new perspective on ways in which the lifestyle of Canadians can be changed to reduce health costs. It favours reduction in smoking, reduction in the use of alcohol—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaplan: —seat-belt legislation which will reduce injuries in motor vehicle accidents, reduced speed limits, and so on. This government has taken a tremendous number of initiatives to restrain the unacceptable growth of health costs in Canada and many provincial governments have adopted these initiatives with our encouragement and support. Surely we agree that that is a goal worth reaching. The proof that the government's approach as shown in Bill C-68 is good is the fact that it has already begun to work, even before the bill is law. We are already seeing tough decisions taken by provincial governments, decisions which I submit would never have been taken if the government had not brought forward the anti-inflation program and Bill C-68.

Finally, I deal with the charge that debate on the bill was ended with closure. I reject the use of that term to describe our procedure. Time was allocated in the second reading debate to allow the bill to go to committee where witnesses could be heard and the minister could be examined in detail on the provisions of the bill. The minister appeared, as did witnesses. There was full examination, I believe to the satisfaction of hon. members opposite and all those who attended the interesting committee meetings. Now the bill has been reported back. As a principle, closure is defensible. I think this is the only parliament in the world without some regular procedure for terminating debates. Indeed, parties opposite have in the past joined with the government in imposing closure and time allocation when certain measures were before the House. The opposition cannot now argue that it opposes closure absolutely, in principle. There is a time for ending debate. I invite hon. members to review *Hansard* and the quality of debate on this bill.

Mr. Paproski: The time comes when the government decides.

Mr. Kaplan: I concede that I have made no new arguments in the few minutes I have spoken in this debate. I have added no new facts.

Mr. Paproski: That is right.

Mr. Kaplan: But neither did the opposition. It repeated the tired statements made previously and raised questions which were answered satisfactorily in the House and in committee.

Mr. Paproski: You do not have to confess.

Mr. Kaplan: Surely, there is nothing more to be said about Bill C-68. I resume my seat, hoping hon. members will agree and that we may proceed to consider other matters on the agenda of parliament.

[Mr. Kaplan.]

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not see how you can put the question on the motion until my amendment has been decided. I suspect the debate may be over, but you cannot put the question on motion No. 4 until we take the vote on my amendment next Wednesday.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I understand all the votes are to be deferred until next Wednesday.

Mr. Paproski: That has been changed to Thursday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I think with the agreement of all hon. members.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I understand that we agreed that motions Nos. 1 to 4, inclusive, would be voted on next week and debated today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I understand there was a House order for the votes to be taken next Wednesday. If hon. members want to change it to next Thursday, we shall need another House order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am willing to agree to next Thursday. We can agree unanimously that debate on the report stage is now over. My point is that we can hardly vote on motion No. 4 until we have voted on the amendment to motion No. 4. We cannot do that until next week. I am prepared to agree that debate at the report stage is now over.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, it was agreed by the House leaders that the votes are to be taken on Thursday.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It has been agreed to by three House leaders.

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

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I will have to check that out.

Mr. Paproski: That's the way it is, Gus. Sit down.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I will not accept it just like that. I will look into it. I am sure the hon. member spoke in good faith, but I would be less than responsible if I did not check. The hon. member mentioned three House leaders. They might be opposition House leaders.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the point being checked. I took part in a conversation this morning with the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) and the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), and the three of us agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that the vote shall be taken next Thursday?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As we have completed debate on Bill C-68 expeditiously, may I call it one o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on a point of order. Is it possible that private members' hour will be called earlier than usual? I ask this question so that hon. members may be ready to proceed. Is there that possibility?

● (1250)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member will find out. The universe will unfold.

Mr. MacFarlane: That is exactly what I mean. Fine.

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

At 12.53 p.m. the House took recess.

* * *

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

FINANCE

MEASURE TO AVOID DOUBLE TAXATION BETWEEN CANADA AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

The House resumed, from Friday, April 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Buchanan (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill S-32, to implement conventions for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax between Canada and France, Canada and Belgium and Canada and Israel, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers in this debate. There may be some on the government side who wish to carry on the discussion for the rest of the day.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, trade and Economic Affairs.

Some hon. Members: Five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed to call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It is unusual that we should find ourselves with half a legislative day before us and no legislation to discuss, but I have sympathy for the position of the government House leader, and if that is the request I suppose we have no choice but to agree.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Why not deal with Bill C-72?

Mr. Stevens: I had hoped the government House leader would acknowledge our co-operation as far as the finance bill was concerned. We felt we were expediting the business of the House by not prolonging debate this afternoon. I find it most remarkable, that we should find ourselves in this position, on a Friday afternoon, with the government having no legislation to bring forward. I would remind hon. members that on April 2 we sat in the House for 20 minutes waiting for the two ministers to turn up just to move that bill.

Mr. Sharp: On the same point of order, as the House is aware, we are trying to move this session to a close. I am very reluctant to bring in legislation I had not forecast would be considered during this term. Because some bills are in committee and others are awaiting certain discussions among the parties, I think it would be a very good use of our time if we adjourned and looked after other public business today. There will be a lot of business to be done before June 30, but it could not be proceeded with expeditiously today. I am very reluctant to call items that I have not forecast should be dealt with before June 30. If we start on this bill we will certainly not be able to conclude this session, which I know the opposition would like to do by June 30.

● (1410)

Mr. MacFarlane: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it would only be propitious for me to say that as a result of remarks at ten minutes to one when I asked hon. members opposite whether they saw any possibility of this happening, I understood that they were not certain what they intended to do. As a result, I do not really think what has happened should come as a surprise.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order I should like to bring to your attention the fact that the hon. member is suggesting that we on this side should know what government business is coming up. It is the deputy whip over there who should be well aware of what is going on in this House, and he was not here to tell us what was going on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacFarlane: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, was simply that during discussions with gentlemen over there about the possibility of this happening, they told me not to be concerned because they thought they would not want to go on and there was no point in discussing further government business. I think sometimes it is an advantage to be a junior member of the House—I do not mean junior in age or intelligence, but in experience. I am used to a great deal of honesty. I have lived that way all my life and I intend to live that way in the future. I wanted Your Honour to know that is the way I feel about it.

Income Tax

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. MacFarlane) asked his question before—

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member just called me a liar. I would like him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. MacFarlane: I didn't.

An hon. Member: He called himself an honest man.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has the floor.

Mr. Paproski: He should withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacFarlane: I did not make the statement.

Mr. Paproski: You aren't kidding. You haven't made one all day today.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was trying to point out that when the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain asked his question just before one o'clock, he made, as part of that question, the statement: Should we be ready earlier than four o'clock for private members' hour? If the government does not have business to proceed with today why can we not call it four o'clock? The hon. member whose motion was to be debated today is in the House. Why not call it four o'clock now and proceed to private members' business?

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think that is an excellent suggestion and I would hope the government House leader would agree to it. We might call it four o'clock now and proceed to private members' business. I think this is reasonable because, as the deputy whip of the government knows, the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization is meeting now with the subcommittee, doing its best to improve the lot of the private member to advance views on behalf of his constituents and, indeed, on behalf of the country.

In this way, what I would only call a lapse on the part of the government in respect of business—and I say that with all the charity I can muster—would not in any way take away from the right of the private member to debate his motion today. This particular member has been looking forward to advancing his motion. The member comes from western Canada and is a long way from home. His motion very much affects the position of young farmers in Canada who are now having great difficulty because of the recent actions of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). As a result of his announcement in respect of new dairy policy and the legislation he is asking this House to consider as a result of his resolution, the motion of the hon. member is of great importance. I would hope, for the reasons I have advanced, that the government House leader will see fit to permit this matter to go ahead today by allowing us to call it four o'clock. I want to thank the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for his suggestion, which I think is very worth while.

[Mr. MacFarlane.]

Mr. MacFarlane: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I would say it is fine if he wishes to adjourn until four o'clock. We can arrange for that. I asked the question because of committee meetings which involve people who are just as interested in the farming situation and are not interested in just putting up speaker after speaker for the sake of speaking. They are people who are as interested in this subject as the hon. member. That was the only reason I asked the question, in order that these interested persons would be in a position to speak at two o'clock or three thirty. The answer to the question was that hon. members probably would not require that.

The other point I had in mind was that if the hon. member sponsoring the bill speaks again, it will be the second time and he will close the debate, and we are not prepared for that.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. MacFarlane: We are not prepared to have that happen, so I will not give unanimous consent to his speaking a second time. Hon. members are all aware of these things and I think sometimes it is of advantage to have them out in the open.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain who says he will not give his unanimous consent, let me say that I do not give unanimous consent to the House adjourning at this time.

Mr. MacFarlane: That's fine.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that we call it four o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It being four o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Motion No. 2, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). Shall the motion stand?

An hon. Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Stand at the request of the government. Notice of motion No. 15, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan). Shall the motion stand? Stand at the request of the government.

Notice of motion No. 19, the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson). Shall the motion stand? Stand at the request of the government.

Notice of motion No. 20, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). Shall the motion stand? Stand at the request of the government.

Notice of motion No. 4. Shall the motion stand? Stand at the request of the government.

Notice of motion No. 45, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). Shall the motion stand? Stand at the request of the government.

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think we can expedite the business this afternoon by just getting on to No. 12.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Motion No. 12.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that we move to motion No. 12?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

FARM CREDIT ACT

SUGGESTED INCENTIVES FOR YOUNG FARMERS

The House resumed, from Monday, January 27, 1975, consideration of the motion of Mr. Schellenberger:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending the Farm Credit Act to provide incentives to young farmers to enter or to continue in the farm industry and, to this end, should consider providing such incentives as partial non-repayment of loans where young farmers meet performance standards, a maximum 5 per cent interest rate, deferred interest payments during an initial period, and open-end loans that will allow additional borrowing without refinancing charges.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I should like to remind hon. members that if the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) speaks now, he will close the debate. Is there unanimous consent that he may speak now?

Mr. MacFarlane: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. C. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, the motion put forward by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) is of great importance, particularly at this time, as a result of the actions of the committee on agriculture which is hearing evidence from the Farm Credit Corporation. Representatives of that corporation appeared before the committee at last night's meeting and will appear again next week. Many of the points raised in the motion by the hon. member across the way were brought out at the meeting last night. Some of them were answered and some of them, I am sure, will be answered at meetings of the committee next week, the first being on Tuesday.

I should like to address myself to a number of the points put forward by the hon. member in his motion, particularly as they apply to young farmers wishing to get into the agricultural field in Canada, whether it be in western or in eastern Canada. It is of the utmost importance that we as a government, in conjunction with provincial governments across this land of ours, give to these young men and women every opportunity to get into the business of farming. We must do so, realizing that this must be a viable entity in which we are asking these young people to take part. We talk about incentives, and this is brought up in the bill. I quote from the motion:

● (1420)

... to this end, should consider providing such incentives as partial non-repayment of loans where young farmers meet performance standards, ...

I think we must be very cautious about this question of incentives, particularly as it applies to young farmers, because of the problems there have been with regard to the dairy industry in Canada.

I think in some instances we must look at the incentives that were put forward, both by the federal government and by many of the provincial governments, which have resulted in young farmers, particularly in the dairy industry, becoming involved in a situation from which they will have difficulty extricating themselves. I speak primarily of the young farmers in Ontario who took advantage of the IMPIP loans provided in good faith at that time by the provincial government. This was an incentive program of which many young men and women in my area took advantage. Possibly this was also the case in other provinces which had similar schemes. These young people entered the dairy business because they saw a great future in it. However, by the middle of last year we were confronted with an over-supply of dairy products, particularly powdered milk. Now these people having received the IMPIP or farm credit loan find themselves in a situation where the quotas given to them by the provincial milk marketing boards and provincial governments simply are not sufficient to cover their outstanding payments.

Last night one hon. member brought before the committee a situation involving a young man who had applied for a Farm Credit loan. His situation was reviewed by the officials of the Farm Credit Corporation who agreed that the loan had been made and that the quota allowed the young farmer would be sufficient to allow him to meet the obligation he would be subjected to under the terms of the loan. Now that the provincial milk marketing board has reduced the quota by 15 per cent, this young man with his sizeable obligation is faced with the payment of a loan in the amount of $900 a month, together with an input loan that would increase the payment by about $300 a month, which would require that he come up with $1,200 each month while being faced with the reduction of the quota in the next coming year. This is the situation which presently exists.

Of course there is mention in the motion that an incentive should be allowed that would entice young people to enter the business of agriculture. While it is all well and good to entice anyone to enter the business of agriculture or to increase his commitment in the field of agriculture, we must also take into consideration the possibility of cut-backs and over-supply because in such a situation we would be enticing people into an occupation in which they would find themselves hard pressed to keep up with it in the future. I think we must give very sincere consideration to this when considering the motion before the House.

The motion suggests that the governement should consider the advisability of amending the Farm Credit Act. Some amendments have been submitted before the agricultural committee and before the House with regard to the Farm Credit Act up to this point, and others certainly will be presented by the government in the future in its

attempt to encourage agriculture in the province of Ontario and throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Last night at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture the question arose about the possibility of farm credit loans approved by the Farm Credit Corporation being extended, or that there be a period of grace for a period of a year or two years in respect of young farmers who have found themselves in the situation I earlier described. I think this is something which could be done without a change in the Farm Credit Act because it is now stated that a farmer, whether he be a young or older farmer, if he finds himself in difficulty can defer payments for a period of one year or perhaps two years. I think that is presently in place in the act and can be considered on an individual basis.

I do not think we should make this a blanket coverage to allow people to defer payments, or that we should make an exception to the over-all rule. I believe it must be considered on an individual basis, and on the understanding that officials of the Farm Credit Corporation will go to the farm involved, take a look at the operation and if possible decide what changes should or could be made under the present confines of the act to allow the producer to meet his commitment.

It also must be pointed out that under the Farm Credit Act the number of defaulters to this point has been very minimal. In fact the number is so low that I believe a great deal of pride should be taken in the fact that the Farm Credit Act has such a very small percentage of its loans that have reached the default stage. It was pointed out on a number of occasions at the meeting last night that several farmers, particularly in western Ontario in the area with which I am sure the hon. member is very familiar, are now bringing to a close mortgages that have been held by the Farm Credit Corporation. Some of these mortgages are at 5 per cent, 6 per cent and 7 per cent. These members of the agricultural community are bringing these mortgages to repayment long before the required time to do so. It is possible that in some instances they would be well advised to invest that money in the banks at a much higher rate of interest so that they would receive a better return.

I am talking about the farmers of Canada. They are people who historically do not like to have a debt of any kind outstanding against them or against their property. I think this is a subject which should be considered in any discussion here in the House of Commons in respect of the agricultural community.

Also at the meeting last night the question of partial payment or advance payment was brought up. The hon. member who introduced this motion most certainly was in attendance and will recall that a statement was made to the committee meeting that pre-payment or advance payment on any of these loans certainly is allowed. The question was raised whether people could, without penalty, make an advance payment on capital on the loans they acquired from the Farm Credit Corporation. We were assured at that time that such a payment certainly could be made without penalty. I think this is something we might take a look at in respect of other areas of the community in relation to mortgages on houses, mortgages on apartments, business mortgages, and business loans because the people in the farming community have some-

what of an advantage in being able to take out a loan and pre-pay it without penalty.

● (1430)

Perhaps we could make a suggestion to people in the housing field that it might not be such a bad idea if the same thing were carried over into housing in Canada so as to allow young men and women, some of whom have taken a very substantial mortgage on the houses which they occupy, an opportunity, if they have had a good year—and we can hope for good years in the future—to advance their payments on those obligations, thereby allowing them to cut down the number of years in which they will be faced with a rather heavy burden in so far as mortgage payments are concerned, but without a penalty involved in that clause. As most hon. members know, at present people who carry a mortgage on a house do so for at least five years with an option at the end of five years either to have the interest on that loan brought up to present standards or, if those standards should decline, lower than present mortgage rates, as we hope they will, to renegotiate the mortgage.

It was pointed out at the meeting last night that under the Farm Credit Corporation Act these mortgages are not renegotiable, in other words the interest rate that is granted on a mortgage under the Farm Credit loan runs for the life of the mortgage. The question was raised by the hon. member—and a very good question too—as to whether we should not look into the future to arrange Farm Credit Corporation mortgages on a five year renewable concept. I have some difficulty in accepting the idea simply because of the most recent experience.

If, in the last ten or 15 years, you had a CMHC mortgage, you would realize that the mortgage rate has always been going up. In the past five or ten years we have never witnessed such a mortgage rate on the decrease. It is hoped that, in the future, high mortgage or high interest rates charged on industrial or housing mortgages will be on the downgrade, but we must also realize that mortgages granted under the Farm Credit Corporation Act, which are now at about 9.5 per cent or 9.75 per cent, are much below the rates that are currently charged on loans for housing. I cannot foresee a decrease in those rates on Farm Credit mortgages, so it might be an advantage to the farmer to have a renewable mortgage after five years. But in general we must accept the fact that in recent history mortgage rates have been rising, so that the farmer who accepts a mortgage at 9.5 per cent or 9.75 per cent under the Farm Credit Corporation Act has a considerable advantage over those who go into the open market and get a mortgage from a bank, a lending institute or a credit union.

The subject of credit unions was also discussed last night and the minister and officials of the Farm Credit Corporation left themselves open to any suggestion that would be put forward by any member of the agricultural committee regarding possibilities of making mortgages available to young farmers at a lesser rate. The rate proposed in the motion is 5 per cent, and I think we will have to give careful consideration before granting a 5 per cent mortgage to farmers when mortgages to anyone else in our society are certainly well above 10 per cent, perhaps even 12 per cent.

I am fully in agreement with giving every opportunity and every concession possible to the young farmer, or to the farmer who wants to expand his operation into a more viable business concept, but we also have to take into account in all our deliberations the aspirations of the rest of the Canadian population, of those who are not farmers, of those who are in the cities who are trying to mortgage a house and who have to pay the rate of 12 per cent, and maybe even 13 per cent or 14 per cent, and if they need a second mortgage they have to pay a rate even higher than that. It must be pointed out also that under the amendments to the Farm Credit Corporation Act second mortgages in some aspects of the farming field will be allowed. This also should be considered when comparing the advantages of the agricultural community with some of the disadvantages of other people in this country.

At times we tend to segregate our population into those who are on the farm and those who are off the farm. While there are certain things about agricultural life that we must realize are advantageous, we must also realize that farmers must compete with the rest of society. The general public must also realize that, while the farmer is special in many respects, he is also very different from people in the rest of our community. So we must be very careful about that rate of 5 per cent. I think that in some ways it is too low to be realistic because the interest rates that are asked and received throughout the rest of our society are much higher than the rate suggested in the motion put forward by the hon. member.

With regard to the open-ended loans which will allow additional borrowing without financing charges, I believe the Farm Credit Corporation Act now allows a person to come in with a second mortgage. If he has borrowed, say, $20,000 in the past, and then brings in another application for a loan because he wants to expand his property to make it more viable, the $20,000 is brought into consideration and he is allowed to borrow up to $150,000 if he is under 35 years of age, and still be covered by the Farm Credit Corporation Act. I am not too sure if that is exactly what the hon. member had in mind in presenting his motion, but I believe that this possibility is open to the young farmer or to the not so young farmer, because I think it is important that we take these people into consideration as well.

Another matter that was brought up at the agricultural meeting last evening, and which I want to bring to the attention of the House, is that we must all realize that every segment of our population must take part in the restraint program. It has been said that the restraint program bears down much more heavily on the farm credit aspect of agriculture than on any other segment of our population, and I agree, but it is a fact that the agricultural segment in Canada has always taken a bigger part in Canadian affairs than the rest of our community would like to recognize.

It was pointed out at that meeting that in future young people who wish to apply for loans under the Farm Credit Corporation Act will fall into two groups. Let us say there is a farmer who has a reasonably viable operation, and he has a son who wants to take advantage of the benefits of the Farm Credit Corporation Act. The only way he can take part is to have the loan granted, and the payment is made. Another farmer perhaps has a viable farm business or farm occupation. He has a couple of sons. I think at the present time what we have suggested is that the Farm Credit Corporation should take a look at that situation.

● (1440)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired. However, he may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): No.

Mr. Douglas (Bruce-Grey): In conclusion, it was definitely pointed out that the order of need will have to be taken into account.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) said no to allowing an extension of time.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I point out that if the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) speaks, he closes the debate, but he must have unanimous consent to do this.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, when the bill was introduced for the first time in January 1975, there was then perhaps some pertinency. On the other hand, since its original submission in January 1975, the House passed Bill C-34 to amend the Farm Credit Act as attested by the comments of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Corriveau) who then maintained that the suggested amendments in Bill C-34 would do much towards prompting young people to get involved in farming.

Indeed, Bill C-34 having been passed on May 8, 1975, the Farm Credit Corporation has now almost a year of experience to determine its value. I feel that this motion is out-of-date as a result of the amendments. If you allow me, with my colleagues I would like to examine the amendments to the Farm Credit Act. Now, as we know, the ceiling for loans has been raised from $100,000 to $150,000. If we consider the number of borrowers aged 35 or less, they represented 27 per cent in 1971 and that figure has now reached 43.1 per cent of all applicants taking advantage of the Farm Credit Act. A young farmer under 35 can now borrow an amount over 90 per cent of the productive value of his land, livestock and equipment.

Finally, the New Part IV of the act empowers the corporation to make loans to individuals under 35 whose principal occupation is not necessarily farming, providing that they undertake to set up a farming operation within 5 years. It is a measure that has certainly helped to increase the number of young people to take up farming. Fourthly, the corporation is now empowered to guarantee these loans by way of a mortgage other than a first mortgage.

As a result of these amendments, farm loans approved by the Farm Credit Corporation during 1975-76 have reached a record number, while in the previous year they had increased by at least 60.7 per cent, reaching approximately $641 million. Such an increase is mostly due to the amendments. The corporation has made nearly 10,000 loans under the Farm Credit Act. Now, 66 per cent or two thirds of those loans were made to farmers under 35, compared to 53 per cent the previous year and only 36 per cent five years earlier, that is in 1971-72. Under Part III of the act, the corporation lent $318.6 million in farm credit during the fiscal year 1975-76, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 310 per cent over the previous fiscal year.

The whole amount was loaned to people under 45, since these loans were made under Part II and Part IV of the act. However, in practice, the major part of those funds were borrowed by people, and as I said, under 35. The average amount of the loans made in 1975-76 was almost $65,000, while in the previous fiscal year the total amount was around $50,000. There has already been an increase of $15,000.

In fact, the recent amendments to the Farm Credit Act were intended almost exclusively for young farmers, and they proved so popular that the Farm Credit Corporation had to introduce restrictive credit measures during the current fiscal year in order to retain funds for farmers in greater need. Actually, the motion before us contains four specific measures designed to urge young people to go into farming, such measures supplementing those I have just mentioned.

Under the first measure, the borrower would have part of his loan forgiven provided he met certain predetermined standards of performance. I feel in that respect, Mr. Speaker, that we must take into consideration the rate of repayment by Farm Credit Corporation borrowers in recent years. And on March 31, 1975, as the hon. member who spoke before me indicated, 93.4 per cent of all accounts were up to date, while on March 31, 1976, that percentage had slightly dropped to about 93.2 per cent. It is an insignificant drop if one considers that the beef industry is going through a difficult period and the prospects of the dairy industry are far from being as encouraging as one would like them to be.

Nobody is to blame for this, Mr. Speaker, except the weather which was much more favourable to the dairy production. The corporation has therefore suffered insignificant losses through the years. Given those facts, I think it is useless to dispense the borrowers from repaying part of their loan. Had it been possible to actually prove that the borrowers were having trouble meeting their obligations, the proposed measure might have been advisable.

I feel, like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), that we have to keep on upgrading the income stabilization programs so that the farmers might meet their actual costs, including the repayment of their loans. In practice, a partial repayment would prove discriminatory. Indeed, the output criterion used to determine this repayment, whatever it is, will always be subject to variables such as the weather, prices and market conditions over which the individual has no control whatsoever and which usually affect the farmers in different ways.

[Mr. Dupras.]

The second measure would establish a 5 per cent ceiling on interest rates. The Farm Credit Corporation rate is 9¾ per cent, and in spite of this, the major challenge the corporation will have to face during this new financial year will be to find enough funds to meet the requirements of the farmers who really need long-term credit.

In my opinion, the ceiling of 5 per cent for the interest rate would only inflate land prices, so that in the end the amounts to borrow and to reimburse would not be lower. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the higher land prices and the attendant increase in loans would largely obliterate the amount saved in interest. In addition, a 5 per cent interest rate would bring farmers to ignore commercial sources of credit and prompt commercial loan companies to withdraw from that market, so that finally less funds would be available to farmers.

The third measure is devised to defer payment of interest during the initial phase of the loan. Now, as the previous speaker has mentioned, it is already possible to defer the reimbursement of principal and interest under the Farm Credit Act and regulations. The reimbursement of principal can be deferred for a maximum of five years, but only for two years as regards principal and interest together. In addition, in practice the corporation can defer payments when it is in the greater interest of the borrower to do so and it takes advantage of that opportunity. It should also be noted that the borrower can make prepayments at any time without being penalized and the interest is later on calculated on the outstanding principal.

Finally, the fourth and last proposal made in the motion would grant open-end loans, that is to say the borrower could borrow again without having to pay refinancing. Thus, mortgages for an undetermined amount would be granted so that farmers could borrow additional funds without having to pay new notary fees and so on. That proposal seems interesting, at first glance. However, after having been studied closely and repeatedly by officials of the department, it was considered not to be practical. Mortgages, as we know, are governed by provincial laws, and no mortgage act mentions mortgages for an undetermined amount.

As we know, a practical solution was found to the problem when the Farm Credit Act was last revised authorizing the corporation to loan money on mortgages other than first. Consequently, when borrowers want to obtain additional funds, they do not have to pay the charges which are normally associated with the title search and to cover the refinancing of the initial loan. They have to pay only the charges associated with the registration of a second mortgage. These charges are not very high in comparison with the average amount of the loan since they only equal less than 1 per cent of the amount of the loan in most provinces. This amendment turned out to be popular and very useful since its adoption last May.

Mr. Speaker, I find that the amendments the House brought to the Farm Credit Act in May 1975 really encourage young people to settle or stay in agriculture, and the figures I produced demonstrate this. Consequently, I think that the proposals in the motion before the House would not really improve the rural economy.

● (1450)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Again I want to warn hon. members of the House that if the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) speaks, his contribution will close the debate. The Chair recognises the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Loiselle).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Loiselle (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the motion on which I agree in principle. However, in view of the present economic conditions. I think it is impossible for the Farm Credit Corporation to increase its funds at the same pace as it thought it would. Actually, the corporation will not have enough funds to approve the same amount of credit as for 1975-76. In addition, since it had to carry certain amounts involved last year over its budget for this year, it is evident that the number of new loans should be reduced likewise.

I think that we should also urge farmers to take part in the anti-inflation program, much as we ask all groups in our society and all our industrial sectors to do. However I think that with all the new guidelines concerning farm credit it will be possible for us, while beating inflation, to reach certain goals.

Those aims have, I believe, been clearly defined in the criteria outlined by the Department of Agriculture. I am quoting only a few instances of the consolidation of applicants' debts. Formerly, it was possible for a farmer to gather all his debts and apply for a single loan which would take care of all the total indebtedness. Now we shall urge instead other loan companies to lend the money so that the corporation may pursue its activities and its aim of improving the agricultural production in this country. This is why we must earmark funds for those farmers who do not derive an adequate income from their operation and who wish to buy more land.

We shall not lend money so readily to those farmers who have enough land, assets and an adequate income.

Those who do not have enough land to farm are unable to derive an adequate income from farming will be particularly encouraged.

Moreover, we will give assistance to the younger people—and I often hear this comment in my constituency—because a young farmer today does not have enough money to buy land which costs more and more. Thus, we will grant loans particularly to one, two or three members of the same family who want to buy the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, I think that even though fewer will be available for farm credit, it will still be possible to help the farmers who either wish to improve their lot or simply to take up farming. In my opinion, this is one aspect of the problem facing the young farmers and those who are developing their operation.

We should not be concerned only with financing problems facing farmers but I believe that with provincial and perhaps even municipal authorities we should hold a joint meeting of the three levels of government with a view to constituting agricultural land banks.

In an area such as mine, even if farm credit is available to the farmers, it has become unthinkable to buy land because most if not all of it has passed into the hands of speculators. Even if he has already settled, a farmer cannot think of increasing his land, let alone a young man who intends to enter this industry. Therefore I believe the major problem does not exist at the credit level only but also extends to the possiblity of acquiring land.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not stop this shameful speculation which is now raging in the Montreal area, we will lose all the best agricultural land in Quebec.

I do not think we should dwell merely on the financial problem. We should rather consider the possibility now given to present and future farmers to buy new lands. And I would urge the committee on agriculture to look into this matter so as to be in a position to make recommendations to the provincial agriculture ministers and also to the municipal affairs ministers who are the only ones qualified and empowered to act in zoning matters.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if we could do as some American states have done and urge the provincial legislatures to intervene as some American states and zone certain agricultural areas, land speculation would no longer be possible in those regions.

So long as we do not come to grips with the financial problem, to earmark additional funds for the Farm Credit Corporation will only amount to overbidding.

I also think that we, as a government, should urge the lending institutions such as banks and trust companies to make more and more loans to the farmers who have always found it difficult to borrow money, and that is why they have always relied on the government. If we believe in our farming industry, I wonder why financial institutions such as banks are not more interested in this field, which proves most profitable. Unfortunately, one only has to consider the farming production surpluses last year.

● (1500)

Mr. Speaker, even if it is hard to tell the farmers that we cannot make more funds available to them, increase their borrowing power next year, I think they must agree to join us and the other sectors of the Canadian economy in our fight against inflation, a fight which has made a very good start with the results we already know, which gives us some hope of a decreasing rate of inflation this year.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion of my colleague, but with the present inflationary crisis, I have to say that however valuable this project may be, we will have to postpone it before adopting it.

Mr. Claude Tessier (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, in principle, the reasons given by the hon. member are acceptable, no doubt, but I think we must put the problem in its true perspective. On one hand, every day the government is urged to reduce its expenditures, to cut its budget, while, on the other hand we hear new demands being constantly pressed upon the government to meet certain needs.

All agree that like many other laws the Farm Credit Act could be amended, as the hon. member has said, and bettered so that we encourage our young producers. On the other hand, in view of the present situation of the dairy policy in 1976-77 for example, not only do we try to find

incentives for the producers to produce more and improve their facilities, but at the same time, because of the current world situation, we have to ask the farmers to reduce their production.

So in a context like this, I think that at a given moment the government has had to decide that expenditures for farm credit would be curtailed. I do not think this is an attempt to hold back Canadian agriculture as a whole, but on the contrary, to rationalize its production. Even in our rural areas, where the economy is in a particularly difficult predicament due to the inflation, we still must ensure proper balance between costs and returns in agricultural production.

Almost daily we hear protests about our social legislation as the government has become the main employer in this country with such schemes as health benefits, social welfare and unemployment insurance. But I think that after having pondered on the present economic situation, we are rather led to bring back the workers to work, to try to find them new job opportunities and to stop creating and encouraging ventures which would represent far too many risks in the present conditions of our economy.

This means that the policy of the government with regard to assistance to farmers is to make sure first and foremost of the profitability of existing farm operations. On the other hand, we must really be certain now when offering farm credit that those who are eligible to it really have the ability to do the job so as to minimize lending risks for the government and to ensure maximum yield of the money that the government makes available to producers.

Therefore, it is now almost unthinkable that in its agricultural policy, the govermnent should add some so-called incentives when the priority as concerns agriculture really seems to be to stabilize and ensure profitability. I therefore consider that, in theory, the suggestion of the hon. member is acceptable. However, at this time, in view of present conditions, this subject should be referred to the committee on agriculture where it can be studied in depth while taking into account in particular rural areas which are now more likely than others to be affected by the current problems caused by inflation.

Of course, I am among those who are quite concerned by the econcomy of rural areas. Obviously an attempt must be made to save the economy of our rural areas. We can probably hope to succeed in the not too distant future, and even in the near future in reviving our rural economy, which must necessarily provide farmers with sufficient economic means.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we on this side cannot help rural economy without speaking of agricultural zoning. I know that, in this regard, the provinces have already undertaken projects which, I hope, can be realized and it is really in this sense that any amendment to the farm credit act will be truly effective and acceptable, and I would even say necessary for rural areas.

Therefore, we must definitely assess the needs of young producers. To deal with the need of young producers is also to deal with their training, because agriculture was once a venture we must now realize that the Canadian farm producer has become a true expert in his field. I think that

[Mr. Tessier.]

government members cannot take the risk of plowing huge amounts of money without making sure that prospective farm producers are equal to the task and this means having an adequate and complete training in order to ensure the survival of the farming community.

● (1510)

Therefore, in my view, raising the problem of farm credit amounts to actually considering on the one hand saving the economy of Canadian rural areas and on the other hand encouraging producers to make use of their personal skills and enabling them to earn an honest living. By the same token, it also amounts, for instance, to requiring from producers enough preparation and seriousness so that government loans may really be considered profitable and that risk may also be considered as really calculated.

Then, looking at the hon. member's proposal, I suggest that the committee which is now discussing the estimates has already raised the problem of a readjustment of our farm credit policy, and I think this is indeed the most appropriate and acceptable way to discuss the new farm credit policy.

Turning back especially to the developments we have been, and will be, witnessing as regards our dairy policy, it is nevertheless necessary to ask producers as well as producers' associations to make an effort at this stage so that our partners in Canadian agriculture, namely the producers themselves, may strive to rationalize their own operations and we may really believe that agriculture must be supported by the government. However, it must not become a novel form of welfare; rather it must consist of elements necessary and essential to a rural economy based on efficiency and profitability.

Now, this is also an appeal to producers themselves as well as to producers' associations to ensure that they are as serious as this government can be, and only in these conditions will the government be eventually able to grant loans which will really assist agriculture and will not simply be another form of welfare.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I think that somewhat explains the concerns we are sharing with the hon. member. On the other hand, in the present context, there is always this dilemma which we are facing: as each day come to pass we are asking more from this government while on the other hand, we are requesting at the same time that it should practise restraint. But one must realize that the government, like any other organization, must do some accounting, calculate its risks and make its decisions. And I suggest that the decision that was made recently in the area of farm credit has been at the advantage of the Canadian economy. And until further notice, we must support the government's present position unless we can demonstrate the merits of another policy.

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 12 proposed by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) and dated January 27, 1975 recommends that the government amend the Farm Credit Act to encourage young people to stay on the farm or expand their farm operations or in some cases to allow young people who left the farm because of a lack of financial means to come back.

The last amendments made by the government are giving encouragement in that direction. Mr. Speaker, as we are now aware, a person under 35 can, without leaving his job in the industrial sector, buy a farm and benefit from the Farm Credit Act.

Motion No. 12 has some good aspects. It particularly recommends an interest rate of only 5 per cent. A member of the government side mentioned that we should also take into account the case of young couples who want to buy a property. Those people will have to pay a rate higher than 5 per cent. In some cases, they can benefit from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation grants and pay a rate of 8 per cent. The suggestion has some good aspects and in certain cases that rate can apply to young farmers and not only the young but every farmer in the province of Quebec.

Another suggestion that could be considered by this government is that for a certain period the Farm Credit Corporation could, through an agreement, increase the loan of those young people without professional fees. It is another suggestion that could be considered by the government. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) responsible to Parliament for the Farm Credit Corporation announced in a press release this week that the funds available for 1976-77 would not be as high as for 1975-76; one of the reasons alleged by the minister is the following: For 1975-76, the Farm Credit Corporation loaned upwards of $600 million, or made loan commitments that will be considered in 1976-77 and in such cases we have, as it is called mortgaged the available appropriations for 1976 and 1977.

In various instances in the past, the government took measures to help young farmers expand their operations. This provided increased loan opportunities where two or three people get into a partnership to continue the family operation. Hon. members are aware that the average age figure among the farmers is relatively high. I understand the most recent statistics show the age to be above 50, and the Farm Credit Act amendment has allowed the senior farmer to indirectly carry on farming, while allowing one or two sons to take over the operation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is with regret that I have to interrupt the hon. member, but the hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

[*English*]

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, with deference and respect, I do not know whether in the circumstances you can say the private members' hour has expired. Standing Order 4 states that the House adjourns at five o'clock on Fridays. I look at the clock and it is only 3:20. If the opponents to the point of view which I am putting forward say that there was unanimous consent, I have to say there was unanimous consent only to part of the matter that would allow us to continue to the actual time of 3.20 o'clock.

The unanimous consent that was given when Your Honour was not in the Chair was to call if four o'clock at that time so that private members' business could continue. However, there was no attempt at that time, nor was it asked that there be unanimous consent that the House adjourn at the end of an hour. Therefore we are now stuck with the Standing Orders of the House.

In view of all the circumstances I do not believe Your Honour could properly rule, and I gather you have not ruled, that private members' hour has adjourned.

• (1520)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the Standing Orders do not say that private members' business shall be for 60 minutes—for one hour. The Standing Orders say that private members' business shall be from four o'clock to five o'clock. It so happens that at 2.20 this afternoon, eastern daylight time, we decided by unanimous consent that it was four o'clock. So private members' business lasts from that point until five o'clock. It is not yet five o'clock, not even in Newfoundland where things are always half an hour later. There is nothing in the book which says it is an hour. The book says it shall be from four o'clock to five o'clock. Joshua made the sun stand still a long time ago. We have not done the same thing. We pushed the sun back a bit. But there has been no unanimous consent to call it five o'clock at 3.20. If the government wishes to make a motion to adjourn, that is a different story, but I do not think we can now decide it is five o'clock unless there is unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised by the remarks of the hon. member who spoke before me, considering what was said in this House during the past few years. At 2.20 it was unanimously agreed to call it 4 o'clock. The hon. member says he cannot stop the sun, but everyone can very well stop his watch or move it forward. I suggest this is exactly what this House did at 2:20, when we unanimously agreed to call it 4 o'clock. It does not matter much where the sun lies for that matter. We call it 4 o'clock, we move on to 4 o'clock. There has to be some consistency in this House. If we unanimously call it 4 o'clock, one hour later it has to be 5 o'clock.

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: When the Deputy Chairman of Committees was in the chair there was some discussion about business for this afternoon and I recall saying that in order to bring about the adjournment of the House on June 30 it was undesirable to open discussion on measures which do not appear on the order paper. Following this the Chair, as I recall the words, asked "Do we hafe unanimous consent to call it four o'clock?" It was my understanding that what we had agreed to was to advance the clock and I suggest it would be ridiculous on our part to turn it back now. The implication was that we had come to the end of the day and were beginning the private members' hour by advancing the clock to four o'clock. If we were to take any other point of view, then at four o'clock we would have to call it four o'clock twice, and that would be ridiculous.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do understand the preoccupation of the hon. member. Recalling what was said when by unanimous consent the House decided at 2.19 to call it four o'clock, I have to consider the situation in the perspective of the decision made at that time. The Chair has to judge

not the intent of hon. members now, but the intention which was in their minds when they agreed to call it four o'clock.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, and I agree with him, that nowhere does the Standing Order say that the private members' hour shall last 60 minutes. Such words do not appear. But we can see from Standing Order 15(4) that the time allotted for private members' business every day is either from five o'clock to six o'clock or from four o'clock to five o'clock on Friday, which is the equivalent of 60 minutes. Hon. members want the Chair to decide that this hour should, today, last two hours and 41 minutes. I do not think the Chair can do this. They have heard me say that the hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has expired. That is the form which has been in use here ever since I have been in the House, either in the chair or as a private member. To me, that hour is 60 minutes in principle.

Hon. members should also consider the fact that they do on occasion recognize that the length of time allotted to private members' business is 60 minutes even though it might only last for 15 minutes. Moreover, if it is the wish of the House, private members' business can be extended. What is being suggested now could be done only by unanimous consent. Hon. members are asking the Chair, in the absence of unanimous consent, to say that the hour allotted to private members' business should extend to two hours and 41 minutes. This cannot be done by the Chair alone; it could be done only with the consent of all hon. members.

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) said it has always been recognized, in recent times at least, that when hon. members decide to advance the private members' hour, it is understood that the time allotted for that portion of our business will be 60 minutes. So my interpretation of the situation, in the light of the precedents and taking into account the unanimous agreement which was reached at 2.19 to call it four o'clock, and reading in that decision the intention to proceed with the private members' hour for the time normally allotted, that is, for one hour, is that I have to call it five o'clock. And I do call it five o'clock.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m. under the terms of Standing Order 2(1).

At 3.31 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 3, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF FUNDS FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to discuss a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Considering that it is always easier to prevent than to cure and that preventive medicine should be the goal of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, considering also that medical research is the main and most important element of any preventive program because research makes it possible to face future problems, and considering finally that control measures in the field of medical research jeopardize the future health of Canadians, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That this House or its Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs consider forthwith the matter of the medical research budget so that the available funds be sufficient to provide for the fastest progress in the field of preventive medicine and thus meet the main priority, namely the present and future health of Canadians.

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

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent; therefore the motion cannot be put.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

ENERGY

OIL—REASON FOR REJECTING BLENDED PRICING CONCEPT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I was going to say "in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources", but I see him coming in just now. Can the minister tell us why the federal government has rejected the blended pricing concept for oil, given the fact that it is alleged this process would provide incentives for oil exploration and production and at the same time provide additional protection for consumers?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, that is the very problem. There is no evidence that the proposal will indeed provide the kind of incentives to which the hon. member refers. The other problem is that the Ontario government has not demonstrated how, if you freeze the price of old oil at $8, with declining production you will generate more cash funds which are needed for exploration and development.

● (1410)

Mr. Gillies: Would the minister not agree, though, that by taking the position he is now taking he is prejudging one of the items which will be put forward at the conference, presumably starting within the next day or two, and is it appropriate for the government to reject a position which is going to be presented there even before there is an opportunity for the people supporting that proposition to put it forward?

Mr. Gillespie: I am very much looking forward to an articulation by the province of Ontario as to how this would work, but up until now the province of Ontario has not demonstrated how it would meet either one of the two points I have made: one is the incentive question, and the other is the provision of cash flow.

Mr. Gillies: Is the minister now saying that if that argument is made forcefully and successfully at the conference, the government has not rejected this possibility out of hand?

Mr. Gillespie: The discussion will take place. There will be other different points of view put forward. I am sure the federal government will have its view. There are many different provinces involved. As far as I know there is only one province which has even flirted with the idea the government of Ontario put forward. None of the others has supported it.

IMPACT OF INVESTMENT PROPOSED IN "ENERGY STRATEGY FOR CANADA" ON OTHER AREAS OF ECONOMY

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, has the minister any estimate of the impact of the investment of $180 billion proposed in "An Energy Strategy for Canada"—which, as the minister knows, appears at page 106 of that document—for energy related activity on availability of investment funds for housing, manufacturing and other non-energy uses in Canada?

Oral Questions

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, "An Energy Strategy for Canada" made it very clear that the implications of very massive investments for energy over the next ten and fifteen years are serious because other aspects of the economy clearly will not be able to call upon the same investment funds if we are to fund fully the kind of investment we need in Canada for energy exploration and development. If the hon. member will take a look at the low price and high price scenario, he will see some very interesting implications with respect to investment policies and how we can husband our resources.

EFFECT OF INVESTMENT PROPOSED IN "ENERGY STRATEGY FOR CANADA" ON INTEREST RATES—SOURCE OF INVESTMENT FUNDS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Because of our interest in this, and because of the horrendous possibilities, I should like to ask another supplementary. Has the department made any calculation of the possible impact of investments of this dimension on domestic interest rates, and has the department estimated what proportion of this investment will come from Canadian sources?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I cannot give the hon. member a precise figure with respect to interest rates. There are, of course, many factors which affect interest rates, and equally there are many factors which will affect the amount of foreign funds which will be required by this industry and other industries in the future.

Mr. Baldwin: Have you considered the weather?

* * *

FINANCE

REASON FOR DECLINE IN BALANCE OF TRADE IN MANUFACTURED GOODS WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the Minister of Finance, and they relate to some of the information placed before the House last Friday in the "Economic Review". The conclusions of the review are not clear, and because the information in the review will form the basis of the coming debate, it is important for us to know what conclusions the minister has drawn from the statistics which were presented.

In looking at the productivity figures in the manufacturing sector, the review points out that for the last three years increases in labour costs per unit of output have been lower in Canada than in the United States, and the graph dramatically points that out. How, then, does the minister account for our sharp decline in the balance of trade in manufactured goods? Surely the minister cannot hold increases in labour rates in Canada responsible for that.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, some of the conclusions to be drawn from the "Economic Review" will be dealt with at some length in the budget. The drop in Canadian exports over the past year—not just in the last several quarters—has been due to a rather less buoyant condition in the United States market in particular, but in other export markets as well, than was the case in the Canadian market. Certainly, in the early years of the period covered, the disincentive was not the Canadian labour cost. However, the concern of the government of Canada was that with the rate of wage settlements which were contemplated in September and October 1975, namely the 30 per cent, 40 per cent and 50 per cent settlements being sought at that time, then any trend of that kind would be directly adverse to the rate of productivity in Canada.

INFLATIONARY EFFECT OF INCREASED PROFITS—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO CONTROL

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. On a number of occasions the minister has stated that wage and salary increases—and he is restating it today—are going to make our international trading position uncompetitive. In the "Economic Review" labour costs per unit of output have increased by 38.9 per cent since 1972; however, despite a decline in 1975, profits per unit of output have increased by some 62.9 per cent. Is the minister prepared to express his concern about this kind of inflation in demand, and can he indicate what he intends to do about the increase in profits as compared to the increase in wage and salaries?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is because we are concerned about both wage and salary increases—which I would remind the hon. gentleman make up two-thirds of the gross national product—and increases in profits that we put forward the anti-inflation program which touches equally on controls of profits and of incomes.

[Translation]

REQUEST THAT LOANS BE GRANTED PROVINCES UNDER SAME CONDITIONS AS LOAN TO CHILE

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

On April 28, 1976, our leader, the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) asked the minister what were the conditions of the loan of $125 million to Chile, and in particular what was the rate of interest charged and the term. The minister promised to inquire and to make a statement on this subject. I would like to know whether the minister has the information.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I made an inquiry and there was no participation by the government of Canada in such a loan. It was a loan, I presume, made by commercial banks. If we do not participate in the loan, of course we are not informed on all the details.

[*English*]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REASON PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY NOT SOUGHT FOR LOAN—AMOUNT OF LIABILITY IF CONTRACT NOT SIGNED

Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services concerning the LRPA contract. Section 36 of the Financial Administration Act states:

No money shall be borrowed or security issued by or on behalf of Her Majesty without the authority of parliament.

As the Lockheed loan appears to be on behalf of Her Majesty or the government, can the minister explain why parliamentary authority has not been sought?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the loan is strictly between Lockheed and a group of Canadian banks. The federal government has nothing to do with the financing agreement between the two parties.

Mr. Paproski: Except guarantee it!

Mr. McKinnon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the loan is not to the government, why is the government going to pay interest charges on the loan?

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, the loan is on behalf of Lockheed and Lockheed will have to deal with this question. Of course, there are some charges and it is normal for the purchaser to assume the charges. Nevertheless, all the financing agreements will be signed between Lockheed and the interested Canadian banks.

Mr. McKinnon: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister wrote to Lockheed on December 2 telling them to proceed with the necessary work on the LRPA contract. Ignoring the question of whether the minister exceeded his authority at that time, is it true that if the minister had not written such a letter the government would have been in a much better position to bargain about the $16 million cost of the resultant work? Would the minister also confirm or deny that legal commitments by the government, such as his letter, may mean a liability of up to $80 million if Canada does not go through with this contract?

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I think the Canadian Government is well protected with this ceiling of $16 million which is still in force. If the contract is not in force because of the lack of agreement between Lockheed and the Canadian banks, still the ceiling is $16 million. I think it is a very good agreement that was reached at the end of March.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT AMOUNT OF INTEREST PAYABLE

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the Minister of Supply and Services. In reply to the questions put by the hon. member for Victoria, the minister indicated that the government was not involved in terms of interest payments. If that is the case, does it mean the government will pay whatever rate of interest these two outside organizations decide upon? Has the government not protected itself in any way in this respect?

● (1420)

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the government has something to do with the payment of interest to Canadian banks. I said that agreement will be reached between Lockheed and Canadian banks and the Canadian government will, of course, assume the payment of bank charges to Lockheed, because Lockheed is providing this service to the Canadian government. That is normal business practice. We have nothing directly to do with the loan to Lockheed.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POSSIBILITY LEGAL OPINION SOUGHT ON WHETHER GOVERNMENT THE BORROWER IN CONNECTION WITH LOAN TO LOCKHEED

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, that appears to answer my question. Apparently the government will abide by any decision concerning these charges to which the banks and Lockheed will come. May I ask the Minister of Justice a supplementary question? Has the government sought his legal opinion on whether the government is, in a legal sense, the borrower in the Lockheed-Canadian banks projected loan? I ask this because of the answer just given by the Minister of Supply and Services, and because I have in mind the provisions of Section 36 of the Financial Administration Act.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice has been involved, pursuant to its obligations, in providing legal advice to the government.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like a specific answer. In view of what the Minister of Supply and Services just said, what is the capacity of the Government of Canada in this arrangement? Did the Department of Justice give a specific opinion? If so, can the minister say what it was? Also, has the Minister of Justice reviewed the approval mechanisms employed in this matter by Treasury Board, which is responsible for making sure that they conform to guidelines laid down by the government for this kind of financial arrangement?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, as I say, we have been providing legal advice to ministers who are carrying out their responsibilities. As the hon. member knows, the nature of the advice is something which is between us and our clients. The answers should be given by the responsible ministers.

Oral Questions

INDUSTRY

DECLINE IN PRODUCTIVITY—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO CORRECT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. As productivity figures released last Friday by the Department of Finance show that during the past two years there has been a sharp and accelerating decrease in productivity which has been the major factor in increasing unemployment and inflation, when will the Prime Minister take the House into his confidence and tell the House, as he promised three months ago, on February 5, how the government intends to correct this serious situation.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was good enough to give my office notice of his intended question. I have asked to be informed of the status of the various works in progress on which I reported to the hon. member about a couple of months ago. The work is progressing well. I am advised that it is important not to draw extreme conclusions from the cyclical slowdown in productivity which took place in 1973 and 1975. The dominant factor was the economic recession. The counterpart to this slowdown is expected to be above-trend productivity increases in the next year or two.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBILITY OF FORCE BECOMING INVOLVED IN JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General? Did the minister recently discuss certain matters with his counterpart, the Solicitor General of Quebec? Did the two ministers iron out the jurisdictional issue involving the RCMP and other law enforcement agencies? If they discussed these matters last Friday, what agreement did they reach?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I met the Solicitor General of Quebec last Friday. We discussed Olympic security and jurisdictional questions affecting Sky Shops. We agreed to prevent these disputes in future. It was suggested that the federal-provincial conference of attorneys general and law officers of the Crown should discuss what is to happen when police in two or three provinces have jurisdiction if a criminal offence is committed. As for outstanding charges, the RCMP agreed to discuss with the Crown in Quebec any proposed charges before proceeding further.

NATURE OF CHARGES BEING CONSIDERED BY PRE-ENQUÊTE HEARING IN QUEBEC

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, that does not sound very much like an argument of any kind. I will put this question. What charges are being considered and reviewed by the justice under Section 455(4)(a) of the Code and so on, in a hearing being held ex parte, in camera, called in short pre-enquête. Are they the charges laid by the RCMP, namely conspiracy, which are much easier to prove, or are they the charges of fraud or bribery suggested by others? What is being heard in private in this regard?

[Mr. Basford.]

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the matters that are before the pre-enquête were placed there by the province of Quebec. That will continue. They are considering the substantial offence of fraud against the government. The charges laid by the RCMP in Ottawa will also continue, although an agreement has been made between the RCMP and the government of Quebec to transfer all evidence necessary for the pre-enquête to Quebec.

Mr. Woolliams: Let us clarify one situation. Are the charges being dealt with in camera those laid by the RCMP, namely conspiracy where, as the Solicitor General knows, you have to prove the illegal agreement and maybe a part of the offence, or is it offences that are more difficult, suggested by others, which could be thrown out in this hearing? Which charges are they, those laid by the RCMP or by others? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Allmand: The charges laid by the RCMP are conspiracy charges. They are against five individuals. They are being heard here in Ottawa. The pre-enquête in Montreal deals with one charge against one individual which is a substantive charge of fraud against the government.

Mr. Woolliams: If I might be permitted to ask one further question, Mr. Speaker. The charges laid by the RCMP, where the bulk of the evidence is, are not being considered by this hearing being held in camera?

Mr. Allmand: That is right, Mr. Speaker. The pre-enquête is dealing with charges prepared by the Crown prosecutor in Quebec.

* * *

TRANSPORT

CREATION OF RESERVED LANE FOR PUBLIC TRANSIT VEHICLES ON CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE, MONTREAL—REMOVAL OF TOLLS

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Because of the urgent need to encourage more effective use of the Champlain Bridge between Montreal and the South Shore for public transit purposes, can the minister assure the House that every possible federal co-operation is being offered the province of Quebec in establishing a public transit vehicle reserved lane on the Champlain Bridge? Also, will tolls be removed for public transit vehicles on the Champlain Bridge and all other federal bridges in Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, following the hon. member's previous question, these matters were pursued. In both cases I think I can give him an encouraging answer. We are co-operating with the provincial government on the various physical changes that are required to eventually allow a public vehicle lane and we are having serious discussions concerning the question of avoiding collecting tolls on public transit vehicles.

SOCIAL SECURITY

FAILURE OF OLD AGE PENSIONERS TO RECEIVE THEIR INCOME SUPPLEMENT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, may I direct my question to either the acting minister or the parliamentary secretary. In view of the inconvenience suffered by many old age pensioners who did not receive their guaranteed income supplement in their April cheques, can the parliamentary secretary indicate whether this matter has been resolved and, if all these persons have not yet received their guaranteed income supplement, how soon it will be in their hands?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should have a copy of the news release issued by the department on Friday indicating that extra service is being provided by the Department of National Health and Welfare and that office hours are being extended so that this matter can be rectified as quickly as possible.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I guess that press release must have been put in the mail.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will steps be taken, either by amending the legislation or in the administration, so that this will not occur again next year?

Mr. Kaplan: That is being considered, Mr. Speaker. I should like to add that the release indicates that retroactive payments are being made as well, so that no one will suffer the absolute loss of a pension to which they would have been entitled if a proper application had been made.

* * *

● (1430)

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT OF PROVISION RELATING TO PROHIBITED DEGREES OF AFFINITY AFFECTING MARRIAGE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of the fact that problems have developed in relation to the prohibited degrees of affinity affecting marriages as a result of the Power vs. Power case decision in the Province of Ontario, can the minister tell me whether or not remedial legislation will soon be introduced—I understand the department is already working on it—to amend section 16 of the Divorce Act?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): I shall be tabling in the House tomorrow the report of the Law Reform Commission on family law which represents the conclusion of some five years of study of the subject. I have obtained the agreement of the provincial attorneys general that we shall take a day of our meetings in June to consider family law and I hope to present to the attorneys general at that time a paper on the whole subject so that, hopefully, a consensus can develop as to what the federal government and parliament should do in the area of divorce and family law and what the provincial attorneys general should do. In answer to the specific question as to whether the law of consanguinity should be changed, that is one of the matters involved in the general review of family law.

* * *

ENERGY

OIL—REASON FOR LOW PRIORITY GIVEN DEVELOPMENT OF RENEWABLE RESOURCES UNDER ENERGY STRATEGY

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Given that the government has changed its energy policy from the goal of self-sufficiency to that of reliance for one third of our oil requirements on offshore sources, will the minister explain why his new energy strategy ranks renewable energy second last in terms of research and development priorities and why the least amount of money has been allotted to this kind of research although it has the greatest potential for self-sufficiency.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Without accepting the premise of the preamble, and that is important, I would like to say that conservation has been given one of the highest priorities. If the hon. lady were to look at the whole area of priorities, she would see that energy conservation is one of the six priority areas.

Miss MacDonald: Obviously, the minister was not listening. I was asking about research and development priorities in connection with renewable resources. They have been allotted the lowest amount of money and I was asking him why they were placed at the present level when they have the greatest potential for self-sufficiency. Further, I should like to ask him, with respect to the expansion of nuclear research which accounts for three-quarters of the total research and development budget, whether the estimates of nuclear safety contained in the document are any more reliable than the estimates of the extent of Canada's energy resources given by the government in past years?

Mr. Gillespie: I would say that those two questions are quite unrelated. As to the first, having to do with renewable sources of energy, I would say this is quite an important area of research and development but as the hon. member may understand, while one would like to have additional funds for these areas there are other areas for which I should also like to have additional funds. The hon. member and her party have been asking the government to cut expenditures. Well, we got an increase in this connection. I would have liked it to have been a greater one.

The second point I should like to make is this: the main thing is to spend money where it can be most useful. I think in terms of solar energy, in terms of wind, in terms of tidal energy, in terms of bio-mass. In a number of these areas we shall have to move rather slowly because very large sums of money would not generate any immediate

pay-back. All the experts tell me this is an area in which we can expect significant amounts of energy, but not for 15 years or more.

Miss MacDonald: The way you are going it will be 100 years.

ROLE OF PETRO-CAN IN SUPPLYING EXPLORATION CAPITAL—SOURCE OF FUNDS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): My question, too, is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources; it relates, also, to government expenditures. In the light of government statements that Petro-Can will ultimately put up about 10 per cent of Canadian exploration capital, and in the light of the fact that the government's energy strategy speaks of an exploration program costing about $40 billion over the next 15 years, is it the minister's opinion that Petro-Can will be able to fulfil its self-appointed role, that is, to provide about 10 per cent of this $40 billion?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): It is not a self-appointed role. I realize the hon. member has difficulties in connection with Petro-Canada because his party and associates will have no part of it. They do not understand the potential or the importance of this national institution. If the hon. member were to take a look at expenditures offshore in the Arctic he would know that Petro-Can will be contributing probably close to 15-20 per cent in the next couple of years to all the exploration costs there.

Mr. Jarvis: I might tell the minister that any of my problems in connection with Petro-Can are miniscule compared with his. Will he advise us where Petro-Can will obtain the extra $2.5 billion over and above the $1.5 billion already promised by the government to achieve the goal I mentioned? While he is answering and talking about government institutions, can he tell us whether it is the government's intention that this money shall be one more government hand-out to Petro-Can out of the taxpayers' funds?

Mr. Gillespie: If the hon. member does not agree with the kind of expenditure Petro-Can has undertaken, for example, $25 million to the Nova Scotia shelf operation each year for five years, let him and the rest of his party so declare.

Mr. Jarvis: Will the minister please indicate whether it is government policy to expend an additional $2.5 billion over and above the $1.5 billion already promised to Petro-Can out of general tax revenues?

Mr. Gillespie: That is an altogether hypothetical question.

[Mr. Gillespie.]

NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

RESIGNATION OF MR. BEAUDET—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE AND EARLY ACTION TO REPLACE

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing hypothetical about the question I have for the Minister of Transport. Now that Mr. Yves Beaudet has submitted his resignation, and his resignation has been accepted by the Prime Minister, can the Minister of Transport or the Prime Minister tell us what intention the department has for the early replacement of Mr. Beaudet to the board so that it might retain at least its capacity to function at least in a legal sense?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Beaudet indicated his desire to resign toward the end of last year; he continued to serve at my request until this time. The appointment of a replacement is expected to be made this week.

Mr. Forrestall: I understand from the minister's reply that the appointment will be made toward the end of this week. I hope it will be somebody who knows something about ports. Would the minister table the exchange of correspondence leading to Mr. Beaudet's resignation and any memoranda which might be attached to it, since we understand it was not a friendly resignation, and that is regrettable.

Mr. Lang: I should like to make it quite clear to the hon. member, and to hon. members generally, that the termination of the relationship between Mr. Beaudet and the National Harbours Board was carried out in a friendly manner. As I indicated, Mr. Beaudet continued to sit for a number of months at my request. As to the other part of the question, I will look at the ordinary procedure covering the tabling of documents.

* * *

● (1440)

PUBLIC SERVICE

REASON FOR REFERRAL OF AWARD TO FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES GROUP TO ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the President of the Treasury Board. After a number of starts, stops and backtracking Treasury Board decided within the last three or four weeks, contrary to all respect for law and past practice, to disregard an arbitration award affecting the forestry and biological sciences group of the Professional Association of the Public Service of Canada and to place the award before the Anti-Inflation Board. Can the minister say whether this indicates that Treasury Board has altered its policy and no longer intends to honour arbitration awards in the public service, even when these particular public servants concerned as far back as August opted for this route rather than the conciliation-strike route.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we will respect all the decisions made by the

arbitration board which are within the guidelines issued by the House of Commons after October 14.

[*English*]

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think I did place on the record that the choice was made in August for arbitration. As these public servants are known for their responsible attitude toward their work, is the minister aware that he may by this action, depending on the AIB's ruling, be pushing these public servants towards strike action against their will, and is he aware of the consequences of strike action by these particular employees in terms of ruined experiments, wastage of public funds and possibly the endangering of public health?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is most difficult for me not to classify that as a hypothetical question.

* * *

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—REFUSAL OF DUPONT TO PUT INTO PRODUCTION NEW POLYESTER YARN PLANT BECAUSE OF LOW-PRICED IMPORTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is the minister aware of the decision today of the Dupont Company not to put into production its newly constructed $50 million polyester yarn plant at Coteau, resulting in a loss of 325 employment opportunities at Coteau, a lay-off of 125 permanent employees at Kingston and the decision not to hire 200 summer students, all of which the company attributes to distress price imports and the refusal of the government to implement the recommendations of its own textile clothing board?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to remind the hon. member that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce already appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, and that the reading of that report will show to what extent the minister is enthusiastic, confident and optimistic about the future of the textile and clothing industry.

On that occasion, we announced the establishment of an ad hoc committee to review thoroughly the quotas, imports and the textile manufacturing industry. The report should be tabled by the end of June. Three interested provinces are members of the ad hoc committee and representatives of the clothing industry also sit on that committee, whose report must be tabled by the end of June.

As to the last part of the question, I would like to point out to the hon. member that I willl discuss that situation with the director of the textile industry this week, and I will inform him of his decision.

[*English*]

HEALTH

POLIO VIRUS IN OTTAWA AREA—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO CONTROL AND TO IMMUNIZE SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I should like to direct a question to the acting minister or to his parliamentary secretary. My question has to do with the alarming reports of five different strains of polio virus in two sewage treatment plants in the Ottawa region. I recognize that some of the responsibility lies with the provincial government, but in view of the fact that this is a communicable disease which can spread to other parts of Canada I should like to ask my question in two parts.

First of all, what steps are being taken to control the spread of the polio virus in the sewage treatment plants in question? Secondly, since nearly 30 per cent of the school children in Ontario have not been immunized against polio, what steps are being taken to ensure that all children whose parents agree are immunized before the fall; and also, will additional supplies of vaccine be available for other persons who want to be vaccinated?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I believe that this investigation of the polio virus strains found in the Ottawa area is continuing. Information has already been relayed to the provincial officials concerned, since as the hon. member noted, there is a considerable provincial responsibility in this area.

I am glad to have the opportunity to remind all Canadians, through you, Mr. Speaker, that a person is not automatically immune to polio and that polio vaccine, as well as booster shots, have to be taken to be immune. I have no knowledge of any shortage of polio vaccine. However, I think this is a good opportunity to remind all Canadians of their responsibility for their own health and of the necessity for them to seek this vaccine which is available and to obtain shots.

POLIO VIRUS IN OTTAWA AREA—SUSCEPTIBILITY OF STRAIN TO SALK VACCINE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like some assurance whether or not adequate supplies of vaccine are on hand and, even more important, is a delivery system being set up for school vaccination programs so that every child in the province who has not been vaccinated will have the opportunity to be vaccinated before the end of the school year?

May I also ask another question related to the same matter while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker. Have any laboratory tests been conducted to see whether or not the five strains that have been discovered in the sewage treatment plants are strains which are susceptible to the Salk vaccine, or will some other vaccine be necessary in view of the types of strains that have been discovered?

Mr. Bob Kaplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, laboratory

tests have been requested by the researcher and the viruses have been identified in federal laboratories, but it is my understanding that the tests have not yet been completed. As for special vaccination programs particularly in schools, these are a provincial responsibility. I will bring the hon. member's question to the attention of the appropriate provincial ministers.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

EGGS—REASON FOR CONTROL OF IMPORTS BY MARKETING AGENCY—BENEFITS TO CONSUMER

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Last Thursday in the House the minister stated that the Canadian consumer received no benefit in the past from private egg importers. What benefits can the Canadian consumer expect from CEMA's recent profitable transactions? I would also ask the minister, since it has been stated government policy that CEMA should not have control over licensing for egg imports, how he can explain to the House his encouragement of CEMA to do indirectly that which government policy forbids directly, or has there in fact been a change in government policy?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I will try to remember all the questions that the hon. member asked. Basically, what CEMA is doing is supplying eggs to consumers at prices that are not inflated, and they have done so more successfully than have the producers of any other commodity consumed by Canadians. The price of eggs has changed less that that of any other product. If other products had changed in price as little as eggs, then we would have had no such thing as inflation over the last six months.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Whelan: CEMA has to observe the global quotas that are laid down, but as for the supplementary quotas they are well within the law in what they are doing. They put the eggs on the market, and if they were the sole importer and they made the money the private importers are making, then they could offset the cost of eggs to consumers.

Mr. Grafftey: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the business that occurred last Monday, of which the minister has told the House he is well aware, the minister told the House that it was government policy that CEMA should not have control over licensing for imported eggs. The minister has encouraged CEMA to do indirectly what it has been forbidden to do directly. For that reason I would ask the minister, yes or no, whether there has been a change in government policy; and is he now admitting that CEMA has a complete monopoly over eggs, including imported eggs?

Mr. Whelan: No, Mr. Speaker, CEMA does not have a complete monopoly. There are approximately 4,600 egg producers in Canada and several hundred, maybe thousand, additional egg producers who have anywhere from one to 500 laying hens and market their eggs in many forms. These producers are under the control of no one. So they do not have a monopoly. There has been no change in government policy concerning who should or should not be importers of eggs. They have made a submission to me and to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce asking that they be the sole importers of eggs. It would be nothing new. To import oats, wheat or barley through the Canadian Wheat Board one must obtain a permit from the Canadian Wheat Board. If one wants to import butter into Canada, one must obtain a permit from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It is the same thing that is being done in respect of eggs. It is nothing new at all.

[Mr. Kaplan.]

● (1450)

VETERINARIANS—UNFILLED POSITIONS AND LOW MORALE AS RESULT OF LOW SALARIES—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the 140 unfilled veterinary positions and the increasing number of resignations of veterinarians in the health of animals branch of the Department of Agriculture in Canada due to a salary schedule which over the last eight years has not even kept up with inflation, what action is the minister taking to rectify this? As he knows very well, morale in the department is now less than satisfactory and getting worse every day.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows that negotiations are going on between the veterinarians and my department and between the civil service commission and the Treasury Board. Maybe the President of the Treasury Board can add a little to that.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

REQUEST FOR NEGOTIATIONS WITH VETERINARIANS

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the fact that salary negotiations have broken off between the veterinarians in the health of animals branch and Treasury Board and a strike is now imminent which would have disastrous results for consumers, the livestock producers, the meat packing industry and our meat exports, will the Treasury Board now meet with representatives of the veterinary group, bargain in all honesty and good faith and formulate a salary schedule that will at long last recognize a long overdue inequity?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, we are always prepared to meet our civil servants' organizations to settle our problems by mutual agreement. Of course we must comply with Parliament's decisions which imposed limits on amounts to be paid as salary increases. Veterinarians could take into consideration that hon. members are going to freeze their own salaries and expenses this afternoon.

[*English*]

FINANCE

EFFECT OF ENERGY POLICY ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN ATLANTIC AREA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance and relates to questions raised last week concerning the meeting of first ministers later this week with regard to energy pricing. Inasmuch as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion indicated last week the concern of his department with regard to the growing price differential, particularly in the area of electrical costs, and expressed this concern to other colleagues in the cabinet, could the minister indicate whether or not the government has arrived at a policy decision in respect of the differential which will be allowed to develop in electrical prices realizing the offsetting effect this would have on the government's whole program relating to regional development.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the position of the government will be put before the provinces. As the hon. member knows there will be a meeting of first ministers on Thursday this week. The position of the government I think will become clear at that meeting.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, since the minister last week referred specifically to the question of the price of petroleum and natural gas, but did not indicate specifically whether the question would also centre on the matter of electrical pricing which has become extremely difficult for a number of provinces, particularly those in eastern Canada, can he indicate whether there is preparation to discuss this issue with the premiers when they meet.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, there has been a specific discussion of the question of the position of the Atlantic provinces which are dependent in the main upon petroleum for electricity generation within the province. The governement has not reached a decision nor do I believe there will be any discussion about the general pricing of energy in Canada. As the hon. member knows the lowest rate for electrical energy I believe is in the province of Manitoba at this time. The government has no notion of equalizing electrical rates across Canada to the rates in Manitoba.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—INQUIRY AS TO TREASURY BOARD APPROVAL

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question follows one by the hon. member for Victoria and by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. It has to do with the Lockheed contract and is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. It is understood that before major projects are submitted to cabinet for approval the Treasury Board must approve the financial arrangements. Did this happen in the Lockheed deal before the project was submitted to cabinet on November 27 last and if not, why not?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Board had studied this contract as any others and, as a matter of fact, one of the issues which the Treasury Board was concerned with was the interim financing, and the matter having been apparently settled, at the last meeting of the Treasury Board we authorized the Minister of Supply and Services to sign the contract.

* * *

MANPOWER

REQUEST THAT FUNDS BE ALLOTTED COMMUNITY PROJECTS ALREADY UNDERTAKEN

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister.

As the Company of Young Canadians has been dismantled, and, as a result, some areas such as the Gaspé Peninsula and Témiscamingue have been severely affected, can the right hon. Prime Minister tell the House whether the government intends to give special assistance so that the community projects now under way can be completed?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House knows that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion has had discussions with the provincial authorities and that several projects now under study are being implemented in that area of the province of Quebec.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT MEASURES TO ASSIST PRIVATE SECTOR EXPANDING IN HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board as a result of the discussions he had with the Canadian Economic Policy Committee. It is reported that the President of the Treasury Board has urged the private sector to help cut public spending by shifting investment and expansion plans toward high unemployment regions. Is the minister in a position now to advise the House what type of incentives are being considered by the government to assist the private sector to realize this objective, keeping in mind that the control period certainly does not lend too much to reaching that objective at this time?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, my message to that group was rather simple. I told them they should themselves also make efforts to create employment in those areas where there is unemployment. We often hear complaints about there being a shortage of workers in areas of great economic growth; without asking everyone to move to the Golden Horseshoe

perhaps some of the industrialists in that area could go to other places in Canada where there is competent manpower that is eager to work.

[*English*]

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the private sector will have a great deal of difficulty accomplishing the minister's objective. At the same time the minister indicated, and it is reported, that the federal government is determined to limit further its expenditures. As I understand it, this matter is presently before cabinet for approval. Can the minister advise when a statement will be made in this regard?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly in what regard. I spoke of the government budget control policy. We do not want to increase our expenditures during the current year and have shown great determination in reducing them since last December. With regard to the invitation extended to industry to settle in areas where there is a shortage of employment, it is self-explanatory. I am happy to see the hon. member does not disagree with my policy.

* * *

[*English*]

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF REGULATIONS GOVERNING PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the publication by the Anti-Inflation Board of the regulations regarding professionals, and in view of the fact that the initial advice of accountants is one of considerable dismay about the ability of the individual professional to comprehend and comply with the regulations, and as the advice now given to many professionals by their accountants is to reduce their productivity, will the minister consider having another look at the regulations to see if they could be made clearer and easier to follow.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as a first step I think I would like to check as to the accuracy of the premise of that question.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

REPRESENTATIONS FROM QUEBEC CONCERNING RENOVATION PROJECT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, of which I have given him notice, but since he is not here I will put it to his parliamentary secretary.

As a result of a meeting with the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs and the vice-president of the executive committee of the City of Montreal, could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs tell the House whether the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs has sent him a letter or telegram about housing renovation within the sector of intervention recognized at the meeting of March 1975 concerning the subsidies provided by Quebec for residential renovation?

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I must answer no. I have tried to find the answer, since the member had given notice of his question. I could not communicate with the minister concerned. We are as anxious as he is to proceed with housing renovation. I hope that in Montreal a residential rehabilitation assistance program will be undertaken as soon as possible and I will be expecting as he is the answer of the Quebec department.

* * *

● (1500)

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

SUGGESTED INSTITUTION FOR INUIT INMATES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief question for the Solicitor General and it is related to the recently reported comments of Michael Labrie, a detention guard, regarding the need for a northern jail for Inuit inmates. In view of the fact that related concerns were expressed at the Edmonton conference, which I know the minister attended, and in view of the fact that many of the recommendations made at that conference if implemented would have a positive effect in reducing the high rate of incarceration of native people in our penal institutions, would the minister indicate whether he will be making a full report and recommendations to the House in the near future about this important matter?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, there was a more recent conference in Montreal about two months ago at which we attempted to follow up on the recommendations of the Edmonton Conference. Right now we have a penal institution in the Northwest Territories which is operating with our assistance in Frobisher and there is one in Yellowknife, but the Inuit people would like their inmates closer to their own towns, and we are looking at ways of doing that.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier in answer to a question I said that the Public Service Commission would join in the negotiations with the Treasury Board. In fact I should have said it is the Professional Institute of the Public Service.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FEDERAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

MEASURE TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF CANADA BY CANADIANS

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-437, to amend the Federal Business Development Bank Act (corporate objects).

He said: The purpose of this amendment to the Federal Business Development Bank Act is to encourage the development of Canada by Canadians and to ensure adequate assistance for this effort by providing financial assistance and other assistance to Canadian citizens, landed immigrants and Canadian companies of which 51 per cent of the equity voting shares is owned by Canadians. This bill, in effect, will provide assistance and encouragement for Canadian ownership of the Canadian economy.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are marked by an asterisk.)

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 4,121, 4,214, 4,216, 4,219, 4,222, 4,228, 4,231, 4,506 to 4,515 inclusively, 4,517, 4,594, 4,779 to 4,783 inclusively, 4,913, 4,918, 4,948, 4,971, 4,972, 4,979, 4,980, 4,987, 4,997 to 5,000 inclusively, 5,002, 5,013, 5,039, 5,105, 5,106, 5,108, 5,179, 5,183, 5,208, 5,210, 5,248 and 5,251.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Text*]

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE—SEPARATE UNIT SYSTEM FOR DISEASES SUCH AS "LASSA FEVER"

Question No. 4,121—**Mr. Robinson:**

Do any hospitals have a separate unit system for a disease such as "Lassa fever" and, if so, how many?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No hospital in Canada has at present a separate unit system designed specifically for a disease such as Lassa Fever. A Federal Provincial Isolation Facilities Working Group is currently well advanced with studies designed both to assess the need for such facilities and to provide both short and long term proposals in relation to the assessed need. The scope of the studies embrace other related aspects of contingency planning for such diseases including availability of appropriate virus laboratory and other support services.

Order Paper Questions

SASKATCHEWAN PENITENTIARY—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,214—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Saskatchewan Penitentiary, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10 (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purpose of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. J. P. O'Sullivan. (b) Since September 9, 1975. (c) Assistant Director of Industries. (d) $25,200 to $31,500.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. G. J. Rhodes. (b) Since October 23, 1975. (c) Assistant Director, Occupational Development. (d) $19,128 to $21,737.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

MILLHAVEN INSTITUTION—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,216—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Millhaven Institution, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10 to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. J. Dowsett. (b) Since October 22, 1974. (c) Regional Chief of Security. (d) $25,200 to $31,500.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. S. M. Scrutton. (b) Since June 10, 1974. (c) Deputy Director, Drumheller Institution, Alberta. (d) $19,128 to $21,737.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

ARCHAMBAULT—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,219—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Archambault, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade, 10 (b) grade 10 to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purpose of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. J. P. LeBrun. (b) Since October 1, 1974. (c) Director, Laval Institution. (d) $25,200 to $31,500.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

Order Paper Questions

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. J. P. Dallaire. (b) Since April 1, 1972. (c) Deputy Director, Leclerc Institution. (d) $19,128 to $21,737.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no (d) yes.

STONY MOUNTAIN INSTITUTION—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,222—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Stony Mountain Institution, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. R. A. Desrochers; (b) Since January 7, 1974; (c) Warden, Fort Saskatchewan Gaol, Alberta; (d) $25,200 to $31,500.

2. (a) no; (b) yes; (c) no; (d) no.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. R. M. Zubrycki; (b) Since September 1, 1973; (c) Assistant Director, Social Development; (d) $19,128 to $21,737.

2. (a) no; (b) no; (c) no; (d) yes.

COLLINS BAY—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,228—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Collins Bay Institution, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. D. J. Weir, Acting Director; (b) Since December 1, 1975; (c) Assistant Director Socialization; (d) $22,705 to $25,764.

2. (a) no; (b) no; (c) no; (d) yes.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. R. J. Markowski, Acting Deputy Director; (b) Since December 1, 1975; (c) Supervisor of Classification; (d) $19,128 to $21,737.

3. (a) no; (b) no; (c) no; (d) yes.

SASKATCHEWAN FARM ANNEX—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,231—**Mr. Hnatyshyn:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Saskatchewan Farm Annex, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

[Mr. Poulin.]

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. L. K. Jacobson; (b) Since August 1, 1961; (c) Bookkeeper, Hobby Shop; (d) $15,817 to $17,935.

2. (a) yes; (b) no; (c) no; (d) no.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. C. J. Receveur; (b) Since August 1, 1965; (c) Administrative and Service Officer; (d) $11,395 to $13,516.

2. (a) no; (b) yes; (c) no; (d) no.

CARLTON CENTRE—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,506—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Carlton Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

PORTSMOUTH CENTRE—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,507—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Portsmouth Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

MONTGOMERY CENTRE—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,508—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Montgomery Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

ST. HUBERT CENTRE—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,509—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at St. Hubert Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

PARRTOWN CENTRE—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,510—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Parrtown Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

LAVAL—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,511—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Laval?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

ONTARIO PRISON FOR WOMEN—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,512—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Ontario Prison for Women?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

DUNGARVON—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,513—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Dungarvon?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

SPRINGHILL—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,514—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Springhill?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

WESTMORELAND—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,515—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Westmoreland?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

QUEBEC REGIONAL RECEPTION CENTRE—SUICIDES

Question No. 4,517—**Mr. MacKay:**

For the years 1970 to 1975, what was the number of suicides at Quebec Regional Reception Centre?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Nil.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—ST. JEAN BASE, MONCTON

Question No. 4,594—**Mr. Jones:**

1. What is the (a) total, (b) estimated cost for construction of the Department of National Defence language training school at St. Jean, Quebec?

2. What is the estimated total annual (a) operating, (b) maintenance cost and, in each case, what are the details?

3. What is the total annual operating and maintenance cost for Canadian Forces Base Moncton?

4. For the years 1970 to 1975, were capital expenditures made at CFB Moncton and, if so, in what amount?

5. For the years 1975 and 1976, what is the estimated capital cost for CFB Moncton?

6. Is the Department of National Defence able to reconcile the expenditures for the language training school at St. Jean, Quebec with the possible reduction of the infrastructure and support services at bases such as Moncton?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) and (b). The National Defence Language school is part of the redevelopment of Canadian Forces Base, St. Jean which also includes the Francophone recruit school, Francophone technical training elements, base support elements and support to Collège Militaire Royal. Since the majority of the facilities are being built for the Base as a whole it is not possible to provide a realistic estimate for the language school by itself. The cost of the redevelopment of CFB St. Jean is $84.1 million in total program dollars including inflation.

2. (a) and (b). The total annual operating and maintenance cost for Base St. Jean for fiscal year 1975/76 is listed below. Operating and maintenance costs for the Language school cannot be given separately for the reasons given above. Military Personnel Costs, $3,819,543; Civilian Personnel Costs, $4,142,078; Equipment Operating and Maintenance Costs, $2,477,148; Facilities Operating and Maintenance Costs, $692,624; Total: $11,131,393.

3. $8,812,242 in Fiscal Year 1975/76.

4. The capital expenditures made at CFB Moncton are as follows: FY 69/70, $95,000; FY 70/71, $47,800; FY 71/72, $162,900; FY 72/73, $72,000; FY 73/74, $82,000; FY 74/75, $74,700.

5. The estimated capital expenditures at CFB Moncton are: FY 75/76, $128,000; FY 76/77, $96,000.

6. There is no direct relationship between the development of CFB St. Jean and the future status of CFB Moncton. The Department of National Defence has allocated resources to the redevelopment and expansion of training facilities at CFB St. Jean in order to meet approved federal government and departmental policies and objectives.

FERNDALE—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,779—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Ferndale, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. N. A. Hall. (b) Since June 4, 1973. (c) Director, Agassiz. (d) $15,886 to $18,052.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. R. Sochan. (b) Since November 17, 1975. (c) Counsellor, Psychiatric Centre. (d) $13,658 to $15,519.

Order Paper Questions

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

MATSQUI—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,780—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Matsqui, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the pusposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) N. G. Caros. (b) Since June 1, 1974. (c) Director, Millhaven. (d) $24,500 to $30,600.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

1. Deputy Director: (a) J. Ryan. (b) Since December 10, 1973. (c) Acting Director, Technical Services. (d) $14,937 to $16,934.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) no. Formal education: Grade 13.

MOUNTAIN PRISON—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,781—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Mountain Institution, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10, to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. W. Mort. (b) Since December 28, 1973. (c) Assistant Regional Director, Classification. (d) $22,705 to $25,764.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. G. Wilson. (b) Since November 1, 1970. (c) CX7. (d) $14,311 to $15,158.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

AGASSIZ CORRECTIONAL CAMP—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,782—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Agassiz Correctional Camp, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10 to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

[Mr. Poulin.]

1. Director: (a) Mr. J. W. Stonoski. (b) Since December 3, 1973. (c) Head, Living Unit. (d) $15,886 to $18,052.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. Don Howard. (b) Since April 1, 1974. (c) Counsellor. (d) $13,658 to $15,519.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

WILLIAMS HEAD—WARDEN AND ACTING WARDEN

Question No. 4,783—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. (a) What is the name of the present warden and acting warden at Williams Head, (b) how long have they held the positions, (c) what positions did they hold previously, (d) what are their salary levels?

2. Was their formal education (a) less than grade 10, (b) grade 10 to grade 12, (c) some university, (d) a first university degree?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: For the purposes of this question, "Warden" is construed to mean "Director" and "Acting Warden" to mean "Deputy Director".

1. Director: (a) Mr. J. A. Mulroney. (b) Since September 1, 1974. (c) Assistant Director, Socialization. (d) $22,705 to $25,764.

2. (a) no. (b) no. (c) no. (d) yes.

1. Deputy Director: (a) Mr. J. Sheridan. (b) Since October 1, 1967. (c) P.M. 2. (d) $14,311 to $15,158.

2. (a) no. (b) yes. (c) no. (d) no.

STOL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Question No. 4,913—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Has the government ended the STOL demonstration four months early and, if so, for what reason?

2. How much was budgeted for the STOL demonstration and how much of the budget was and will be spent?

3. What were the projected and actual (a) capital, (b) operating costs of the demonstration?

4. How much revenue was collected from STOL passengers and did it cover the operating costs?

5. Will DOT and Airtransit employees who worked on the STOL demonstration be re-assigned or released?

6. (a) What will be the disposition of the equipment used in the STOL demonstration, (b) will it be used in other (i) sections of DOT, (ii) departments and, if so, is this future use reflected in the 1976-77 Estimates?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The STOL demonstration is to end four months early on April 30, 1976 because the objectives of the project will have been met by that date, and the monies budgeted to the program will have been expended by that date.

2. A total of $24.411 million was budgeted for the STOL demonstration project. On April 30, 1976, it is estimated that this budget will have been overrun by $124,000.

3. The projected capital and operating costs of the demonstration were $15.5 million and $8.9 million, respectively. The actual capital and operating costs to April 30, 1976 are estimated at $15.5 million and $9.035 million respectively.

4. Total revenues collected from STOL passengers up to the end of February amounted to $3.378 million. It is

estimated that by April 30, 1976, total revenues collected from passengers will have amounted to approximately $3.6 million. These revenues do not cover the operating costs.

5. Term employees with Transport Canada, will be re-assigned where positions are available. Otherwise, they will be released. Indeterminate Transport Canada employees will be re-assigned. Air Canada has been working very closely with Airtransit to ensure that all employees of Airtransit are given full consideration for any Air Canada job vacancies for which they are qualified. A number have already been hired by Air Canada. Also, Air Canada employees who were seconded to Airtransit are being reabsorbed on an individual basis consistent with commitments made to them when they were seconded.

6. Disposition of the equipment used in the STOL demonstration project will be determined in accordance with the needs of various agencies of Her Majesty's Government. Some equipment will be re-allocated to other sections of Transport Canada. Some equipment will be used by other departments. This future use is not reflected in the 1976-77 Estimates.

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE—GRANTS FOR AMATEUR SPORTS IN CONSTITUENCY OF TÉMISCAMINGUE

Question No. 4,918—**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):**

1. Since 1970, did the Department of National Health and Welfare spend money on amateur sport in the Constituency of Témiscamingue and, if so, in what amount?

2. What were (a) the names of the (i) short-term, (ii) long-term projects in the Constituency, (b) the amounts involved, (c) the names of the municipalities involved?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1 and 2. There were no recipients of grants-in-aid resident in the Constituency of Témiscamingue during 1974-75 and 1975-76.

NOTE: The Fitness and Amateur Sport program does not normally cover capital projects and other forms of expenditures that are amendable to a designation by constituency. The nature of the funding program is outlined in the 1973-74 Annual Report of the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch tabled in the House of Commons on February 11, 1975 (Sessional Paper No. 301-1/150).

VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—PARKING STRUCTURE

Question No. 4,948—**Mr. Reynolds:**

With reference to the answer to Question No. 3,556, could the Minister advise (a) on what date the feasibility study for a parking structure at the Vancouver International Airport was authorized, (b) what is the name of the company who made a proposal for indoor parking facilities at the Airport and what are the details of the proposal?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): (a) In July 1973, a study was authorized to determine the parking requirements until 1980. The recommendations are being evaluated as part of the overall master plan for the long range development of Vancouver International Airport. (b) Rotopark Intercontinental S.A. of Montreal, presented a proposal for an automatic car parking system, utilizing computer controlled electro-mechanical equipment which would transport a vehicle from a designated drop-off point into the garage. The procedure would be reversed when the vehicle was required.

RCMP—QUEBEC

Question No. 4,971—**Mr. Matte:**

1. How many members of the RCMP were stationed in the Province of Quebec in (a) 1970. (b) 1971. (c) 1972. (d) 1973. (e) 1974. (f) 1975. (g) 1976?

2. How many were responsible for (a) general management, (b) training, (c) law enforcement?

3. How many were (a) French speaking, (b) English speaking, (c) bilingual?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: Parts 1 and 2 refer to authorized establishment whereas Part 3 refers to actual strength.

1. (a) 688. (b) 807. (c) 850. (d) 938. (e) 1,003. (f) 1,071. (g) 1,171.

2.	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
(a)	22	22	30	32	32	40	43
(b)	0	0	2	2	2	2	4
(c)	666	785	818	904	969	1029	1124

3. Statistics available for 1976 only. (a) 263. (b) 65. (c) 797.

RCMP—ONTARIO

Question No. 4,972—**Mr. Matte:**

1. How many members of the RCMP were stationed in the Province of Ontario in (a) 1970. (b) 1971. (c) 1972. (d) 1973. (e) 1974. (f) 1975. (g) 1976?

2. How many were responsible for (a) general management, (b) training, (c) law enforcement?

3. How many were (a) French speaking, (b) English speaking, (c) bilingual?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note (1): Parts 1 and 2 refer to authorized establishment whereas Part 3 refers to actual strength. Note (2): This question has been interpreted to refer to operational divisions. Therefore statistics with respect to Headquarters, Ottawa have not been included.

1. (a) 914. (b) 1,013. (c) 1,071. (d) 1,205. (e) 1,400. (f) 1,536. (g) 1,721.

2.	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
(a)	26	26	31	35	37	47	53
(b)	0	0	2	3	4	5	5
(c)	888	987	1038	1167	1359	1484	1663

3. Statistics available for 1976 only. (a) 67. (b) 1,320. (c) 318.

Order Paper Questions

RCMP—MANITOBA

Question No. 4,979—Mr. Matte:

1. How many members of the RCMP were stationed in the Province of Manitoba in (a) 1970. (b) 1971. (c) 1972. (d) 1973. (e) 1974. (f) 1975. (g) 1976?

2. How many were responsible for (a) general management, (b) training, (c) law enforcement?

3. How many were (a) French speaking, (b) English speaking, (c) bilingual?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note: Parts 1 and 2 refer to authorized establishment whereas Part 3 refers to actual strength.

1. (a) 644. (b) 704. (c) 735. (d) 768. (e) 831. (f) 881. (g) 956.

2.	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
(a)	15	15	19	20	23	22	30
(b)	0	0	2	2	2	4	2
(c)	629	689	714	746	806	855	924

3. Statistics available for 1976 only. (a) 7. (b) 904. (c) 45.

RCMP—SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 4,980—Mr. Matte:

1. How many members of the RCMP were stationed in the Province of Saskatchewan in (a) 1970. (b) 1971. (c) 1972. (d) 1973. (e) 1974. (f) 1975. (g) 1976?

2. How many were responsible for (a) general management, (b) training, (c) law enforcement?

3. How many were (a) French speaking, (b) English speaking, (c) bilingual?

Mr. Hugh Poulin (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Note (1): Parts 1 and 2 refer to authorized establishment whereas Part 3 refers to actual strength. Note (2): This question has been interpreted to refer to operational divisions. Therefore statistics with respect to the training division in Regina have not been included.

1. (a) 922. (b) 947. (c) 980. (d) 983. (e) 1,033. (f) 1,059. (g) 1,107.

2.	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
(a)	16	16	20	23	22	27	28
(b)	0	0	2	2	2	2	2
(c)	906	931	958	958	1009	1030	1077

3. Statistics available for 1976 only. (a) Nil. (b) 1,091. (c) 16.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—DAMAGE AS A RESPECT OF COLLISION INCURRED BY HMS "MARGAREE", HMS "ST. CHARLES" AND HMS "RIVERTON"

Question No. 4,987—Mr. Forrestall:

1. What is the estimate of the total cost of all damages incurred by (a) HMS *St. Charles*, (b) HMS *Margaree*, (c) HMS *Riverton* in the recent collisions and resultant engine damage from their trip together from Halifax to Montreal?

2. Was such a voyage essential?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) CFAV, *St. Charles*, $43,442. (b) HMCS *Margaree*, $274,997. (c) CFAV *Riverton*, Nil.

2. Yes.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SEARCH AND RESCUE IN "PORT KIRWIN" INCIDENT

Question No. 4,997—Mr. McGrath:

With reference to the search and rescue operations off Newfoundland in the *Port Kirwin* incident in January, 1976 (a) at what time, in Atlantic Standard Time, was the distress call received by the Search and Rescue Centre in Halifax, (b) was assistance dispatched and, if so (i) in what form, (ii) to what extent, (c) did the search and rescue craft reach the search area and, if so, at what time, (d) was (i) radio, (ii) visual (iii) radar contact established and, if so, for what length of time, (e) how much (i) time, (ii) manpower was deployed in the search?

Hon. James Richarson (Minister of National Defence): (a) 1725 hours Atlantic Standard Time January 11, 1975. (b) Yes. (i) Marine craft Aircraft. (ii) St. John's pilot boat, DOE Golden Boy, DOE Cape Freels, CCGE Sir Humphrey Gilbert, CF Buffalo No. 455, CF Tracker, CF Argus No. 0734, CF Labrador No. 305, CCG Helicopter, RCMP Helicopter. (c) St. John's pilot boat reached the search area at 2120 hours January 11 and the RCMP and CCG Helicopters in a first light search reached the ara at 0830 hours, January 12 . The RCC was advised that the initial search was unsuccessful at 0920 hours January 12, and an additional two aircraft were dispatched and were airborne at 0935 and 0950 hours, respectively. The two aircraft, the Buffalo and the Labrador were in the search area at 1200 hours and at 1500 hours, respectively. In additional the following search resources were in the area at the following times: BOE Golden Boy 1155 hours January 12, DOE Cape Freels 1512 hours January 12, CF Tracker aircraft 1300 hours January 12. CCGC Sir Humphrey Gilbert 1830 hours January 12, CF Argus 0734 2130 hours January 12, (d) No contact was made with the search object. (e) (i) CF Aircraft, 187.3 hours; RCMP and CCG Helicopters, 10.0 hours; Total: 197.3 hours search flying time; Marine Craft, 161 hours float time. (ii) 203 personnel.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SEARCH AND RESCUE, SEALERS FROM MORETON'S HARBOUR

Question No. 4,998—Mr. McGrath:

With reference to the search and rescue operations off Newfoundland in the search for the two sealers from Moreton's Harbour, Notre Dame Bay in February, 1976 (a) at what time, in Atlantic Standard Time, was the distress call received by the Search and Rescue Centre in Halifax, (b) was assistance dispatched and, if so (i) in what form, (ii) to what extent, (c) did the search and rescue craft reach the search area and, if so, at what time, (d) was (i) radio, (ii) visual, (iii) radar contact established and, if so, for what length of time, (e) how much (i) time, (ii) manpower was deployed in the search?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) 0000 hours Atlantic Time February 3, 1976; (b) Yes. (i) Aircraft and Helicopter Marine Craft. (ii) CF Buffalo No. 459; CF Labrador No. 305; CF Tracker No. 2164; CR Argus No. 0737; CCGC Sir Humphrey Gilbert. (c) Yes.

Buffalo 1115 hours February 4, Labrador 1330 hours February 4, Sir Humphrey Gilbert 1903 hours February 4, Tracker 0930 hours February 5, Argus 1205 hours February 7. From the time that the distress call was received to the time that aircraft and marine craft could be dispatched to the search area weather conditions were so adverse as to preclude aircraft from taking off and vessels from entering the search area. As soon as the weather broke search aircraft and marine craft entered the search area. (d) No contact was made with the search object. (e) (i) Aircraft, 80.8 hours; Marine craft, 66 hours. (ii) 88 personnel.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SEARCH AND RESCUE, "SAN JUAN" INCIDENT

Question No. 4,999—**Mr. McGrath:**

With reference to the search and rescue operations off Newfoundland in the *San Juan* incident in February, 1976 (a) at what time, in Atlantic Standard Time, was the distress call received by the Search and Rescue Centre in Halifax, (b) was assistance dispatched and, if so (i) in what form, (ii) to what extent, (c) did the search and rescue craft reach the search area and, if so, at what time, (d) was (i) radio, (ii) visual, (iii) radar contact established and, if so, for what length of time, (e) how much (i) time, (ii) manpower was deployed in the search?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) 1920 hours Atlantic Standard Time, February 22, 1976. (b) Yes. (i) Marine Craft, Aircraft. (ii) CCGS Bartlett; CF Buffalo aircraft No. 457; CF Tracker aircraft No. 2182. (c) Yes. Bartlett at 0330 hours, February 23; Tracker at 1925 hours, February 23; Buffalo at 0905 hours, February 24. (d) (i) Radio contract was established between the San Juan and the Bartlett at 0230 hours, February 23, 1976 and maintained until 0430 hours, February 23, 1976. (ii) Visual contact was established by the Bartlett at 0330 hours, February 23, 1976 and maintained until 0430 hours, February 23, 1976. Visual contact was established by a Buffalo aircraft at 1112 hours, February 24, 1976 and maintained until the Bartlett arrived at 1300 hours, February 24, 1976. (iii) No radar contact was established. (e) (i) Aircraft, 25.6 hours search flying time; Marine craft, 45.4 hours float time. (ii) 38 personnel.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—SEARCH AND RESCUE, "CAPE FREELS" INCIDENT

Question No. 5,000—**Mr. McGrath:**

With reference to the search and rescue operations off Newfoundland in the *Cape Freels* incident in March, 1976 (a) at what time, in Atlantic Standard Time, was the distress call received by the Search and Rescue Centre in Halifax, (b) was assistance dispatched and, if so (i) in what form, (ii) to what extent, (c) did the search and rescue craft reach the search area and, if so, at what time, (d) was (i) radio, (ii) visual, (iii) radar contact established and, if so, for what length of time, (e) how much (i) time, (ii) manpower was deployed in the search?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): (a) 0206 hours (Atlantic Standard Time), March 12, 1976. (b) Yes. (i) Aircraft and Marine craft. (ii) CF Tracker aircraft No. 2188; CF Buffalo aircraft No. 455; CF Buffalo aircraft No. 457; CF Labrador helicopter No. 305; CF Labrador helicopter No. 306; CCGC Sir Humphrey Gilbert; CCGC John Cabot; CSS Hudson. (c) Yes. Tracker No. 2188, 0628 hours, March, 12; Buffalo No. 455, 1357 hours, March, 12; Buffalo No. 457, 1659 hours, March, 12; Hudson 1725 hours, March, 12; John Cabot 2141 hours, March 12. (d) (i), (ii) and (iii). Visual contact was established by aircraft with the Cape Freels at 0628 hours and surveillance was maintained till 0857 hours when due to deteriorating weather conditions the aircraft had to return to St. Johns. At 1357 hours visual contact was established with the life rafts and surveillance was maintained by a Buffalo aircraft until the Hudson arrived at 1725 hours to pick up the survivors. (e) (i) Aircraft, 38.2 flying hours. Marine craft, 72.4 hours float time. (ii) 205 personnel.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—MANPOWER STRENGTH, 1970-76

Question No. 5,002—**Mr. Matte:**

1. From 1970 to date, what was the military complement for the (a) Navy, (b) Army, (c) Air Force?

2. How many servicemen were posted in the Province of Quebec in (a) 1970, (b) 1971, (c) 1972, (d) 1973, (e) 1974, (f) 1975, (g) 1976 to date?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1 and 2. The Canadian Forces Reorganization Act of 1968 unified the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canada Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force into the Canadian Armed Forces. The table below gives the total strength of the Canadian Forces and the number of Canadian Forces personnel located in Quebec. The system of maintaining data was changed in 1970 and reliable data is not available for that year.

Date	Canadian Forces Strength	Canadian Forces Strength in Quebec
31 Dec. 71	83,257	10,967
31 Dec. 72	81,433	10,506
31 Dec. 73	80,451	10,639
31 Dec. 74	78,170	10,510
31 Dec. 75	77,846	10,658
25 Mar. 76	78,164	10,556

OLD AGE SECURITY—PENSIONS AND GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT RECIPIENTS

Question No. 5,013—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. How many persons in Canada, and in each province, are in receipt of the Old Age Security pension?

2. Of the recipients of the Old Age Security pension, how many persons in Canada, and in each province, are in receipt of the Guaranteed Income Supplement?

3. Of those receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement, how many persons in Canada, and in each province, are receiving the full amount?

4. What is the average amount, in Canada, and in each province, being received as a Guaranteed Income Supplement by recipients of the Old Age Security pension?

5. Do the answers to the above questions take into consideration persons living outside of Canada who are in receipt of the Old Age Security pension and, if so, how many of such persons are there, and if they are considered as belonging to the various provinces, what is the number for each province?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1, 2 and 3.

Order Paper Questions

Province or Territory	Number of people receiving OAS	Number of pensioners receiving GIS	Number of pensioner receiving max. GIS
Newfoundland	36,393	29,625	19,811
Prince Edward Island	13,204	9,785	4,736
Nova Scotia	79,318	52,727	25,391
New Brunswick	60,197	39,762	19,650
Quebec	477,308	297,478	147,059
Ontario	716,071	339,247	113,645
Manitoba	104,640	61,879	23,100
Saskatchewan	101,497	57,194	22,343
Alberta	132,686	76,827	30,477
British Columbia	231,041	123,106	46,319
Northwest Territories	1,017	793	675
Yukon	558	316	215
Total national	1,953,930	1,088,739	453,421

4. Newfoundland, $79.27; Prince Edward Island, $75.62; Nova Scotia, $74.69; New Brunswick, $74.97; Quebec, $75.30; Ontario, $70.05; Manitoba, $71.35; Saskatchewan, $71.70; Alberta, $72.88; British Columbia, $70.31; Northwest Territories, $92.08; Yukon, $81.72; National Average, $72.60.

5. Yes. Newfoundland, 121; Prince Edward Island, 73; Nova Scotia, 418; New Brunswick, 297; Quebec, 3,333; Ontario, 5,748; Manitoba, 613; Saskatchewan, 363; Alberta, 687; British Columbia, 2,442; Northwest Territories, 4; Yukon, 4; Total, 14,103.

NOTE: All of the above information is based upon statistics for the month of December, 1975.

USE OF CANADIAN WINES AND CHEESES ON DOMESTIC AIR CARRIERS

Question No. 5,039—**Mr. Flynn:**

1. Has the Minister of Transport urged Canadian air carriers to use domestic wines on all flights?

2. Will the Minister consider urging all Canadian air carriers to use Canadian cheeses in place of foreign cheeses on all flights and, if not, for what reason?

3. Will the Minister consider urging all restaurants and duty-free shops who lease space in Canadian airports to stock Canadian wines and cheeses and, if not, for what reason?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Transport Canada presently has no policy whereby I can urge or direct Canadian air carriers as to what type or origin of products the carrier stocks or offers for sale to its passengers. The carriers determine their requirements by customer preference, availability of product and the eventual selling price to passengers.

2. All Canadian air carriers stock Canadian cheeses on both domestic and international flights.

3. At the present time all restaurants who lease space in Canadian airports stock Canadian wines and cheeses. In response to the question of stocking Canadian wines and cheeses at duty free shops, I will direct my officials to explore this potential market area.

[Mr. Lalonde.]

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—ICEBREAKING AND DREDGING SERVICES

Question No. 5,105—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Is the government considering assessments of any sort against ports in the St. Lawrence River who benefit from the provision of icebreaking and dredging services at those ports and (a) if not, for what reason, (b) if so, on what date can government action be reasonably expected?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Government is looking at the subject on a global basis and considering many ways to improve the revenue picture for the Canadian Coast Guard. Amongst the items under consideration are charges to beneficiaries of services provided through icebreaking and dredging services particularly when the advantages can be identified with individual industries. The benefits arising from these services in the St. Lawrence River do not always accrue to any one particular port or industry but may be beneficial to the entire St. Lawrence basin from the point of view of shipping, flood control and economic development.

TRANSPORT—LOANS TO MARITIME EMPLOYERS ASSOCIATION

Question No. 5,106—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What is the current extent of loans and guarantees of loans by the National Harbours Board and the Department of Transport to the Maritime Employers Association?

2. On what date is it anticipated that such loans will be fully paid?

3. Is any consideration being given by the government to forgiving such loans in whole or in part?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Transport Canada advises as follows: 1. At the beginning of the 1976 shipping season, the loans outstanding to the MEA from the Department of Transport were $6.6 million. In addition, there exists a guarantee of $1.2 million which was extended by the Government to the banks in 1974. On all occasions the financial assistance was provided to cover expenses related to the early retirement of redundant port workers.

2. The MEA is to repay these loans—principal and interest—over a 10 year period with the final payment December 31, 1985.

3. No consideration has been given by the Government to forgiving its loans to the MEA and in fact an increase in the cargo assessment has been made effective March 22, 1976 to ensure a balanced repayment of Government and bank loans.

The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. Nil.

2 and 3. Not applicable.

TRANSPORT—BERTHS 73 AND 74 AT PORT OF MONTREAL

Question No. 5,108—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Are berths 73 and 74 at the Port of Montreal leased by Logistic Corporation and operated for Care Line and, if so, under what terms of payback was the roll-on/roll-off ramp constructed?

2. Does the lease compare with the terms under which the ramp at Halterm Limited's facility at Halifax was leased and, if so, in what way?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. Berths 73 and 74 at the Port of Montreal are occupied by Logistec Corporation under a permit of occupancy. The roll-on/roll-off ramp is part of the total complex the cost recovery of which is assured through land rental and a minimum wharfage warranty.

2. The ramp at Halifax, as in Montreal, is part of the total complex—Pier "C"—which is under lease to Halterm Limited. The terms of the lease include a land rental but no minimum wharfage warranty.

PROPOSED NEW CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

Question No. 5,179—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Has the government prepared a draft of a proposed new Canadian Constitution and, if so, what are the names and job designations of all those involved directly or indirectly in the preparation of such a document?

2. Will the document be made public and, if so, on what date?

3. Was the document circulated to Members of the Cabinet and, if so (a) on what date, (b) what persons in the Privy Council Office and the Prime Minister's Office were involved in the circulation?

4. What other persons have been permitted to see the document?

5. Has the document been circulated to the Provincial Premiers and, if not (a) for what reason, (b) is it the government's intention to do so or does this represent a government policy of unilateral action on the matter?

6. Has the Prime Minister received expressions of deep concern from certain Anglophone Cabinet Ministers in regard to certain portions of the document?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): 1. During the constitutional discussions from 1968 to 1971, many reports were prepared on different aspects of the constitution and on the way it might be modified or modernized. The schedule to the Victoria Charter contains a large number of modernizations, including the designation of a series of constitutional instruments as "Constitution Acts". In total these would under the Victoria plan, have constituted the "Constitution of Canada". The discussions which began in April 1975 have been much more limited and have not involved consideration of any new constitution. None has been prepared for or considered during these discussions.

2 to 6. See reply to question No. 1.

MANPOWER—CARIBBEAN SEASONAL WORKERS PROGRAM

Question No. 5,183—**Mr. Matte:**

1. For each year since 1966, has the Department of Manpower and Immigration made any grants to the West-Indian Seasonal Workers Programme and, if so, in what amounts?

2. For each year since 1966, how many West-Indian workers have had temporary agricultural employment in Canada?

3. (a) From what countries were they from, (b) since 1966, what was their salary in (i) Quebec, (ii) Ontario, (c) how many worked in (i) Quebec, (ii) Ontario?

4. Is the Programme restricted to the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes. 1966, $6,804; 1967, $10,120; 1968, $14,110; 1969, $14,000; 1970, $14,000; 1971, $14,000; 1972, $14,000; 1973, $14,000; 1974, $14,000; 1975, $14,000.

2. 1966, 264; 1967, 1,077; 1968, 1,258; 1969, 1,449; 1970, 1,279; 1971, 1,271; 1972, 1,529; 1973, 3,048; 1974, 5,342; 1975, 5,584.

3. (a) Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Barbados. (b) Existing regulations require that Caribbean seasonal agricultural workers be paid at a rate equal to the minimum wage for industrial workers provided by law in the province in which the worker is employed, or at a rate determined from time to time by the Department of Manpower and Immigration to be the prevailing wage rate for the type of agricultural work being carried out by the worker in the locality in which the work will be done, whichever is the greater. The actual wages paid have usually ranged between the minimum hourly wage rate to levels much greater than the minimum. The comparison of the minimum hourly wage rates for each year the program has been in existence is as follows:

	(i) Quebec	(ii) Ontario
1966	$ *	$ 1.25
1967	*	1.30
1968	*	1.45
1969	*	1.56
1970	*	1.65
1971	*	1.65
1972	*	1.75
1973	1.80	1.80
1974	2.00	2.00
1975	2.40	2.40
1976	2.80	2.65

*No Caribbean workers employed in Quebec

(c)	(i) Quebec	(ii) Ontario
1966	*	264
1967	*	1,077
1968	*	1,258
1969	*	1,449
1970	*	1,279
1971	*	1,271
1972	*	1,529
1973	41	3,007
1974	55	5,287
1975	71	5,513

*No Caribbean workers employed in Quebec

4. No. Caribbean workers have not been requested by employers in provinces other than Quebec or Ontario.

MANPOWER—CARIBBEAN SEASONAL WORKERS PROGRAM

Question No. 5,208—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the government consider abandoning the Caribbean Seasonal Workers Programme on the grounds that unemployment will likely reach 7 per cent during the summer months of 1976?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The Caribbean Seasonal Workers Program is designed to supplement, rather than replace, the supply of seasonal agricultural workers in Canada. The number of Caribbean workers admitted into Canada for agricultural employment during 1976 will be limited to the extent that

qualified Canadian workers are not available for agricultural employment.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN'S VISIT TO CANADA THIS SUMMER

Question No. 5,210—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Is the Prime Minister and/or his office or anyone else in the government aware of Her Majesty the Queen's wish to hold a dinner party on the Royal Yacht *Britannia* during the Olympic Sailing Games at Kingston, Ontario and of Her Majesty's desire to invite the Lieutenant Governors and provincial premiers together with their spouses and, if so (a) since what date, (b) did the Prime Minister and/or his office or anyone else in the government agree to such an invitation?

2. Has there been a delay in replying to Her Majesty's wish to extend such an invitation and, if so, for what reason?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The Government is considering the final arrangements for Her Majesty's visit to Canada this summer. The Government is examining the possibility of proposing to Her Majesty a dinner to be held on board the Royal Yacht *Britannia* while at Kingston. There have been no delays to this point, and if a proposal is made to and accepted by Her Majesty, invitations will be issued shortly

TRANSPORT—GULF FERRY SERVICE TO NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 5,248—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What are the names of the ships operating the Gulf ferry service to the Province of Newfoundland?

2. What is the classification of the ships as to ownership, charter, crew and cost per day?

3. What is the disposition of the ships owned and operated by CNR?

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The following vessels are designated as operating in the Gulf Ferry Service to the Province of Newfoundland: (a) M.V. *Sir Robert Bond* railcar ferry. (b) M.V. *Frederick Carter* railcar ferry. (c) M.V. *William Carson.* (d) M.V. *Leif Eiriksson.* (e) M.V. *Marine Nautica.* (f) M.V. *Marine Atlantica.* (g) M.V. *Ambrose Shea.* (h) M.V. *Marine Cruiser.*

2. The following schematic of those vessels operating in the Gulf Ferry Service supplies information re. ownership, charter, crew nationality and charter hire cost per day.

Vessel	Owned by	Chartered Vessel	Crew Nationality	Charter Hire/Day
(a) Robert Bond	D.O.T.	No	Canadian	Nil
(b) Frederick Carter	D.O.T.	No	Canadian	Nil
(c) William Carson	D.O.T.	No	Canadian	Nil
(d) Leif Eiriksson	D.O.T.	No	Canadian	Nil
(e) Marine Nautica	Stena Line A/B[1]	Yes	Canadian[3]	$7,550 Canadian
(f) Marine Atlantica	Stena Line A/B[1]	Yes	Canadian[3]	$7,550 Canadian
(g) Ambrose Shea	D.O.T.	No	Canadian	Nil
(h) Marine Cruiser	Bahamarine[2]	Yes	Canadian	$1,397 Canadian.

[1] Firm Location—Gothenburg, Sweden

[2] Firm Location—Bermuda

[3] There is a Swedish Master and a Swedish Chief Engineer aboard these vessels in order to comply with Swedish law. These two (2) crew members are paid by Stena Line A/B. There is also a Canadian Master and Chief Engineer aboard these vessels who have the primary operating responsibility.

3. There are no ships owned by C.N.R. However, the current status of each of the vessels previously designated as operating in the Gulf Ferry Service is as follows:

Vessel	Current Status
(a) Robert Bond	In service between Port-aux-Basques and North Sydney
(b) Frederick Carter	In service between Port-Aux-Basques and North Sydney
(c) William Carson	Tied up at Point Edward
(d) Leif Eriksson	Tied up at Point Edward
(e) Marine Nautica	Out of service at North Sydney following accident
(f) Marine Atlantica	In service between Port-Aux-Basques and North Sydney
(g) Ambrose Shea	Tied up at Point Edward
(h) Marine Cruiser	In service between Port-aux-Basques and North Sydney

MANPOWER—AVAILABILITY OF SEASONAL JOBS IN AGRICULTURE, 1976

Question No. 5,251—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. Is the Department of Manpower and Immigration taking any action to advertise nationally the availability of seasonal jobs to assist farmers and food processors in the growing, harvesting and processing of the 1976 fruit, tobacco and vegetable crops and, if so, what is such action?

2. Has any consideration been given to tying-in the farm labour shortage each year with a training programme for students who may want to enter farming and food processing as an occupation?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. A national advertising campaign will not be undertaken by the Department to make known the availability of seasonal jobs in agriculture in 1976. However, a national advertising campaign is already underway advising students to register with their local Canada Manpower Centre for Students. Students who register there or with other Canada Manpower offices are informed of any available seasonal agricultural employment. In addition, the Department will offer service to both farmers and workers through the network of Canada Farm Labour Pools (CFLP) during the coming months. During the peak manpower demand periods there will be no less than 78

points of service, some 62 of which are operated year round. Publicity and advertising is again being organized at all levels to ensure that the employment needs of both the farmers and the agricultural workers will be met. (a) Locally, CFLPs advertise the need for workers in local newspapers. They also arrange with Canada Manpower Centres on a daily basis to have workers brought in from outside the local area, as they are required. (b) Regionally, particularly in Ontario and Quebec, radio stations will be used for frequent spot announcements to outline current situations in the fruit, vegetable and tobacco harvests. (c) Nationally, brochures and fact sheets are used to inform potential employers and workers of the services available at the Canada Farm Labour Pools and Canada Manpower Centres (CMCs). During peak demand periods, the CMCs of agricultural manpower supply and demand areas are in daily contact with each other to make sure that workers are at the disposal of employers when required.

2. The Department already sponsors a program designed to attract young Canadians, primarily students, to agricultural work during the summer vacation period and to possible future careers in agriculture. Known as Agriculture for Young Canadians, the program features federal participation in the establishment of new or existing agricultural manpower programs for youth, operated by the provinces and cost-shared under the provisions of the existing Federal-Provincial Agricultural Manpower Agreements. The program was initiated in 1974 and, to date, the Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia have participated. Inexperienced students, as well as other workers, who obtain seasonal agricultural employment through any of the Department's agencies are eligible to receive up to four days training with full wages. This assistance is provided at no cost to the agricultural employers under the Canada Farm Labour Pool's worker orientation program. Graduate students who wish to enter farming or food processing as an occupation have always been eligible to receive training directly from employers participating in the Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AND SUPPLEMENTARY RETIREMENT BENEFITS ACT

MEASURE RESPECTING CERTAIN PAYMENTS THEREUNDER

Hon. Jean Chrétien (President of the Treasury Board) moved that Bill C-81, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act and the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act with respect to the escalation of certain payments thereunder, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As is required by the Standing Orders of the House, this motion refers to second reading and reference to a standing committee, and in this case it is the Standing Committee on

Miscellaneous Estimates. Because of the nature of the bill, it being a bill which concerns the internal affairs, in a sense, of the members of the House of Commons, it seemed to us to be more appropriate that the bill be considered in committee of the whole rather than referred to a standing committee where there would be few representatives of all of us from the various parties. I therefore seek unanimous consent to have this bill, after second reading, referred to committee of the whole.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the principle is certainly agreeable to us. I would just ask the minister, as the government House leader, whether it is still his intention to introduce the amendment which he spoke abut when I asked the question on business of the house; and when it is introduced in committee of the whole, I understand it will be done either by himself or by the spokesman for the bill. If that is his undertaking, then we are prepared to consent. I would be quite prepared to accept a nod of his head, if that is acceptable.

Mr. Sharp: That is the government's intention.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We welcome the assurance about the amendment. We would be prepared to give consent to have the bill go to committee of the whole.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I understood correctly—

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We were told that there would be a speech, on second reading, by the minister introducing the bill. I think we should hear that speech first.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, as I have said at the meeting held at the House leaders level, I want this bill to follow the same process as for all the other bills and be sent to the standing House committee so that we, the representatives of rural ridings, can outline the reasons why we are opposed to the passage of this bill under the present circumstances. That is why we are refusing our consent.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to allow the minister to speak now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the bill speaks for itself and I would have thought that it could have been referred directly to the committee, but if it is understood that I am to speak, I do not believe it will be the most joyous speech I have had to deliver in this House.

On December 18, 1975, I announced expenditure reductions of the order of $1.5 billion during the 1976-77 fiscal year. Of course, these reductions were part of the government program to curb inflation. Among them were measured to end some programs, to cancel indexing of family allowances, to reduce costs approved for some Crown corporations and to freeze certain payments to members of

the House of Commons and the Senate, officials and Crown corporations agents whose salaries are in the upper brackets.

At that time I mentioned that certain pieces of legislations had to be amended to make those cutbacks; I was the one who the day after tabled this bill whose purpose is to delay until the beginning of 1977 the escalation of the sessional allowances of members of the Senate and the House of Commons, which would have automatically taken place at the end of the year 1975; to delay until 1977 the escalation of the extra salaries and allowances payable to ministers, parliamentary secretaries and other members of the Senate and House of Commons receiving remuneration over and above their sessional allowance; for the year 1976, limit to $200 the portion of the monthly increase in the supplementary retirement benefit that is attributable to the 11.3 per cent rise in the Benefit Index during the 12 months ending September 30, 1975.

On December 18, 1975, I announced that we could save $600,000 in this way; according to our latest estimates, we will be able to save nearly $750,000. As the House leader said on Thursday, April 29 last, I will be moving in due time an amendment to this bill to freeze also expense allowances as well as current salaries for 1976. It is anticipated that Bill C-87, the Government Expenditures Restraint Act, will be given second reading soon.

As to the level of pay of the senior staff in the public service and crown corporations, I repeat that it will be frozen, that is maintained at the current level by an administrative measure, until April 1, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, if members of the Senate and the House of Commons examined this Bill C-81 diligently the Canadian people would know that we are capable of making very great sacrifices.

I hope that people, particularly those who are sometimes very cynical about members of this House, will understand that they are making an enormous personal sacrifice today. I think the salaries that members currently receive are really too low for good members, and I will defend that before any audience. There are thousands of people in the public service and crown corporations who are paid much more than private members. But, once again, for the good of the community, members decided to make enormous sacrifices by waving any increase in their salaries or with respect to their expenses for the current year. What I regret, Mr. Speaker—

● (1510)

[*English*]

This measure was announced last December, and there were very few people in the land who gave any credit to members of parliament for that. We imposed that kind of sacrifice upon ourselves. I am not talking about myself. I am a minister and I can survive with my salary, but I know many members of parliament who do not make much money, who have to go into their riding, who are not assisted by all sorts of organizations, yet they are ready to impose that sacrifice upon themselves. When we got a little increase a few months ago, there were all sorts of articles all over Canada blaming members of parliament. I consider $24,000 a very small salary for a person who represents thousands of people in the House of Commons every week from Monday to Friday night, who flies or drives back to his riding every weekend, who works 12 hours a day, and so on.

Mr. McGrath: We believe you, but they won't.

Mr. Chrétien: I am speaking for those upstairs.

Mr. McGrath: They won't believe it.

Mr. Chrétien: I know they will not believe it, but I can speak my mind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: I know of some in this House who have no obligations and no family. They do not care. But the backbencher who has a family is imposing upon himself and his family a very harsh thing. However, even if it is tough for him and for me as a minister, I want to tell the nation that members of parliament are not selfish and are putting the interests of the nation first.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the reluctance of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) in rising today to open the debate on this bill. The unfortunate thing for parliament, about which he spoke in such sincere terms, is the long-term effect of his statement of December 18, not for what it said but for what it failed to say. I characterize the minister's act on the night of December 18 as either an act of duplicity, on the one hand, or an act of stupidity on the other. But in both cases—not one of the other—parliament was dealt a great blow. So if the President of the Treasury Board is now speaking about parliament and what it means, then I am prepared to agree with him in those terms. I am no different from any other member of parliament—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You sure are.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —in terms of how I view this place. I do not believe that the attraction to this place ought to be the salary. Of course it ought not to be. On the other hand, I have said in other debates, and I say again, that I do not believe that salary ought to be the determining factor as to whether a person who is here can continue to serve as an MP. That is the other side of the coin. The minister and I share the same view. But if that is the view which is held generally on all sides of the House of Commons, I think it is important that in terms of salary there should be some reasonable consultation with respect thereto among all parties in the House. In the case of this bill there was not that consultation. That is why I say it was either an act of duplicity, on the one hand, or an act of stupidity on the other. That is the first point.

The second aspect of this matter is how it was handled on the night of December 18. Many people have not gone back to look at *Hansard* for that night, but I have. Although most members of parliament are prepared to deal with the matter of restraint, this is what the minister said as reported at page 10156 of *Hansard*:

We are introducing a bill to freeze the pay of members of the House of Commons and the Senate for one year—including the salaries of ministers.

The word he used was "pay" and there was not one member who left the House that night absolutely certain in his own mind that the word "pay" applied only to salaries.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I know that the hon. member wants to be fair. After I made my statement on December 18, the new rule of this House permitted members of this House to ask questions. Perhaps the hon. member left, but some members of his party should have listened.

● (1520)

The first question asked of me by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) was, "Does that include expenses?" I replied, "It is the salary only." There was no duplication and no duplicity, Mr. Speaker. I was very clear in the reference I made in the House. I referred to the pay. If I had wanted to refer to expenses, I would have said so but I said the "pay". If the hon. member did not understand, it was clear to me, and also the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre recognized that and is why he asked for precision. He got it that night in the first question that was asked of me.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I am talking about the statement. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was making a statement to the country via television with respect to this answer, he said that the government was introducing a bill to freeze the pay of members of the House of Commons and the Senate for one year, including the salaries of ministers.

I do not know the feeling about a later clarification in this House in answer to a question, but even the clarification was not very direct if one looks at page 10165 of *Hansard*. What I am saying is that the impression among members of parliament who were here that night, and certainly the impression given to the country—which is perhaps more important in terms of the honour for which parliament is to stand in the minds of the people—was that all of the pay and allowances being set forth were being frozen. I do not care what was in the minister's mind—

Mr. Chrétien: If you do not know how to read, I cannot teach you.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Perhaps I cannot teach the minister either, but that was the impression, because next day the headlines in the newspapers indicated just what damage had been done to parliament. That is the point I am concerned about.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It is credibility.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): As the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) says, it is credibility.

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

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If you want to be all day on this—

Mr. Dionne: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that every member in this House had a specific impression when he left the House. I would ask how he knows what impression any member had? He certainly did not discuss the matter with me. As far as I know, the impression was clear.

An hon. Member: Your mind is an open book.

Mr. Dionne: Don't speak for me.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): That is hardly a point of order, in any event, Mr. Speaker. The other thing that makes the whole issue a bad thing for parliament generally is the relationship that existed with respect to this matter among members of parliament. There has been a tradition in this House of consultation among members. That was the tradition when we dealt with Bill C-44 which was handled in a way that brought disrepute to parliament. There was consultation then, and there has been consultation on these matters from time immemorial. As I understand it, in this case the only consultation that took place was with the Liberal caucus prior to that time.

Mr. Sharp: There was not, no.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): If I need any indication of the argument, I can look at the *Globe and Mail* for December 20, 1975, where the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader (Mr. Blais) is quoted as saying that the increase in the tax-free allowance is needed to meet the higher cost of serving one's riding. How did he come to that conclusion? Obviously, there had been some consultation.

Mr. Chrétien: None.

Mr. Sharp: There was none.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): All right. I would not want to ask the minister, on the floor of the House of Commons, whether there had been any consultation in caucus since then. However, I think this House is entitled to know why, when the matter was raised by the then leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), by way of a motion under Standing Order 43 on December 20, it has taken all this time to bring the bill forward. What is the reason for the delay?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): What consultation had to take place prior to that time? That is the position we are in. I am going to say to the minister, with all the respect I have for him personally, that in terms of the way this was handled, which has been described as shabby—and I repeat the word here, that is was handled shabbily by this government—we want to know why has it taken them all this time? Our party took the position, and some quite reluctantly, with respect to this particular place of legislation, that in terms of parliament and a commitment to restraint which the government had not answered in any way, we had no alternative but to say as our then leader did at the first opportunity on January 29 in a press release:

Clearly there was an element of deception involved in the discrepancy between the impression which the government generated and the

bill which it presented. There was also a gross and needless breach of courtesy in the government's departure from the traditional practice of consultation with the opposition on matters affecting members' remuneration.

The government can accept this, or not, as they choose. That was the impression left among members of the House of Commons on the night of December 18. It was also the impression left with members of the press gallery on the night of the briefing prior to that, because I spoke to many of them afterwards and they felt that the allowances were subject to the same rules of restraint or freezing as were the salaries. We have had a difficult enough time in this House—

An hon. Member: Thanks to you.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —with respect to salaries. I think it did not lie in the mouth of the government to leave the impression it did on the night of December 18, and then refuse to do anything about it until today, or until last Thursday when it announced it intended to move an amendment in committee to bring the bill into line with the perspective it had tried to create.

Mr. Sharp: That is not the purpose.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I say that with some regret, because I am as proud to serve in parliament as anyone. The government should not play fast and loose with the traditions of this institution, however—and when it does, there should not be too much reaction from members of the government, particularly the minister, if I point out, with all the respect I can muster in the circumstances—

Some hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): —that their handling of this pay issue has been had. Here we are, with Bill C-44 in place which entitles us to a salary increase as of January 1. That is the law. That increase happens to be frozen, se we are not receiving it. In the same bill we are entitled to an increase in allowances.

Mr. Sharp: Not "pay", you will notice.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): We are in a position now where something will have to be paid back. The situation has just been exacerbated by delay on the part of the government. All I am saying to the government is that somebody on that side should tell us why. I think they should disclose to the House the reason for this. The position of the official opposition was quite clear on December 20, 1975—that extraordinary Saturday. I am sure the government had no doubt about the position of the New Democratic Party, and they had no doubt about our position and what we intended to do. The then leader of the opposition said that he intended to introduce an amendment to have the freeze apply to members' expense allowances as well as their indemnities. It would have been as well to take the bull by the horns and do the right thing, instead of delaying. The delay has not helped parliament.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

● (1530)

Let me repeat what I said earlier about this place. I firmly believe that members of parliament make sacrifices. There are sacrifices involving travel which hurt the body and the spirit. There are absences from families. Many members must support two homes and meet double expenses. Many things disrupt and make difficult the life of the member of parliament. It is no answer to say, "But you volunteered for the job. You can always leave if you want to." That is putting service in parliament on the wrong basis.

As I said at the beginning, the decision to serve in parliament should not be governed by monetary considerations. I know some will say that it is easy for me to talk this way as my situation is somewhat different from that of a great many members. There are differences in circumstances. But if we all believe that service is the vital thing, and every one of us in this House ought not to let the President of the Treasury Board off easily. I am thinking of what happened on December 18 and December 20 last and the long delay in implementing this matter.

That is why we welcome this move for which we have asked time and again both inside and outside this House. We welcome the amendment to the bill which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) and the President of the Treasury Board said would be brought before the House. I do not welcome it because members of parliament will be entitled to less money than if the amendment were not brought forward; that is not my position. I think that members of parliament agreeing to accept restraint symbolize something important. It shows that we are willing to restrain increases in our own salaries and expenses and that members of parliament enjoy no hidden benefits.

Mr. Stanfield: There is nothing under the table.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Yes, there is nothing under the table; everything is open and above board. All this should have been done on December 18, in my respectful opinion. I know that Bill C-44 provided for statutory increases to members well within the guidelines of the anti-inflation program. I suppose it is logical to talk about increases falling within the guidelines. I suppose we could do what is logical and permitted. But I ask hon. members to consider that this would affect how people outside parliament perceive this place.

The government embarked on the restraint program. I foresee difficulties down the road concerning pay and allowances. Nonetheless, we have embarked upon that road. That is why I regret that the government did not deal honestly, squarely and openly with this matter. I regret the impression parliament left with the people. For that reason, I welcome the amendment. We have waited for it a long time. It is a limited welcome, but a welcome nonetheless. The bill allows the government to do directly what it was afraid to do indirectly on the night of December 18, 1975.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the important fact before the House is that the government has agreed to present an amendment to Bill C-81 so that the freeze for 1976 on the income of members of parliament and senators will apply to all the moneys we receive. Bill C-81, without an amendment, went part way and, of course, we would have voted for it. But we shall vote for it much more enthusiastically now that we have the assurance that the freeze will be put on the tax-free allowance we receive as well as on our indemnity or salary.

I agree with part of what the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) said, but with part of his speech I am in complete disagreement. I agree that the way this matter was presented on the night of December 18, 1975, gave the press, and through the press the public, the impression that our total income was being frozen. It was not so. Sir, I do not agree that we who were in the House that night went away under any doubt as to what was happening. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien), during the course of his restraint speech said, according to *Hansard* at page 10156:

> We are introducing a bill to freeze the pay of members of the House of Commons and the Senate for one year—including the salaries of ministers. That is, the increase in pay they would have received in January under existing legislation they will not receive when the bill is enacted into law.

I recognized that the minister said "pay"; he did not say "income". But I could smell what was taking place. As soon as he sat down, I was recognized and I put the following question to the President of the Treasury Board, as reported at page 10165 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board. In the bill to which he referred in his statement which is to freeze the pay of members of parliament for a year, may I ask whether that applies only to the indemnity or does it also apply to the tax-free allowance?

The minister replied in French. The English version of his words reads as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, that applies to the members' salaries.

Sir, I remember our discussion in the lobby that night. We knew, in all parties, what had happened. We knew that the impression was being given in a public way that the pay of members of parliament was being frozen. But we knew from the minister's statement that our indemnities would be frozen, but that there would be given a $700 increase in our tax-free allowance. The next day I protested strongly. That protest reached the ears of the media. By Saturday morning it was headline news in the paper on which hon. members base most of their questions.

An hon. Member: The *Daily Worker*.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, it was not the *Daily Worker*; it was the *Globe and Mail*, without which the question period sometimes could be a flop. As the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton said, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), who was then the leader of the opposition, on the morning of Saturday, December 20, moved a motion under Standing Order 43 regretting the lack of consultation on this matter. He regretted the way in which the government was embarrassing all members of parliament outside the Liberal caucus by pretending that members' remuneration was to be frozen for 1976. Later, the hon. member for Halifax made it clear that he wanted an amendment to Bill C-81. But at that moment he was only expressing regret. A few minutes later, in the same period when motions under Standing Order 43 are considered, as recorded on page 10218 of *Hansard* I moved, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), the following motion:

> That this House urges the government to substitute for Bill C-81 a bill to freeze the total income of members of parliament including both indemnities and the tax-free allowance.

Of course somebody said "No." There was not unanimous consent and the motion did not carry. That was the last sitting day before Christmas. When we came back on Monday, January 26, lest the issue had been forgotten I moved the following motion, this time seconded by the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman):

● (1540)

> That this House calls on the government to indicate forthwith its readiness to move or accept an amendment to Bill C-81 to prevent any increase at this time in the tax-free allowances as well as the salaries of members of parliament, senators and cabinet ministers. . . .
>
> SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.
>
> SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

We did not get anywhere by trying to deal with this matter under Standing Order 43. However, we did make it clear on December 18, 19 and 20 and on January 26 that in our view, if we were going to take this big step of freezing the incomes of members of parliament, we should freeze our total income.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton says there has been a lot of delay. I join with him in regretting that long delay. I wonder why it has taken so long to resolve the issue. On two or three occasions when I asked questions about it, the reply from the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) was to the effect that the government was not prepared to go along with our kind of amendment. At last the members of the government have come to the point where they are willing to do it. We are glad that is the case. Today we shall support the amendment that is to be proposed when this bill gets into committee, and we shall support the bill as amended.

The public was annoyed last year about the increases that were voted. It was annoyed again when the impression was given that we were freezing our total pay, when we were not doing so. I hope the same public will now give the House credit for doing what it is going to do today, or whenever this bill goes through, namely, removing the hypocrisy or stupidity of the December 18 position to the effect that the freeze would be on salaries only. Because we have reached that position I do not think it is necessary to keep this debate going much longer. However, I was startled at the President of the Treasury Board making such utterances as telling us that members of parliament are making a great sacrifice. Those were his words. He did not say that it was a generous offer or just a sacrifice, but a great sacrifice.

We are denying ourselves, in the year 1976, $700 that we are in the process of getting, some of which we will have to pay back. Surely, for persons who are receiving indemnities of $24,000 a year and then a tax-free expense allowance or $10,600 a year, to deny themselves $700, no matter what

terms you put it on, is not a great sacrifice. When my friend, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), sat near me I could hear his interjections. I have an idea that on this subject he and I are not in agreement as we sometimes are on other subjects.

The other interesting statement of which the President of the Treasury Board delivered himself today was that the present salary scales are too low to attract good members to this House of Commons. That is a terrible condemnation of all members who are here.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the hon. member to be misled. I did not speak about attraction. I said that for a good MP with a family, the present salary is not enough. It is not a question of attraction, because they are here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: That is the point I wanted to make. I did not talk about attraction. I said that to pay a good MP $24,000 is not enough. For those who are no good, it is away too much.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: However, there is nothing we can do about it. I just hope that at the time of the next election the electors will kick out those who are no good. In any event, I was talking about a good MP with young children. I was not referring to those who are rich, have other incomes, or no family. I am talking about the normal, average, young MP. It is not enough. I will repeat that anywhere in the land. However, I agree with the hon. member that for a bad MP that is too much.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the statement of the President of Treasury Board that for MPs who are no good, the amount of money is too much. I wonder if we can post a list somewhere showing who will come under that category!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I do not like quarrelling with a good friend such as the President of the Treasury Board over what he said. He did say that the amount of pay is too low for those who have work to do, other responsibilities, and so on. He also said—and I wrote it down the minute he said it—that the present pay scale is too low to attract good members. If that is the case, how did the members of this House get here, because when we ran in the last election the pay was only $18,000, plus $8,000 tax-free allowance?

Mrs. Sauvé: Because we have a fabulous sense of sacrifice; that is why we are here.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé) says it is because of a great sense of sacrifice. You would think that the whole crowd around here were living in sackcloth and ashes, or in third-floor, tenements, making a great sacrifice. That is not true.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): With $24,000 indemnity and $10,600 tax free allowance, we are not making any sacrifice in agreeing not to take another $700. In addition, we get free trips by air, telephone service, and all the rest. Also, there are the cars we are able to buy and the trips we are able to make. There are no great sacrifices around this place. On top of that, we have something that money cannot buy. We have the privilege of being here and playing our part in directing the affairs of this nation. I submit that is worth a great deal. In years gone by, greater persons than anybody now in this House came here for a lot less pay. Some of them really did make sacrifices.

My friend, the Minister of Communications was smiling when she talked about sacrifices. However, the President of the Treasury Board uttered those words as though he was quite serious.

Mrs. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I was smiling, it was not because I did not believe what I was saying. I repeat that many members here live in digs you would not want to live. If you had to provide two homes, you have no other choice. I know that some of my colleagues have big families and cannot afford to live in what the hon. member refers to as luxurious apartments. They do not. They need to have a sense of sacrifice in order to stay here for the present salary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Before this debate is over, I wonder if the government will be bringing in a bill to double the salary.

An hon. Member: Would you accept it?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No, I certainly would not. I voted against the last increase, as everyone knows.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If the questions came one at a time, I should be glad to answer them. However, when there are so many interruptions they cancel out each other. The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton was dead right when he said how this place is perceived—as terribly important in this country. One of the ways Canadians have of perceiving this place is how much concern we show for ourselves or for the job we do. I think we are only doing as we ought to, as a place which is preaching restraint, in agreeing not to take any increase this year after the very substantial increase voted by the House in 1944.

● (1550)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Where have you been?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am sorry; I mean in 1975 by way of Bill C-44. The bill was brought in in 1974, but it was not passed until 1975. I hope I have made

that clear. We support the present bill. We support the freezing of the pay, salaries and allowances of members of this place and of the other place for the year 1976.

The bill does not stop with the clauses which amend the Senate and House of Commons Act. It also contains clauses amending the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act. The aim of that amendment is to make sure that no one, in 1976, will get an escalation in his pension beyond a certain amount, and this applies not just to members of parliament but to retired public servants, retired members of the armed forces, retired members of the RCMP, and so on. It applies to anyone getting any kind of pension coming under the government. The provision is that no one is to get an increase amounting to more than $2,400 a year. This, I submit, is a good idea. I would remind hon. members that there are lots of Canadians who never see a pension from their work amounting to $200 a month. We are simply saying that no one should get an increase, in 1976, of an amount greater than $200 a month. We certainly support that limitation.

I regret that when the President of the Treasury Board brought in a bill containing this clause he did not see fit to deal with some other things as well. He proposed a measure to prevent certain persons from getting pensions which would be too high, but I regret he did not bring in a provision to correct a situation which we thought would be corrected last December when we were dealing with Bill C-52. I refer to the fact that retired members of the armed Forces, the RCMP and others are obliged to wait until they are 60 before their pensions are escalated unless they can qualify under a rule which is sometimes known as the 85 rule.

When we were dealing with Bill C-52 last December, it looked for a time as though that rule would be modified, and I had hoped we might have dealt with this matter by way of the legislation presently before us. In other words, while we are seeking to ensure that some persons should not receive pensions which are too high, we should also seek to deal with the positions of those who are not getting the escalation they should be entitled to receive. I hope we can deal with this aspect in the committee or at the report stage.

After this quiet speech, despite the cut-calls and interruptions, I am happy to say we shall support, Bill C-81.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy with my action this afternoon, in preventing unanimous consent to the motion by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp). If I objected, it was mainly in order that the people, at least those who receive *Hansard*, be better informed on the subject of members' salaries and allowances.

Had the first motion gone through, everything would have gone under the veil of silence as usual, and the people would have gone on reading all kinds of suggestions concerning our salaries. I want to point out I have no grudge against newspapermen. Only, I resent that some of them take pleasure, when referring to member's salaries, in including both indemnity and allowances under salaries paid. Imagine the reaction by people believing that our salary is tax free. This is unfair to the greater majority of newspapermen. I commend those stating the the salary is $24,000, the allowances are such and such a figure, but the salary is subject to income tax, and therefore if a member gets $24,000 and pays $4,500 in income tax, his net salary is only $18,500. The press have a duty to tell that story to the people, if they are to really inform the poeple.

Ot course, allowances are tax free. Nowhere in industry or the public service are officials' expense allowances taxable. The contrary would be impossible and irrational. Why should our expense allowances be taxable? They must be deductible, as those of senior officials, considering the higher cost of living.

I refer directly to the President of the Privy Council. I did not think him capable of dealing that way. Usually he practices consultation, he acts in a less unilateral way. But today, he introduced an amazing piece of legislation. If the MP's expenses are frozen, finally they will be the ones who absorb the higher prices granted big companies, oil and other. I changed car this year, and it cost me $800 more than last year. I use it in my riding to work for my constituents. Some may find this odd but, in my riding, people find it strange because they have never seen, in 14 years, a federal member of Parliament go around visiting the riding. But for 14 years now—the federal Parliament really does exist—people see the federal MP go about the riding. May I say to the hon. members and the people that to go around our riding costs something, especially in the rural ridings.

● (1600)

And I say that the motion moved by the minister today, the amendment to Bill C-81, discriminates against rural members of parliament. I would like to quote some figures. We are not all in the same situation as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who stays in Ottawa and never goes anywhere else. Mr. Speaker, I live 500 miles from here; each week, I must drive 1,000 miles before covering from 300 to 500 miles in to my constituency on Saturdays and Sundays.

I drive an average of 40,000 miles a year for the government. If people want to see my figures, I will show them. Last year, with what the government paid me, I had a deficit of $2,842. This does not matter since I depend on my two companies to make ends meet. But I agree with the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) when he says that if a member of parliament must subsist on his allowance alone, be will starve, and I have said so for 14 years. A member who has only his allowance must either starve or do nothing in his constituency, and if he does nothing, he will not last long in his constituency these days. This is why members of parliament who have only a salary and expense allowances live very frugally. They do not need to say so, they live very frugally. This is why I speak on their behalf today. I speak on behalf of all members who represent rural constituencies. When you have to drive 100 or 125 miles to meet a group of senior citizens who are unable to travel, this costs money, and we do not receive one penny for these trips, while members of legislative assemblies receive 10 cents a mile for their travels. I can assure hon. members that at the federal level, we look like beggars.

When the President of the Treasury Board introduced the bill to reduce salaries on December 18, 1975, I was in favour of a salary freeze. I was in favour of such a move even though it was completely different from the theories that are accepted for other workers. See how stupid we are in this House, if I may use this expression. We allow, and I speak of all other workers, increases of at least 12 per cent to be accepted, and increases of 12 per cent, 10 per cent or 8 per cent, and what do we do to give the example? We do not even allow ourselves a 7 per cent rise in the cost of living. Would you believe! In the constituencies, we pass for idiots. Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly to meet the wishes of the government, because some ministers are afraid of losing their job; as for me, I am not afraid, when they vote against me, I shall go back home singing, and as long as I am elected, people will have to put up with me and I intend to go on saying the truth in my constituency. When I meet intelligent people in the departments, I say so, and when I meet idiots, I say so as well.

Mr. Speaker, I know that today most members do not support this particular motion. It is not because they like money, but because they are tired of trying to boost the government's popularity, the popularity of politics. I think that a member's salary should be at least that of a high official who earns $30,000 a year; let the journalists note this figure, high government officials make $28,000, $29,000, $30,000, $32,000, $40,000, $42,000 a year, excluding their expenses. And I repeat, this year, their expenses will not be reduced and, mind you, I do not blame them, I admire them, because they know how to look after themselves, they are clever, their expenses will not be reduced by a single cent. They will pay and if the price of gas goes up to $1, they will pay $1. But us, if the price of gas goes up to $1, we will have to make a gift to the government and say: For our good government, let us pay out of our own pockets. Imagine that!

Once again, if they want changes, if they want to standardize things—I have been asking this for a long time—all they need to do is to give us the status of high government officials. Yes, the status of high government officials and let us be paid $32,000 a year plus an expense account. Wait and see at the end of the year when I submit my expense account, there will be much to be paid. Instead of $10,000, the expenditures will be around $25,000. Let us be allowed expense accounts. But no, we are restricted and we have to pay the difference. Then, we have to provide service that is in adequate, unsatisfactory in our riding.

I feel that the government is now working not only against members of parliament but also against the rural people. Today the government wants to prevent those people from receiving the services they are entitled to get from their members in their constituencies. Again, the salary does not matter to me. But as regards expenses, I shall not give up. If the government wants to freeze expenses, it should first freeze the prices asked by big companies. We have been asking that for a long time. The government keeps knocking down wages, but it should first freeze the prices of all those big companies, for they are at the root of inflation. Why not touch them? The government will come begging members of parliament again in order to save these big corporations.

[Mr. Gauthier (Roberval).]

Mr. Speaker, I am fed up, tired of all this sham and I simply ask the President of the Treasury Board, if he is honest and sincere, to withdraw his amendment.

I was listening a moment ago to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and I wonder which of the two has the power. He or the President of the Privy Council? It would seem that he follows the orders of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The minister should keep in mind that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre lives here alone; he has no family, he has nothing and he is satisfied with that. He does not have nine or ten children to look after, to educate, to clothe and to feed. Keep that in mind because he does not set an example for Canada.

An hon. Member: He is a burden for Canada.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Someone says that, on the contrary, he is a burden for Canada. Fortunately he compensates for this somewhat in another way. He is a very learned man who, I think, is needed in this House, because of his sensible questions. I am convinced that it is important to have people of such calibre in this House, but he is not worth much for reproduction.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said earlier that we might save $600,000. Imagine all this turmoil to save the meager amount of $600,000, when we have just authorized the Department of National Defence to go into debt to the tune of $1 billion. I really say to run into a $1 billion debt and I am satisfied that most people do not know that: it passed unnoticed. We want to save $600,000, and Canadians are saddled with a $1 billion debt for national defence. But for the defence of whom? The defence of what? We have nothing to defend, we are going to defend foreign countries. And now we run into a $1 billion debt for national defence. And if I were to go on this way, I could prove one by one every extravagance made by this Parliament in its expenditures, when it appeals for anti-inflation restrictions. But the government is at the grassroots of inflation through its wasteful expenditures.

But let them not put forward such a ridiculous amendment to make believe that something is done. We, the members of parliament, the people's representatives, have to pay at each election all our election expenses, let alone those used to help the population. Let us sacrifice ourselves! Let us not complain, let us not wonder why we cannot get members I was going to say of high calibre. There are here wonderful members, good workers, but no one with the Public Service with a yearly salary of $40,000 or $42,000 will be interested in becoming a member unless he can be assured of receiving a minimum increase of $3,000 a month or a minister's portfolio. Apart from that, we will not get anybody worth while, and we are going to keep on, with the new ideas that the President of the Privy Council has just put forward, finding it difficult to get serious candidates to come to this House and defend the interests of our fellow citizens.

I hope that the minister is not in fact looking for incompetent members so that he can control them more easily. In conclusion, I hope with all my heart, that this amendment will be lost and I once again ask the President of the Privy Council to simply withdraw his amendment and please everyone.

Let us stop this. He is embarrassing his own members, his own ministers, and there is a limit to making fun of members of parliament.

I think this nonsense has lasted long enough Mr. Speaker, and the President of the Privy Council should purely and simply withdraw his amendment.

● (1610)

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I think this debate is totally superfluous. This bill should not be before us. I do not suppose any woman giving birth to quintuplets would go through what we went through in setting the salaries of members of parliament with a formula to take care of cost of living increases. We had a fight among members of this House on all sides, and with the press and media: that is where the opposition was.

That having been settled, now we have what I suggest is a totally hypocritical and cosmetic action by the government, through the lips of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). The blame lies right there. It is said that members of parliament should forgo the cost of living increase in their salaries. Nothing is said about expenses. Of course nothing is said about expenses, and quite rightly so. The world was not discovered yesterday. We have seen the tribulations of members of parliament on all sides. We have seen good members of parliament driven out of this House because of the financial exigencies of their position.

I agree with the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier). Those who speak against increasing salaries of members of parliament who must meet the obligations of their position either have an independent income or sit here in a corner in Ottawa and do not know what the constituency problems are. They do not know what it is to maintain a separate home in a constituency and one in Ottawa, or to maintain an apartment here. They do not know what it is to drive an automobile in a constituency, whether urban or rural. I have an urban constituency. I marvel at my colleagues in this House who represent rural constituencies when I see how they are able to absorb, without loud protest, the cost of moving around in that constituency at today's prices. What about the cost of hotels, the price of meals, the price of gasoline and the cost of automobile repairs? It is only a self-deluded fool who would say that these costs have not gone up. A member of parliament is supposed to absorb those costs out of his salary.

The union official, the teacher, the newspaper reporter, the news editor or anyone else who goes on official travel can deduct the cost as a business expense. They are compensated for the increase in those expenditures. However, the elected official, be he a school board trustee, a municipal councillor, a city alderman, a member of a provincial legislature, or a member of this House, is dismissed. He cannot absorb that cost. What public hypocrisy that represents! That is what I object to. I have been in this House for nearly 20 years and I object to these double standards.

The businessman is entitled to deduct his expenses in the course of business at the level of the expenditures. The union officials, the CLC officials who came to Ottawa the other day, will be able to collect their expenses and be reimbursed on the basis of today's costs. They are able to do it at any time. We have the situation in respect of the teachers and all the officials moving around. Do not think that all the shifting around of the officials we have in respect of labour unrest at the present time does not represent a great expense. Those men and women do not give up one penny from their pockets for that. All along the line in the public service, pensions are escalated to meet cost of living increases. Old age pensions are escalated in order to meet cost of living increases. Veterans pensions are escalated to meet cost of living increases.

An hon. Member: Escalations were denied in respect of family allowances.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): They were denied in respect of family allowances; that is right. But all along the line pensions have been escalated. After that nauseous, hypocritical debate of last year with regard to the salaries of members of parliament, when a negotiated conclusion was reached about the first thing that was done by the government in order to, shall we say, sweeten the pill with regard to denying the vast salary increases to senior public servants who just previously had had a salary increase was to deny this to members of parliament.

This is purely a cosmetic and unwarranted gesture. The elected officials in this country are a small number of people dispersed in every constituency. In a school board district there may be six, eight or ten representatives. In a rural municipality or country there may be a few dozen representatives. In a city there may be from 6 to 20 aldermen. The members of a provincial legislature may total 105 or 110 across the country. We are 264. We are easy game to pick off. How do we react? People come down to this place to observe, and with less than two of three month's experience in how this complicated shop operates they are prepared to levy judgment on individual members and tell this place how it should be run. They do not even know their way to the head, to use a nautical term. If they had been here a couple of years, maybe they would have discovered the way to the head and then they would have decided how to run the bridge. I know I will not make any friends with this speech, and I do not intend to. However, I will say this; if I and the hon. member for Roberval and a few others intend to make ourselves the self-appointed ombudsmen on behalf of elected officials, I am quite prepared to do it because I think there is something fundamental to be said all through our system of government on behalf of the elected people.

● (1620)

I will not go into the various motives of why elected representatives seek office. But having sought office and having been rewarded with the confidence of the people, many hon. members—and I look to the left at my colleagues, all the way down to the NDP and the Creditistes, as well as to the government side—men and women who would have had far greater success in other occupations have given them up. Something that all too often John Public in the street, the reporters, their editors, and, God bless them, their publishers, seem to forget is that until you get into this game there is no way of knowing how your own personal occupation will be affected.

Those full-time parliamentarians who are professional men have seen their practices wiped out because this is a

full-time job. There are some pooh-bah colonels running around in this country. I use that phrase to express that mentality which prevails in the newspaper offices, magazine offices and among commentators who seem to think that this is a part-time avocation; that having been elected, a member can just retire without loss, senior members of the House can be shunted out without any difficulty, members in the House who do not speak very often are not the best constituency people, and representation in parliament means putting on a show for the two o'clock follies known as the question period. That is the only thing that counts with a great many people, and particularly with the press. Let us consider the constituency. I point out to members on all sides of the House, who rarely speak in the House, who are true representatives of their people and who do their jobs well—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): —that this is a complex job, more complex than any man written about, because in this day and age none of our colleagues has developed that disease of instant book and instant comment—we are too busy with other things to do.

I think this bill is an insult to members of parliament. It is an insult to say that we should not increase our salaries by 7 per cent, when everybody else is insisting upon their increase. What sort of chumps do the public think the members of this House are? I have already been asked in my constituency, "What kind of silly fools are you?"

An hon. Member: Yes, I know you are.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The only thing is that the proposal came from the Prime Minister. That is the point. This is a government bill, and he is the man who announced it. Why? Because there were some senior civil servants whom they want to whip into line. Therefore, they use members of parliament as whipping-boys on the fringe of that line. I know how many members here have spoken to me; I am a member of the members' services committee, if you have been here a long time, you get to hear confidences from members on all sides of the House, and I share their concerns because I think this bill does a total disservice to them. With all due respect to my friend the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), let me say to hon. members outside the city of Ottawa that the amendment is even worse.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I will not only ask members of the House to vote against this bill; I will ask the government to adjourn this debate and withdraw the bill. It is unworthy of the House and it should never have seen the light of day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It was an aberration in somebody's thinking that they should offer, as sacrificial lambs, members of parliament. Have we seen anything comparable in other legislatures? No, not for a total freeze but for a total wipe-out! Are we going to see anybody voluntarily giving up the cost of living escalation in any negotiated contract? Will there be senior citizens' organizations, who have as great a stake in fighting inflation as we have, writing in to say that next January the cost of living escalation formula with regard to basic pensions should be waived? Are we going to get the Royal Canadian Legion writing in to say that the war service disability pensions escalation formula should be waived next year? I challenge the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to say whether this should be done. Why should it be done only here? As an example?

Last year the hon. member participated in what I call an undignified public chase by people who did not know the complexities of public life. They did not know what it was like in several provincial legislatures where many of them are trying to catch up. I know that at the provincial level many elected individuals have to expect to live and support their families on their salaries. God only knows, but somebody seems to have forgotten families and our normal aspirations for our children in this day and age. When you get down to city councils you find that the level of remuneration there is far less than any minimum wage, yet the hours are far in excess of any union contract.

● (1630)

Why is one supposed to do that? For the honour and glory of the job? Is one to tell one's wife that she cannot have new drapes and the normal things in a home, and that the children cannot have what their peers or their counterparts have, because there is not any money? Everybody does not have a beautiful, cushy job. There are some people who have to earn their living today out of their own efforts, and we refuse to give them any consideration. I say that this is rank, public hypocrisy of the worst kind.

I want to ask those people who are the chief critics of this place, the publishers, what they have done with regard to their salaries in the past five years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): What about those editors? What have they done about their salaries? What about everyone in the media, or are we not supposed to criticize the media? Are they the sacred cows? They are people like ourselves. They live, too. They have their problems—but, my goodness, did they cut back? Does it cost me less now than it did five years ago to buy the *Globe and Mail*? No! I think it costs me 80 per cent more to have that newspaper delivered. I use the *Globe and Mail* only as an example because it was cited earlier. The Montreal *Gazette* is another one, as well as the Ottawa *Journal* and the Edmonton *Journal*.

Have hon. members looked at their advertising rates and considered what they will have to pay for advertising in those newspapers in the next election campaign? Have hon. members talked to the television stations and asked about their rates? They would say, "Don't be so silly. That is another thing; it is not in the same league". What is good for them is not good for us, but there are still some people who are prepared to pay, shall we say, a tribute to this gesture. I would simply call it brown-nosing, to be very blunt about it.

Mr. Speaker, I speak as one who has occupied the chair formerly. I have been in this House for almost 20 years,

and the more I see of it, the more I feel that one of the chief requirements in this country is an ombudsman for elected people, elected members all the way from school boards up to members of parliament. Having said all that, I wish to reiterate what I have said before. All I have said since I started is a preamble to the plea I make, the plea I made at the time of Bill C-44 and on other occasions. That plea is that there must be an independent board, set up by statute and required by statute to report regularly on the level of salaries of members of parliament, judges, senators and senior public servants.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Because of the exercise we went through last year, and this particular exercise, frankly, I would like to puke because I do not like to talk about this. This is repugnant to us, but sometimes one has to speak out. We do want to have something which is honourable and decent. Let us not have anyone come back with the hokum argument that only members of parliament have the right to set their own salaries and that this is the only place where that is done. Let us consider members of boards of directors. Who sets the salaries of publishers? Who sets the salaries of editors? Boards of directors do, but many of those people sit on those boards. In any company where the principal officers are directors, who sets the salaries but the board of directors? The officers themselves. In any private company, who determines the salary of any of the directors or any of the officers but the owners themselves?

Mrs. Holt: This is the board of directors of Canada.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is right, and there is no one else. The decision is made right here. But I say to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) that it would be far better for this to come under perpetual review. I do not disagree with hon. members setting the level of salaries, provided some experience, some common sense and some fairness is brought to bear upon the deliberations.

So let us get away from this charge, even if it is artificial, and let us have an independent statutory body which every year or every second year will make a recommendation that the salaries be adjusted. Let us not leave this to cabinet ukase to implement, so that there will be no political consideration. Unless there is a very substantial objection from this House and from the other place, the decision or the recommendation of that review board should be implemented. Then I think an adjustment would be safe from comment.

This bill is unnecessary, and frankly the government would do this House, the other place and the public a great deal of service if it withdrew the bill.

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would entertain a question.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Most certainly, if I still have time.

[*Translation*]

Miss Bégin: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say to the hon. member that of course I find the refusal to adjust members' expenses absolutely unfair, but I would also like to ask the hon. member who made a very nice speech on that subject why the former leader of his party, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), issued two press releases that lead to today's proposed amendment?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I will very simply ask the hon. parliamentary secretary why did the Prime Minister make the very first move? I do not accept either.

Miss Bégin: No, it was your leader who started this by failing to abide by the agreement about readjusting members' expenses.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all the hon. member's protests it was indeed the proposition of the Prime Minister that members salaries would be frozen at that level. That was the first proposition, and the most unfair of all.

Miss Bégin: No, he talked about expenses.

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some enjoyment to the last two speeches. They were reminiscent of all the speeches which have been made on the occasions when pay for members of parliament was discussed. I thought we had got away from that. We got to the stage of setting up a commission at considerable expense. In fact, we did that twice, and a number of suggestions they put forward finally were enacted in legislation, including such things as an escalation clause attached to the composite wage index. This seems to be a fair and reasonable way of handling the situation. It is much more fair than members having to make decisions periodically. There are some of us who believe that our expenses are detached from our salaries, that they are separate and there is merit in some of those separations.

● (1640)

Mr. Speaker, I very much resent the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) went on television and used our salaries and expenses as the basis for eliminating some desirable and some less than desirable programs—LIP, LEAP, CYC, and one that I consider to be very advantageous, the indexing of family allowances. He indicated that he was going to cut down on the civil service. In my opinion that has not been done, and in fact a very poor example has been set in the Prime Minister's own office where a number of people have been added to his staff. The Prime Minister suggested on that telecast that members of parliament were going to help him justify his austerity program and set an example for the country.

I intend to move an amendment to the amendment that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) has indicated he will introduce. I think this is the worst kind of legislation we could possibly have, where the government puts up a kite to test whether they can satisfy the public or even members of parliament. They went halfway; they put the freeze on salaries but they did not put it on the pay which included expenses. Now, after nearly six months, they have decided to amend the bill and ask for a recall of the pay that has already been collected on the expenses.

This is the worst of two worlds, Mr. Speaker, and what the government has done is a disgrace. They have delayed making a decision and putting a bill before this House for almost six months to freeze the salary increase that would have been obtained by the index. They have listened to the public and decided they have to add the expenses to the freeze as well. If they had found the public was not interested, this bill would never have been called but would have been allowed to die on the order paper.

I am sympathetic to some of the remarks that have been made. We have set a standard that can be justified. The index takes into consideration most of the negotiated contracts in other civil service fields. That criteria has been applied to our salary and the cost of living has been used in the expenses. That seems reasonable to me, but it also seems an idle gesture to make the compromise we are making in this bill and to add the amendment that the President of the Treasury Board intends to introduce.

Today we have been informed that Canada will spend a billion dollars to buy a number of outdated aircraft which are not suitable for the job they are intended for. No one in a responsible position has indicated that they can justify the role played by the Argus aircraft which they are to replace. I think the government's position is similar to that of Mayor Drapeau: when that billion dollars is multiplied over the years, it will probably amount to about $3 billion. The amount of money involved annually for the expense allowances of members of parliament is approximately $185,000. I think the government should not be allowed to pass this kind of restrictive legislation after they have tested the wind.

The easiest way to bring this matter to the attention of the House is to amend the amendment that will be introduced by the President of the Treasury Board and to make the operative date the date of the passing of this bill. I believe we should make this gesture, Mr. Speaker, because members of parliament should have been consulted. This House should have decided how the country could be persuaded to make the changes that are necessary to alleviate inflation. But we were not consulted. If the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) had listened to the question put by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) when this matter first came up, he would have realized that only a partial gesture was being made and he would not have added the $700 increase that members were expecting on their expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish on the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, nor on the President of the Privy Council newly married though he be the ten children that were mentioned by a previous member. Such a family would be difficult to raise on their salary. Many of us in this House who have no small children now forget about the responsability of raising a family. Recently I was talking to the provincial member of the legislature just elected in my area who had an new son a few months ago. His salary is about the same as ours, but he indicated that it is $4,000 or $5,000 less that he received for teaching school. He remarked on the statement I had made to a newspaperman who had asked me why I thought we should elect a provincial member who was a school teacher. I had said that we probably could not find anybody less intelligent, because as a school teacher earning the kind of wages he did, for him to want to run for elected office and get less money than he was getting would not be too bright.

● (1650)

Talking to him, I was surprised to learn that he must meet expenses to which I have been accustomed for many years. He cannot charge them against income, against income tax, and cannot obtain the sort of relief available to other people who in their type of work charge expenses against income. Perhaps members who have no young children should sympathize with those who have. Most members of parliament are willing to make this gesture. But I should hate it to be a political gesture made only to satisfy the Prime Minister. Also, I distrust any amendment which includes a member's expenses with the rest of his income. The government is doing it this way because otherwise it could not sell the idea. But this is a shoddy way of going about it. I am not proud of the government and I am not proud of the way members of parliament have gone about this business.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Chrétien) which was agreed to on the following division.

(*Division No. 131*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander
Allmand
Andras (Port Arthur)
Andre (Calgary Centre)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
Baldwin
Balfour
Basford
Béchard
Bégin (Miss)
Blouin
Breau
Brewin
Buchanan
Bussières
Cafik
Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
Caron
Chrétien
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Clermont
Collenette
Condon
Crouse
Cyr
Darling
Demers
Dinsdale
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Douglas (Bruce-Grey)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duclos
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Flynn
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier)
Gillespie
Goodale
Goyer

Messrs.

Grafftey	Lefebvre	Nielsen
Guay (St. Boniface)	Lumley	Oberle
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)	MacDonald (Cardigan)	O'Connell
Hargrave	MacDonald (Egmont)	Ouellet
Harquail	Macdonald (Rosedale)	Paproski
Herbert	MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Pelletier
Hnatyshyn	MacFarlane	Peters
Hogan	MacGuigan	Philbrook
Holmes	Mackasey	Poulin
Holt (Mrs.)	MacLean	Railton
Hopkins	Maine	Reid
Howie	Malone	Ritchie
Hurlburt	Marchand (Langelier)	Roy (Laval)
Isabelle	Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)	Saltsman
Jamieson	Marshall	Sauvé (Mrs.)
Jarvis	McCain	Schumacher
Joyal	McIsaac	Sharp
Kaplan	McKinley	Smith (Churchill)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	McKinnon	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Lajoie	McRae	Stanbury
Lapointe	Mitges	Stanfield
La Salle	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Stewart (Marquette)
Lavoie	Munro (Hamilton East)	Tessier
Leblanc (Laurier)	Nicholson (Miss)	Towers
LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent)		Trudeau
Lee		Trudel
		Watson
		Whelan
		Wise
		Woolliams—125

NAYS

Messrs.

Allard	Gauthier (Roberval)	Lambert (Edmonton West)
Caouette (Villeneuve)		Rooney—5

● (1730)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—National Defence—Request for details of planning for improved surveillance, search and rescue in view of possible extension of jurisdiction to 200 miles; the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald)—Transport—Possible abandonment of rail service in Prince Edward Island—Government action to avoid crisis.

It being five o'clock, pursuant to order made on Friday, February 27, 1976, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, notices of motions.

The Territories

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REQUEST FOR APPLICATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES TO TERRITORIES

On the order:

Resuming debate on the motion of Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Stanfield:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should immediately introduce legislation to implement the resolutions of the Yukon Territorial Council and the Northwest Territorial Council requesting that the government apply those principles of constitutional and democratic development that will establish a fully representative and responsible system of government to the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories respectively.

Mr. Speaker: Is there an agreement or understanding about the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen)?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken with the government House leader but on February 3, 1975, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) proposed an amendment which is to be found at page 2855 of *Hansard* for that date. At that time the Acting Speaker reserved his ruling on whether or not that amendment would be acceptable.

In order to provide an opportunity for the Chair to consider that amendment, and in order for us to have ample consideration of the motion with the inclusion of the amendment, in private members' hour I would hope the House would consent to putting this motion over until tomorrow during private members' hour at which time the Chair could rule on the amendment of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie and we could proceed with the consideration of the motion, thus having a full hour's debate.

● (1740)

Mr. Speaker: The immediate difficulty with that is that tomorrow is an opposition day. I take it the intention is that it be on the next appointed day.

The House has heard the terms suggested by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). Is it agreed that the motion which would ordinarily be called at this time will be put over and will retain its priority until the next appointed private members' hour, and in the interim the Chair will prepare whatever ruling was anticipated. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At 5.45 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE RESPECTING PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENCES

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General) moved that Bill C-84, to amend the Criminal Code in relation to the punishment for murder and certain other serious offences, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on opening the debate on Bill C-84 I am sure all of us are aware that we are beginning the latest instalment of a very old debate. Hon. members who have been here for ten years, as I have, will be participating in their fourth full-scale debate on capital punishment.

I am hoping that the House leaders will be able to work out a formal agreement among all parties that speakers will be limited to 20 minutes. I had prepared a much longer and more detailed speech, going into each of my arguments in some depth. However, in order to stay within 20 minutes I have cut the length of my speech so that we may use the time of the House in the most efficient way possible. The full text of my original speech will, however, be made available to hon. members and others, and I hope it will be read with some attention.

If in speaking today I convince some hon. members—and I am especially thinking of the almost 60 members who have not participated in a debate on this subject before—that we must look at this matter from a new perspective, then I will have done much to get this debate off to a good start.

I am convinced that if we attack this question objectively, then we must, from a logical, ethical and public policy point of view, conclude that capital punishment must be abolished once and for all.

In my view there are two central themes and two general lines of argument which embrace all of the secondary questions which must be answered in this debate. The first central theme concerns the issue of deterrence or, more broadly put, the question of how we can effectively protect the Canadian public against violent crime, in this case, murder. It is a discussion of the means to accomplish the end, which is protection.

I should like to go through the argument with regard to deterrence and protection step by step because in my view an examination of the evidence must lead us to the conclusion that capital punishment is no more effective a means of protecting society than other alternative less severe and less error prone means.

The second general line of argument concerns goals. While it is often said that arguments concerning means and arguments concerning ends or values are wholly distinct kinds of arguments, I feel that each has something to add to the other. I am convinced that many of those debating the question of capital punishment focus too narrowly, and for that reason misconstrue the nature of our task in this debate.

[Mr. Speaker.]

There is no doubt that those opposing the abolition of capital punishment will cite statistics to show that the reported murder rate in Canada has climbed since the last executions were carried out in 1962 from 1.2 murders per 100,000 population to 2.4 murders per 100,000 population in 1974. This is a legitimate statistic to cite, but the conclusion drawn from it is often based on such a narrow view of the problem we are confronted with as to make that conclusion suspect.

Those citing the increase in the murder rate and concluding that the lack of executions in Canada since 1962 explains the increase in murders delude themselves and those who listen to them. I say this because this argument utterly ignores the dimensions of the problem of violent crime. This lack of perspective, and this facile assignment of cause and effect relationship between the lack of executions as cause and the rise in the murder rate as effect are a principal stumbling block to an intelligent and informed public discussion of the real problem.

● (2010)

I can demonstrate to hon. members that the real problem we must deal with is not simply one of murder here in Canada but that of crime throughout the western world. In my original text I give statistics and arguments to support that demonstration. I do not, I hasten to add, point this out with a view to sloughing off responsibility or minimizing the horror of murder. Far from it. I do so only in order to point out that we must address ourselves to the right questions and that a simple concentration on capital punishment and murder takes much too restricted a view of the questions about which Canadians are concerned.

Concentration on the issue of capital punishment does not serve us well if our purpose is, as it should be, the finding of truly effective means of protecting the public against violent crime. Such a concentration serves instead to distract our efforts, as was pointed out by Sir Robert Mark, a 38-year veteran and present commissioner of the London Metropolitan Police, better known as Scotland Yard. This distinguished spokesman for the police community in Great Britain, in addressing the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police in Canada last summer made precisely this point. He said:

> I am therefore opposed to the death penalty and so are most of my senior and most experienced colleagues, simply because its continuance prevents the reforms necessary to increase the effectiveness of criminal justice.

In presenting the peace and security program the government is focusing on these real problems and this focus aims at including only effective measures to protect the public and excluding ineffective measures. That is why we are now debating this bill to abolish capital punishment.

Having said this, I should like once more to come back to the two principal questions I set out a few moments ago on the specific question of capital punishment: the question of whether capital punishment is an effective means to the end of protecting the public, and the question of whether

the use of capital punishment is in keeping with the end or values which we as a society embrace.

The question of means boils down in essence to a question of effectiveness. The essential question is not whether the death penalty deters any would be murderers but whether it deters them more than life imprisonment does. As Professor James Q. Wilson of Harvard puts this issue:

> It is a matter of dispute whether any penalty will have a deterrent effect on murderers, but surely the prospect of a long prison term will have as much as most others. For the death penalty to be warranted, it would have to supply an additional increment of deterrence sufficient to offset the costs of imposing it, those costs being the risk of executing an innocent man, the opportunities for discrimination in imposing the penalty, and the foregone possibility of rehabilitating the murderer. Fairness would always be a problem . . . because, though imposition of the death penalty could be made mandatory, juries in such cases might be unwilling to convict at all for fear of convicting wrongly.

If this is the question, Mr. Speaker, what is the answer? From all the studies that have been done, both here in Canada and in other nations, one cannot draw the conclusion that the prospect of capital punishment is a more effective deterrent to prospective murderers than is the prospect of life imprisonment. Hon. members need not take my word for it. Let me refer to other authors more expert in the field than I am whose conclusions, I think, hon. members should listen to with close attention.

If I had time this evening I would cite at some length the conclusions of Professor Thorsten Sellin who showed that capital punishment has no unique effect as between abolitionist and retentionist states over time, and as it especially affected the safety of policemen and prison guards. For a fuller examination of these points I would refer hon. members to the speech I gave on capital punishment three years ago and again to the original text of the speech I was to give here tonight.

Professor Sellin's findings were also supported by many other researchers. This evening I will cite only one of them who carried out research on the subject of deterrents in the Canadian context.

Professor Fattah's findings played an important role in the last debate on this subject and are worth referring to again by those who have not read them recently. The conclusion of the study on the deterrent effects of capital punishment in the Canadian context is that homicide rates are conditional on factors other than the death penalty. They suggest that the cause of homicide and murder cannot be found in any single factor but in a total social situation in which a specially important or particular punishment can have little or no effect. Professor Fattah concluded that:

> The suspension (of the death penalty) is unlikely to have played a part in the . . . light increase in the homicide rate in recent years . . .

These conclusions of three years ago are equally supportable now, on the basis of later data. In 1973 as compared to 1972 the murder rate in Montreal and Vancouver fell and the murder rate in Toronto rose. The 1974 figures as compared to 1973 show a reversal of this: that is, the murder rate in Montreal and Vancouver rose, while that in Toronto fell. In 1974 as compared to 1973 the murder rate in Canada dropped in four provinces and rose in all the others.

Since the same law, with the same penalty, is in effect in all parts of Canada, then clearly the variation in rates of crime cannot be explained solely by that sanction. Other factors are at work, and if we are to do anything effective about violent crime then we must focus on those other factors rather than on the illusionary effect of the statute and the penalty itself.

While I am on this topic I should like to address the question raised by the findings of the Econometric School of Deterrence and, specifically, the findings of Professor Ehrlich of the University of Chicago. In a widely cited article Professor Ehrlich's sophisticated statistical studies are purported to show that each additional execution would have resulted in seven or eight fewer murders. Because the results of Professor Ehrlich's analysis differ markedly from the results of previous research on this question, his work has naturally been very closely examined by a large number of scholars representing a variety of academic disciplines.

Robert G. Hann, in a detailed analysis of the Ehrlich study and the follow-up studies resulting from it, stresses the finding of Professor Friedman of Berkeley University, whose examination of Ehrlich's work led him to the startling conclusion that if an algebraic error committed by Ehrlich himself were corrected and if the other aspects of his work were valid, then Ehrlich's own analysis would imply that each execution is related to an increase of 14 murders, rather than a decrease of seven or eight. I cite these studies because it is important to recognize that those who would cite Professor Ehrlich without at the same time citing those who feel his study is fatally flawed by methodological and statistical errors are treading on very shaky ground.

● (2020)

What is it possible to conclude from all of these studies on the deterrent effect of capital punishment? It is my contention that if no irrefutable evidence can be brought forward that capital punishment is a more effective deterrent to the commission of murder than is a lengthy sentence, then we must conclude that a lengthy sentence is preferable, and that the burden of proof to conclude otherwise rests with those favouring the death penalty.

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Allmand: Because you are taking life when you propose the death penalty. The burden of proof is on those who propose retention of the death penalty. They must show that retention does some good in society and has positive effect. Furthermore, I do not think retentionists can logically or ethically discharge that burden of proof.

But in saying this I am moving into the second question of major importance, the question of whether the death penalty can be supported by moral arguments, which is to say, by arguments setting out to show that capital punishment is the only adequate punishment to express society's outrage against the murderer. On the one side of this question are the many Canadians who would reject the death penalty even if it could be proven to have a significant effect in furthering the end of protecting Canadian society against murder and other violent crime. One of the most moving statements of this nature I have ever heard was written by Mrs. Pauline Maitland whose husband, Constable Leslie Maitland, was murdered in Toronto by a

man who currently awaits our decision on death row. Mrs. Maitland wrote as follows:

> In no way do I wish to interfere with the course of justice and the safety of an already overworked police department, but the killing of this man would be completely foreign to all the moral standards of both my late husband and myself . . . It would not bring Leslie back and it is too easy a way out for all of us. Society condemns murder, but is willing to accept the murder of this man, in the name of justice. Please do what you can to prevent this terrible second crime, before it is too late.

On the other side of this question are those who believe that it is a dishonour to the victim of murder to do other than put to death his murderer, quite aside from the possible deterrent effect on others.

There is little that argument can do to affect those who hold either absolute view. But, despite this, I do think it is reasonable to say that the vast majority of Canadians hold views on the question of the suitability of capital punishment in our society that are amenable to factual and reasoned argument, and are not based on either absolutist moral position. It is these people I am addressing this evening.

To begin with, then, let us try to define the argument that capital punishment is the only "just" or "fitting" penalty for murder a little more closely. Clearly those who call for the reinstatement of capital punishment in order adequately to satisfy society's justified condemnation of the murderer are not setting up the death penalty itself as a goal or a value for society. I am sure that those who argue this position take it up because they see capital punishment as a justified reaction, not as an end in itself. But if it is not an end in itself, what then is it? Clearly, then, it is a means to another end, and that other end is the effective protection of society and the righteous expression of society's outrage against those who violate the ultimate value of the right to live peaceful and safe lives. But just as clearly the moral discussion on this point must then centre around the question of whether capital punishment is in fact just and fair both in theory and in application.

This is a complex argument, and because of time restrictions I must leave out some parts which are included in my original text. In the first place there is a great deal of evidence that, if justice requires fairness in application, then application of capital punishment in the past has not been just, because it has been applied disproportionately to those who are poor, unrepresented, and members of minority groups. This is a fact that is well established and does not merely refer to the contentious issue of execution in error alone.

Second, the sanction of death cannot be considered merely a quantitative extension of other sanctions in our criminal law. It is qualitatively, fundamentally, irretrievably different in kind and, as such, we as policy makers and as citizens bear an especially heavy burden to show that the special disadvantages which accompany the use of capital punishment outweigh the need to demonstrate society's outrage against murderers by other, less severe means.

What are some of these special disadvantages which accompany the use of the death penalty? I have very briefly referred to the irreversibility of the act of execution, which sets the death penalty in a separate category apart from all other penalties. I have also referred briefly to the possibility of execution in error, and to the inevitability—according to Professor Charles Black of the Yale Law School—of execution as a result of the application of capricious, arbitrary, and therefore discriminatory standards. Another argument frequently brought up in this connection is that juries are more reluctant to convict when the life of the defendant is at stake than when the penalty is one of fine or imprisonment. Do we have evidence to support this contention? The answer in Canada is yes, we do.

In the eight decades between 1880 and 1960 the average yearly conviction rate in Canada for murder was 37.7 per cent, whereas for manslaughter it was 49.7 per cent, for attempted murder 51.6 per cent, for shooting and wounding 64.6 per cent. A study of these figures, and of the figures between 1961 and 1974 showing that three out of five of those charged with capital murder were convicted of a lesser offence, makes it possible to infer that Canadian jurors are loath to convict for capital murder, but are quite prepared to convict for a lesser offence where life is not at stake.

From another point of view Professor Wilson takes note of the interesting fact that:

> In Great Britain, where judges had less discretion in imposing the death penalty than they do in the United States, the number of murderers found insane—and so spared the gallows—dropped sharply after the death penalty was abolished in 1965. It is hard to believe that there were fewer insane persons in Britain after abolition of the death penalty; what apparently happened was that the authorities no longer felt that it was necessary to protect the accused from penalties when the penalty was no longer death.

There is one final set of facts which I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members in order to allow them to weigh more adequately the wisdom of approving the death penalty as a justifiable penalty for murder. A recent article by Daniel Glaser and Max Zeigler showed that those who would have us indulge in the violence of state-sanctioned executions would do so only at the cost of engendering more violence—more murder—in our society. Glaser and Zeigler wrote:

> Demands that capital punishment be restored are raised whenever the public is outraged at a particularly heinous and highly publicized killing, but the geographic facts presented here suggest that this 'gut response' is counter-productive as a means of reducing the prevalence of murder. The evidence shows that where use of the death penalty is most frequent there is less long-run outrage against killers than prevails in states that forbid murder, whether by private parties or by the government. The alternatives to violence are, in addition to a respect for the sacredness of life, the many civilized procedures and practices of analysing, negotiating, legally adjudicating, or simply tolerating disagreements. All of these alternatives are impaired or impeded rather than nurtured when the government resorts to the murderer's methods.

● (2030)

If this conclusion is correct, that the carrying out of executions by the state not only does not prevent murders but actually may serve to create or maintain a climate where more murders and more violence exists, then the argument that the death penalty is a just and fitting punishment in our society in order to show our outrage against murder must be seen to be empty and dangerous rhetoric.

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a few words to those who might be inclined to oppose this bill on the grounds that it is not a perfect piece of legislation, or on the grounds that the alternative suggested in

the bill is not precisely the alternative they would like to see.

First, I am not arguing that this bill is perfect, or that in proposing this bill we are offering a guarantee that there will be no more murders in Canada. To those who have doubts about this bill because they think that abolition is right but the proposed alternative is not, I would sound a note of caution. The Canadian public are concerned about crime and have a right to expect protection. Murder is a horrible and heinous crime and must be sanctioned severely if we are adequately to express society's denunciation of the murderer.

I disagree with those who argue that a life sentence with no parole eligibility for 25 years is worse than death. A period of incarceration, with hope of parole, and with the built-in additional incentive for the inmate, and protection for the guards, of a review of that parole eligibility after 15 years is necessarily better than a sentence of death because it removes the possibility of an irreversible error of execution.

Second, available studies, including those carried out by Joseph Vernet, S.J., provide no evidence that life imprisonment is as cruel or more cruel than is execution. His survey of European countries which have abolished the death penalty in order to ascertain whether this abolition gave rise to more cases of insanity, premature death, suicide, escape attempts, and frequent punishment among those sentenced to lengthy periods of incarceration, provided no evidence to support this proposition.

Furthermore, the government has committed itself as part of the peace and security package to improving general conditions within institutions through such measures as greater flexibility of institutional assignment in smaller and more specialized institutional centres, greater efforts toward staff training and improved deployment of staff resources in such programs as the team concept and living unit concept, new programs for training and work assignments for inmates, the completion of the five regional psychiatric centres, and a great deal of research to identify the effects of long-term incarceration and other related factors.

Some hon. members might cite their constituents as saying this sort of program costs too much and that the taxpayers do not want to bear the burden of paying approximately $14,000 per year per capital murderer over the term of a long sentence. To those who are unwilling to pay the costs of incarcerating these people and who wish to save money by carrying out executions, I would like to say the following in reply.

First, I am certain that no hon. member would agree that human life should be expended because of potential monetary savings alone. That is a principle which I am sure no serious person would argue.

Second, the whole argument is based upon a fallacy. If we were to execute the 11 people currently on death row we would not be saving $14,000 a year for each of those inmates for each year he is kept in prison. This is because the cost of maintaining the inmate is arrived at by dividing the total number of inmates into the total cost of running our institutions, and the marginal difference of eliminating 11 inmates would be so miniscule as to make practically no difference whatsoever in the over-all cost of running our system.

One recent estimate of the marginal cost of keeping one more inmate in our federal penitentiaries worked out the additional cost for food, clothing, sanitary supplies and daily wages at just over $3.50 per day. This marginal cost may even be less than the special costs of trying, appealing, detaining under special guard and executing those found guilty of capital murder, as was suggested before the United States Senate committee on the death penalty and by such authorities as the late Governor Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas and former Governor Pat Brown of California.

I have argued today that there are two major themes of debate on the subject of capital punishment: the first is an argument over means, the second over values. I have examined briefly each of the attendant arguments on these two major themes and would refer hon. members to my full text for a more detailed examination of the arguments involved.

As a result of these arguments I am convinced that hon. members will see that the retention of capital punishment is not only ineffective but that it may actually be counter productive to the goal of protecting the Canadian public against murder.

When we examine the question objectively, and when we study the evidence closely, logically, and with an open mind, then the conclusion we must reach, if we are to discharge our responsibility to the Canadian people as legislators of sound and effective laws, is that capital punishment must be abolished in Canada now, and that this bill should be passed.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that in the four times that I have participated in the debate in connection with the abolition of capital punishment, back to the time of Prime Minister Diefenbaker up to this evening's commencement, that I too, as I am sure all hon. members do, have approached the matter with a logical and open mind, even though my views differ with those of the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand). I only hope that all members do not follow his example, and I say this without intending to be offensive to him—in attempting to be short, don't overshoot by ten or 15 minutes. My speech is going to be brief, as my speeches usually are in this House.

I am a retentionist and will be voting against the bill. I want to make clear at the outset that I, as with other members of this party, will be speaking for myself. All members in this party who will be participating in this debate will be speaking their own minds and will be voting as they see fit.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (2040)

Mr. Nielsen: I dare say there will be members opposite telling us that since this is a free vote the same will be the case with respect to members on their side also. Mr. Speaker, I am a cynic and I don't believe that, although I am prepared, as is customary in this place, to accept any hon. member's word to the contrary. I cannot see all those ambitious members sitting on the back benches over there

going against the cabinet, and the cabinet in this case is 100 per cent behind the Solicitor General in favour of the abolition of the death penalty.

Mr. Allmand: What about your leader?

Mr. Nielsen: The Solicitor General asks: what about your leader? I can tell him that this party is, as it were, split when it comes to the support or non-support of the bill before us.

An hon. Member: So are we.

Mr. Nielsen: Members over there say "So are we", but I cannot accept that.

Mr. Sharp: We accept your view. You accept ours.

Mr. Nielsen: When I see that the cabinet is absolutely solid on the question I cannot imagine the mass of those backbenchers over there—and they are all ambitious people—going against the will of the cabinet.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): A lot of bull.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Marchand) says it is a lot of bull. It is not a lot of bull.

Mr. Sharp: Why not get down to your argument?

Mr. Nielsen: I am merely making the point that there will not be the kind of free expression of opinion from the benches opposite that we have been led to believe, just as there was not the last time we discussed this matter. It is just not going to happen.

Mr. Allmand: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, right now the hon. member is questioning the motives of members who voted in the last debate on capital punishment and he is questioning the motives which will lead them to vote on this particular bill. I do not think that is right. I believe members in all parties will vote in such a way as to give free expression of their views on the issue. I do not think it is proper for the hon. member to question why people will vote one way or the other.

An hon. Member: What about the cabinet?

Mr. Sharp: They have consciences, the same as you have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The minister will agree that it is very difficult for the Chair to prevent an hon. member from passing a judgment as to the reasons for which members are going to vote. I hope the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) will soon come to the subject matter of the bill. I do not think that reflections which are of a general nature can be forbidden. I believe the hon. member was referring to the procedures surrounding this debate, and in my view he should be allowed to do so.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me make this perfectly clear. I am not attempting to cast a reflection on the vote of any particular member, because that would be offensive to our rules; I am simply making a few observations with respect to the approach taken toward the free-vote aspect of this debate. To put it very simply, there is not going to be the kind of free vote over there as will be the case on this side of the House.

Mr. Lee: You will see that this vote is free.

Mrs. Holt: This vote is free. I will be voting free on this.

Mr. Nielsen: I have no doubt that that one particular vote is going to be free; none at all.

The Solicitor General will, I am sure, review the statistics, as no doubt other members intend to do. In my opinion that is a useless basis for argument. I do not think any more can be said than has been said in the three previous debates on this subject. Nonetheless I do not endorse the point of view expressed in one of the newspaper editorials tonight—I believe it was in the Ottawa *Citizen*—that closure should be imposed; that was the course this newspaper advocated on the ground that everything has been said which could possibly be said and therefore we should vote and get on with it. I happen to agree with the latter part of the suggestion, but I also believe members should have an opportunity to speak. However, those speeches, I believe, should be brief so that we need not be here until mid-July or mid-August.

No doubt those responsible for government strategy had the vacation in mind when they put the bill before us at this time. Speeches should be kept brief for that simple reason.

One can use the statistics the Solicitor General has exposed tonight to support an argument either for or against the retention of capital punishment. I do not intend to deal with those statistics but I am going to maintain that the death penalty is a deterrent. Obviously the government does not share that view, although I am sure the vast majority of the people of Canada do share it. The most recent polls certainly seem to support that contention.

I certainly do not put down the vast majority of Canadian public opinion as the Solicitor General attempted to do tonight, by inference if not directly, as being illogical or ill-reasoned, or opinion which is the product of closed minds. Simply because our opinion does not agree with his does not mean it is illogical, it does not mean that it has been reached with a closed mind, or that it has been formed by bias or prejudice on one side.

Mr. Allmand: I did not even mention public opinion in my remarks.

Mr. Nielsen: I will accept that statement, but the hon. gentleman did generalize by referring to "those on the other side of the argument", which includes that segment of the public which holds differing views.

My belief that the death penalty is a deterrent has its roots in my early experience in the Armed Forces. There are not too many of us left in this House who served in World War II. And there are not many of us, if any, who were not scared proverbially every time we came face to face with situations in that war which might cause death. In my activities, as someone required to fly over enemy territory and shoot and drop bombs and so on, there was never a moment when death was not a constant companion or when I was not frightened of meeting the spectre of death. I maintain that every one of us, or at least every

normal one of us—I do not know how many that eliminates on the other side—would react in the same way.

There is not one normal human being on the face of the earth who does not fear death. I do not believe this can be gainsaid. One is therefore led to the conclusion, probably over-simplistic, that death must be a deterrent. No one is going to attempt to cross the tracks at a subway station if he sees a train is coming. No one is going to open the door of an aircraft flying at 30,000 feet if he believes that by so doing he is bound to fall out. No one would do a rash, foolish act if they thought death would result.

● (2050)

It may be that because medicine and law stand widely apart these days the provisions of the Criminal Code do not adequately provide for the treatment of those who commit murder, of those who are not absolutely normal. I am speaking of the legal definition of insanity and the medical definition of insanity. Perhaps they should be brought closer together, but that is another matter. However, it seems to me there are a large number of murders committed by persons who, even medical science would agree, are normal but for the commission of the crime of murder on their part. To them I say the death penalty is a deterrent.

I know the government does not believe this for a number of reasons, one being its recent rejection of the bill of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) respecting the carrying of firearms. The right hon. gentleman by his bill, which is on the order paper, wants a mandatory five year term imposed on any person caught with a firearm in his possession during the commission of a criminal offence. I say that is a deterrent. Before individuals commit a crime with a firearm in their possession I suggest they will think twice, knowing that if they are caught they will serve an additional five years in prison on conviction, quite apart from the sentence imposed on them for committing the actual crime.

It may be over-simplistic, Mr. Speaker, but I also believe that people will think twice about committing murder if they know that on conviction the death penalty awaits them. That is the conclusion I have reached, and I have not been swayed otherwise by the last debate on capital punishment or the two previous debates through which I have sat and listened to all the statistics and arguments pro and con.

The Solicitor General says that an examination of the evidence—and I am sure he has read volumes of it—reveals that capital punishment is no more effective than other means in deterring crime. One can cite the same statistics and adopt the same philosophy for saying that an examination of the evidence reveals there is no other more effective method of deterring murder than capital punishment. You can go around in an ever-repetitive circle in the statistical argument.

I believe my argument may be best summed up for the most part by a letter that I received very recently in the mail, as did all hon. members, from a Vancouver solicitor in connection with the recent murder there of Doreen Garbutt. He writes as of April 7 last:

At this most important time in the parliamentary debate concerning amendment to the criminal law and, seemingly incidentally, concerning capital punishment, I thought you might wish to consider the recent murder of Doreen Garbutt in Vancouver.

Doreen had risen to be office manager in a local company and was indeed a very charming, intelligent, hardworking woman who participated actively in voluntary community affairs. My wife and I considered her to be a most delightful friend as did the hundreds of others who attended her funeral.

One day, a few weeks ago, a former employee of Doreen's employer, who had been fired and who had threatened the employer, brought a rifle—

In my own parenthesis I say not a "handgun".

—into Doreen's office and killed her instantly in her chair. So much for a meaningful, worthwhile 35 year old; death instantly, at the hands of a man who then said; "that's my kind of justice".

This murderer will receive all the protection and help that our law has provided. He will be treated politely, will be well fed, well housed, given psychiatric examination and help, should he need it, and will be provided with competent counsel. He may then be convicted and jailed after which he will probably be paroled.

Even with our law as it is, this murderer could never be executed. Even with our law as it is, no murderer is executed in Canada because our federal cabinet abuses at least the intent of the law and commutes every sentence of death. The cabinet does not follow the law—it willfully disregards the law and for individual, personal reasons, collectively applied, it refuses execution for all convicted murderers.

Again I say in parenthesis, as it has been doing for the last seven to nine years.

And so it is that a bill is now before parliament which is not a "free" vote with respect to capital punishment because the issue of capital punishment is protectively cloaked in deliberate confusion by that same cabinet which ignores the law today.

I do not wish to make Doreen Garbutt a martyr to any cause, I do not believe she would wish to be. I do wish to point out that any person who has killed any other and who has been given the protection of the police and judicial systems which Canadians previously enjoyed and who is then determined sane and then on final court appeal, found guilty of that killing, has received every reasonable human and humane consideration.

It is my opinion that the convicted killer should then be put to death. I do not approve of hanging because I believe it to be unnecessarily cruel—the least cruel, least sensational, method of all should be used.

You may, or may not, agree with my opinion but at least I can speak freely. You, as a representative of your constituents, do not have the freedom I have because the bill ties your hands. It has been seen fit to present a bill to you which refuses you the "free" vote promised.

I urge you to defeat the bill presently before you and require the government to provide you with an opportunity for a truly "free" vote on capital punishment. At that same time, by additional legislation, the permissiveness now so evident in our criminal law could be restrained.

I might close on that note, Mr. Speaker. How does the cabinet, let alone the Solicitor General, expect me to lend credibility to his argument when he and his colleagues in cabinet have for so many years been willfully disregarding the law which they themselves presented to parliament and provided the majority for its passage?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nielsen: It is indicative of the malaise which pervades this cabinet not only with respect to its approach to this debate but—

Mr. Allmand: That is not true.

Mr. Nielsen: The Solicitor General says that is not true, but its actions speak louder than its words. Not one killer of a prison guard or policeman has been executed since the first law was passed in 1963.

Mr. Allmand: All in accordance with the law.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not argue for a moment that those commutations have not been within the law, but what the cabinet has been doing is abusing the prerogative which lies in its hands to commute sentences which the members of the ministers own party in this parliament decided should be applied to the murderers of prison guards and policemen.

Mr. Allmand: Only five since 1968.

● (2100)

Mr. Nielsen: They quote statistics. If I could be heard, Sir, may I say that the number does not make a particle of difference. What is important is what the cabinet is doing. It is evident from the fact of the public statement the Solicitor General has made that there will not be an execution while he is Solicitor General.

Mr. Allmand: I never said that.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not think—

Mr. Allmand: If you want to hang somebody, get somebody else to do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member for the Yukon should be heard.

Mr. Nielsen: Again in response to the rather emotional outburst by the Solicitor General may I say I do not wish to provoke him. Even less do I want to provoke the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt). I certainly do not want to become involved in that kind of situation.

We are not arguing in this debate the question of hanging or not hanging. We are arguing whether or not there are justifiable reasons for the maintenance of the death penalty. Let us not colour it with the method of achieving that.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Are you ashamed of the means?

Mr. Nielsen: In case the hon. member did not hear me, I believe that the death penalty is a deterrent. It is that simple. Because of that I am not ashamed of voting in favour of the death penalty in cases of the deliberate murder of individuals, the premeditated deliberate murder of individuals. I am not ashamed at all.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: If the hon. member holds the opposite view, I respect absolutely that view. I do not wish to become involved in an emotional partisan split here in this debate. However, there are those of us who believe the death penalty should be retained, just as there are others who believe, just as deeply and just as sincerely, that it should be abolished. I am simply stating the reasons why I believe it should be retained.

I believe the death penalty is a deterrent. I have no knowledge to believe it is not. It seems logical to me that, since every human being has a fear of death, if this is on the law books it will make a person think twice before planning to kill someone deliberately. The statistics really are not convincing to me. They can be used either way.

Having said, and having promised the House, that I would be brief, I shall resume my seat after once again emphasizing the fact that those who follow me in this debate from this party will be speaking from the depths of their convictions on a personal basis and not on a party basis. That is the way the vote will go over here. I would hope there will be a change on the opposite side from the previous situation. I would hope hon. members opposite will swallow their ambition and vote from their beliefs at this one time and freely express their opinions.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I share one thing with the last speaker, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). This is the fourth debate in which I have participated on this subject of capital punishment. Having agreed with him that far, may I say I agree with very little else he said.

There is, of course, a danger of repetition. It is reasonable also to anticipate that in a matter of such emotional content it will be difficult to imagine that the attitudes of members will be much changed by the speeches made in this House. Nevertheless it is one of the most solemn obligations we have as members of parliament to deal with this issue as wisely as we know how.

In my party we agreed with the view that the subject matter, being clearly one of principle, members should be permitted to vote freely according to their consciences. It is nevertheless a fact that a common approach among the members of my party has brought all members of our party to the same view, namely, that we should vote for the bill and in favour of ending capital punishment.

In this debate I shall be speaking for myself, and other members of my party will be speaking for themselves. We understand why there are so many in society who believe that capital punishment is a necessary protection for human life and who believe, however unpalatable it may be, that the state should deliberately take the lives of individuals, and that this must be done in order to protect society. If we believed that society could be so protected we would have to support capital punishment; but after the closest and most careful study we are satisfied that capital punishment does not discourage crime nor is it the most effective deterrent. If it is not an effective deterrent, there is no excuse for it.

We reject the view that the state should impose capital punishment to satisfy public demand for vengeance. It is perfectly true that the death penalty may deter some. It is equally clear that life imprisonment may deter some. The facts on record are beyond dispute that on balance the death penalty does not perform the function its supporters claim.

A British royal commission on capital punishment noted that a study from many countries showed there was no definite evidence that the abolition of capital punishment led to an increase in the murder rate. Studies have been made in neighbouring states of the United States of a somewhat similar nature. Some of these states had abolished capital punishment and some had not. Similar studies were made of states and provinces in Australia. A study was made in two adjoining provinces, one of which had abolished capital punishment and the other which had not. All these studies indicated that the rise and fall of the

murder rate were just about the same in the states which had abolished capital punishment as in those which had not. So the death penalty was not a determining factor.

Two eminent penologists, Barnes and Teeters, in the book "New Horizons in Criminology", state:

History reveals the most varied and numerous proofs—

I underline the word "proofs".

—that there is no correlation between the severity of the criminal code and the infrequency of crime. The statistics which we have available show that there is no ground whatever for holding that the murder rate increases when the death penalty is abolished.

Canadian studies have produced precisely the same conclusion.

The chairman of the British commission, Sir Ernest Gowers, was originally a supporter of capital punishment, but after presiding over the commission for four years and hearing expert witnesses, he became an abolitionist. He referred to the situation in Belgium where the results were so conclusive that further argument has been silenced and the lesson seems to have been learned, he said, that the best way to have respect for human life is to refrain from taking it in the name of the law.

Sweden formally abolished capital punishment in 1902, and I believe has one of the lowest murder rates in the world. It has one of the lowest rates of homicide of any country in the world. I was speaking to Swedish members of parliament and they told me there is no pressure whatever to reinstate capital punishment in that country.

● (2110)

Many hon. members here may recall that in the past in Canada the crime of rape was a criminal offence. The death penalty was abolished in Canada in April, 1955, and the maximum penalty of life imprisonment was substituted for it. Since that day there has been a steady fall in the convictions for that offence. Once again it is perfectly obvious that the death penalty was not an effective deterrent. Are we to ignore these facts, or should we take facts into account in making our judgment on this solemn matter? I suggest that we are obliged by conscience and common sense to have regard to the clear facts of the situation.

It was almost 13 years ago that the British House of Commons declared by a majority vote that the death penalty for murder no longer accords with the true needs or interests of a civilized society. One could go on and on with statistics, but the picture is indeed clear enough.

There is one aspect of the matter which should not be overlooked. I think the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) mentioned it. I have and I retain a deep respect for the administration of justice in Canada, and believe that it is of the utmost importance to the maintenance of law and order in a decent society that we should respect the law and those who are appointed to administer it. But this does not mean that there is not a real possibility of error. The courts themselves can make mistakes and sometimes make them.

Indeed, as one who practised before the courts for nearly 40 years, I personally know of cases in which the courts did in fact make mistakes. One of the best known cases was in England, the Christie case, where a man was executed after having been found guilty of murder, and only some years later did the person who committed the crime admit his guilt and demonstrate beyond doubt that the court had erred. There is a finalty about the death penalty which makes it impossible to correct such errors.

I was very familiar with the case of Steven Truscott who escaped capital punishment when he was found guilty of murder only because he was 14 or 15 years of age. I followed that case closely, and in my belief the dissenting judgment of Mr. Justice Hall in the Supreme Court of Canada was correct and the majority judgment of that court was wrong. Perhaps my judgment is wrong in respect of this case, but the possibility of error is very real and it is inconsistent with capital punishment.

The Solicitor General has already referred to P. C. Leslie Maitland who in 1973 was shot and died. He was a constituent of mine, and so is his wife. Naturally there was great indignation about the murder for he was a very fine police officer. I have received, and handed to the Solicitor General, a letter from Mrs. Maitland who now resides in Scotland. I have a slightly fuller version of the letter than the one which the Solicitor General read to the House. I have her permission to quote the letter, which reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Brewin:

I learned from my brother-in-law that the man who killed my husband P. C. Leslie Maitland last February 1st, has now been sentenced to death. I would like you to know that the views of myself and my husband's family, on capital punishment, remain unchanged. We are totally against it. It would not bring Leslie back and it is too easy a way out for all of us. Society condemns murder, but is willing to accept the murder of this man, in the name of justice. Please do what you can to prevent this terrible second crime, before it is too late. Abolitionists may be in the minority but we still have the right to be heard. You can count on me, and my family to do anything possible to help. In no way do I wish to interfere with the course of justice and the safety of an already overworked police department, but the killing of this man would be completely foreign to all the moral standards of both my late husband and myself.

I have received, and I am sure all other members have, a number of messages from constituents, some for and some against capital punishment, but frankly I regard Mrs. Maitland's letter as one of the most cogent influences on my decision.

I want to mention another matter. Quite a few of the letters I have received have invoked religion and the Bible in support of capital punishment. The fact of the matter is, however, that nearly all the major churches have clearly and emphatically repudiated capital punishment. Included in these are the Roman Catholic church, or at least many of its spokesmen, the Anglican, Presbyterian, United, Baptist and Mennonite churches, and many others such as the Society of Friends.

I believe that the ancient precepts in the Old Testament which are quoted as supporting capital punishment were written when a barbaric system prevailed. Indeed the writers of those words were progressive. They sought to restrict the desire for vengeance to the person responsible for some crime and not invoke it and promote feuds between warring families. But they did not confine the notion of capital punishment to murder, nor did they confine the passage in the Bible in which they referred to murder but included such offences as cursing one's parents, trespassing on a neighbour, adultery, and other such

offences. Can it be seriously urged that we go back to those barbaric days?

For me the basic Christian message is contained in the spirit of compassion and mercy with which Christ treated the crime of adultery. When a woman who was clearly guilty of adultery was being stoned by her accusers, Christ said, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone". In my view this represents the voice of true religion.

All I can say to those who have written and urged me in the name of Christianity to support capital punishment is that I think they are wrong. I do not say this arrogantly but with a clear conviction. I have also received letters from social workers, and they too have expressed the view that capital punishment should be abolished.

I am well aware of the fact that as a general rule policemen are of the opinion that capital punishment protects them. But this is not a universal view. The Solicitor General has already mentioned Sir Robert Mark, the head of Scotland Yard, who in a statement published in the *Globe and Mail* on August 29 of last year called for the abolition of the death penalty.

As I am sure all other members of the House do, I respect the important function that the police have in the protection of society. Nevertheless I think many people are in danger of expecting police to fulfil a function which they are not trained or obliged to fulfil in society, that is, to make the laws. In a democratic society it is the elected members of parliament who make the laws, not policemen. We should, of course, listen to what policemen have to say, but we should not permit ourselves to accept their views automatically as to what the law should be. Their function is to enforce the law, and in my view an effective enforcement of the law, the adequate training and payment of the police, would be a more adequate protection for society than capital punishment could ever be. I do not believe that capital punishment is an effective protection for society.

I want to deal now with a matter which has been discussed, and that is the position that members of parliament should take on this issue in respect of opinions expressed to them by constituents. It is sometimes said, by means of consultation of polls, that a majority of people in a particular riding, or in Canada as a whole, favour capital punishment, and therefore it is the duty of a member of parliament to reflect this opinion. I reject this argument. It is contrary to the principles of parliamentary democracy.

Of course any sensible member of parliament and one who expects to be re-elected considers his constituents' views and is sensitive to their opinions. However, we were not elected to be computers who count heads. We were elected to use our own judgment and conscience in the interest of the society we represent. We have no right, in my opinion, to put that responsibility off or to yield to what may be a temporary majority, or indeed may not be a majority.

● (2120)

I have received letters on both sides of the question from my constituents, and I think they are fairly evenly balanced. However, in the ultimate analysis I must vote in accordance with my own conviction of what is right or wrong. If enough of my constituents reject my view, they can defeat me in an election, but they have no right to stifle my own conscience or principles. If we were all to adopt this philosophy—that it is the majority view in a constituency, when one does not know exactly how to determine, which should dictate our opinions and actions in the House—we would deprive the House of members of independence of character who are required for the job.

I have stated this clearly and can only add that this view of the functions of a member of parliament has been clearly expressed many times before. As far as I know the first expression was by the famous Conservative writer, Edmund Burke. The same opinion was expressed by Winston Churchill, and if one comes closer to home, by the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker. I am not ashamed to follow in their tradition, which I think is the true parliamentary tradition.

I regret that so many people in our society misunderstand and think that they have the right, because they believe they have a majority, to decide how we should vote. Quite recently the British House of Commons voted almost overwhelmingly for the continuing abolition of capital punishment. This was contrary to the views said by the pollsters to represent majority opinion in Great Britain. If the elected members of the mother of parliaments have the guts to stick to their convictions, I believe we in Canada should follow their example.

I should like to close with two or three quotations. The first is from the great Archbishop Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, who said:

> I believe that the example of the state taking life even when it does so in return for a life already taken does more to lower the value of human life for its citizens than the deterrent influence of this penalty can do to protect lives. In this way I believe that the main influence of the retention of the death penalty is rather to increase than diminish the numbers of murders.

I want to quote another person who has already been quoted by the Solicitor General, Professor Sellin, who indeed is a scholar and expert in this field. He said this:

> I have attempted to show that as now used capital punishment performs none of the utilitarian functions claimed by its supporters, nor can it ever be made to serve such functions. It is an archaic custom dying out through the world and ought to disappear in any civilized country.

There is one other quotation I wish to give to the House. It is a fairly lengthy one. It is a quotation from the writer Albert Camus, a very famous French writer who won the Nobel prize. He wrote an article entitled "Reflections on the Guillotine". It is true he was referring to the guillotine and not hanging, but I do not think the distinction is a very real one. He wrote this:

> Shortly before the war of 1914, an assassin whose crime was particularly repulsive (he had slaughtered a family of farmers, including the children) was condemned to death in Algiers. He was a farm worker who had killed in a sort of bloodthirsty frenzy but had aggravated his case by robbing his victims. The affair created a great stir. It was generally thought that decapitation was too mild a punishment for such a monster. This was the opinion, I have been told, of my father, who was especially aroused by the murder of the children. One of the few things I know about him, in any case, is that he wanted to witness the execution, for the first time in his life. He got up in the dark to go to the place of execution at the other end of town amid a great crowd of people. What he saw that morning he never told anyone. My mother relates merely that he came rushing home, his face distorted, refused to talk, lay down for a moment on the bed, and suddenly began to vomit. He had just discovered the reality hidden under the noble phrases with

which it was masked. Instead of thinking of the slaughtered children, he could think of nothing but that quivering body that had just been dropped onto a board to have its head cut off.

I should like to have read more, but I will not do so. I commend "Reflections on the Guillotine" by Albert Camus as a most valuable and extremely well written statement of the case.

I conclusion I wish to say that I like all hon. members of the House, am very proud to be a Canadian. I will be even more proud if we in parliament reject firmly the backward step which would be involved in the retention of capital punishment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, a moment earlier the speakers before me were saying that it was the fourth debate on capital punishment and I realized that they are older than I as I participate in the third debate on capital punishment which is the subject matter of Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Criminal Code.

In 1967, the Liberal government presented the first bill concerning the abolition of capital punishment for a five year period experiment. In 1973, the present Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) tabled Bill C-2 recommending a partial and temporary abolition for another five year period but this time, to innovate, there was an exception for murders of policemen and prison guards. The Solicitor General was probably not satisfied with the results as Statistics Canada showed that violent crimes had increased during that experimental period.

With Bill C-84 we are again discussing capital punishment for the third time in ten years but this time the Solicitor General forces more firmly upon us the view that he always had about capital punishment. He proceeded progressively but so imperturbably that if he were alone against a whole population his view would still triumph. This is why he has always refused to submit this question to a public referendum. The minister knows very well that 70 per cent of the people would oppose his old bill and he still knows today that 71 per cent of the people favour the death penalty as long as social security will not be better guaranteed by the Criminal Code. And what is even more surprising is that the Solicitor General pretends to be a democrat in a one way democracy directed from the top. Mr. Speaker, I call this dictatorship. In any case, the present minister lost all his credibility with the people as he never respected his own legislation of 1973.

● (2130)

While emphasizing in his own Bill C-2 that murderers of policemen and prison guards would be put to death, what did the Solicitor General do with all these murderers who ridiculed the act by killing a number of prison guards and policemen between 1967-72 and 1976? He himself commuted these sentences into life imprisonment. Such is the concrete result of efforts by all members here during the past years. If the minister had spent the same amount of energy on improving penitentiary system, my assurance is we would not be faced with such a prison record that is shameful for a nation as industrialized and technologically advanced as ours, because these institutions are much more in the nature of schools for crime than rehabilitation establishments. Therefore, I cannot approve the suggestion by the minister, in Bill C-84, that capital punishment should be reduced to 25, 15 and even 10 years according to the criminal's classification. Certainly within a few years we will have to follow the United States. They are considering reestablishing capital punishment that has been abolished in a number of states.

Since the tree must be known by its fruit, we cannot expect anything better if the minister keeps his portfolio for the next five years. After the law providing for capital punishment has been ignored for the past years, in cases where prison guards and policemen have been murdered, what will happen now that the sentence will be reduced to 25 years imprisonment? Everyone knows perfectly well that if the minister ignored the former restrictions, he will ignore to a greater extent still the maximum penalty of 25 or even 10 years imprisonment for first and second degree murder. I am even amazed there is no reference in the bill now before us to a third degree murder, for which a decoration would be provided.

What is discouraging in this bill, as indeed in every other one, is the total lack of any reference to the murderers' victims. The minister commiserates with the unhappy murderers but he cannot spare a thought for the latters' victims. Mr. Speaker, when will we have members humane enough to look into that difficult problem, namely the future of the murderers' victims. I have always felt the essential purpose of a legislation was the adequate protection of the general public, to ensure a safer and therefore more humane social life. This assumes elimination of troublemakers, and if possible their rehabilitation, and the redress of first or second degree damage done by such trouble makers. Finally, we need an effective and permanent policy for the diehards, since in my view they are the worst kind of mental cases there are in our psychiatric wards, with that difference that the latter are not first degree murderers. Before going any further with parole provisions, we will have to consider total reform of our Criminal Code to include rehabilitation, help for crime victims and also greater rights to police officers.

As long as we persist in shutting up our criminals in the schools of crime that our prisons now are, whether it be for two, three, four or even six years, they will come out even more rebellious, and I would even say even more refined in their future actions.

Let us stop deluding ourselves, Mr. Speaker, and let us listen to the opinions of former convicts who, after their release, found themselves homeless, with no money, with the identity of a former convict. What can such a man do under the circumstances if not go back to his former profession?

If we want to really help the convicts, let us forget about Bill C-84 and introduce in the House another bill which will allow us to make our prisons and reformatories more humane. We should first of all select convicts according to their age, their offence and their social condition. For this, we should have appropriate facilities, and, even more important, qualified personnel, including doctors, psychiatrists, nurses and social counsellors, to bring the required help to all those who can be rehabilitated, and especially those who wish to get out of their abnormal situation.

It is certainly not by arresting a young man and putting him in a cell with habitual criminals that we shall reach

our common goal. A society is made up of many elements and all its members cannot be super-intelligent beings or angels. We must therefore take it as it is, and face reality. It is certainly not by releasing someone who is not ready to reintegrate society that we can maintain peace. However, it is up to us parliamentarians to act on behalf of those who cannot express their opinions, that is the convicts themselves. Of course, there are some habitual criminals, but the very great majority can be rehabilitated if we bring them the help that they expect from us, the elected representatives of the people, and only from us, let us not forget it.

Prisons can be compared with psychiatric institutions, and this is why I firmly believe that a selection is necessary and that the people responsible must be given the necessary tools to operate a selection and give each individual a proper orientation. I have known some young people who went to prison for a small offence, or for a trivial slip, and who became then well-known bandits because of a penitentiary system which denies them any opportunity for rehabilitation.

Have we thought for one moment of this prisoner who is labelled as a bandit and who once was a little boy with very legitimate ambitions, like any other youth but for whom, during all his childhood and adolescence the streets were the only meeting place and who often had to look into garbage cans to find his food. One day, he decided to get out of his misery at all cost, even through illegal means since he already saw himself in an illegal situation. This adolescent had all the necessary qualities to become a leader, but because of the serious faults of our society, he became the leader of a gang. But is he really responsible for his situation? Whose fault is it, I ask you, hon. members, whose fault is it?

● (2140)

Conditional release is still mentioned in this bill, but in order to make it less accessible. With the experience of recent years, I do not call it conditional release, but "protectional" release, because unless an external influence, whether political, financial or other, apart from a few exceptions those releases are empty words. And I will go further, Mr. Speaker. In most cases, who is released and from what? Inmates from a smaller prison are released to go in a wider prison, but all the more fatal because of their lack of preparation. As a result they will become recidivists, for they will still prefer the walls of their earlier prison to those of incomprehension. As to assistance for victims of criminals, I repeat, our present code does not provide anything for them. Nevertheless, if the government is responsible for the welfare of the inmates, it is all the more so for that of the victims of criminals.

For example, take a father who is shot during a hold up; what is to become of his wife and children? Their pictures are taken at the funeral home, in church, and even back home from the graveyard, and then great silence. Often the families get only the meagre social welfare benefits to replace the income of the family's breadwinner shot while protecting our nice society.

Each time I witness such incidents, I wonder, in all fairness, what we are doing here. What does social justice mean to us? Mr. Speaker, why do 90 per cent of the policemen favour capital punishment? They do so for all the reasons I just mentioned, and also because policemen feel increasingly vulnerable in front of well armed criminals. Besides the risks they run with criminals, they always fear that their efforts be destroyed before the judges.

I would even say that in some cases policemen have two enemies: the first standing in front of them, namely the gangster, and the other behind him, the judge who is waiting for him. In this regard I note some of the weaknesses of the present Criminal Code, because of the restrictions it imposes on them, namely that they must warn the criminal before firing. In short, the killer must shoot first. The consequence is logical: the policemen get it first.

I personally witnessed trials which I found simply repulsive. While I was well aware of all the precautions taken by the police agents, throughout the trial one would have sworn the real gangsters were the policemen themselves. If it is their duty to see to it that the law is respected, then the judges should give them greater support in what often proves to be a thankless task. After all those considerations, I often wonder who the real criminals are: are they to be found at the top or the botton of the ladder?

If we could question every prisoner to find out what really happened, we would be surprised to find out that 90 per cent of them are in prison through society's fault, often because of some influence which is said to be unknown but that we all know full well, that of money which has forced those people to choose the less honest way out.

I certainly do not have the time to present a table of the serious faults of our society in arriving at our judicial system, nor do I have the time to go over all the arguments that were made in this House since 1967. Everyone knows quite well why we were against the previous bills and why we will be against Bill C-84. The Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) repeated tonight all the arguments we heard in the past 10 years, and I am sure that a month from now we will be able to make another volume similar to that of 1967 and that of 1965.

In all those arguments, one soon realizes that the Solicitor General has a fixed idea on the issue of capital punishment. Indeed, he will necessarily continue to use his right of veto on every future conviction, and continue to have it his own way. That is why I regret this absolutely useless discussion and we should let the Solicitor General of Canada continue to commute sentences, as he has already done, without asking for anybody's permission. When the Solicitor General talks about respecting life, did he only ask himself whether murderers ever thought about the nice theories advocated by the minister? We noticed in the inquiries into organized crime that the heads of criminal organizations have much more realistic principles than the present legislators. They have their own law, and that law is beyond appeal. You notice that gangsters do not play on words, as politicians who always fear public opinion do. They do what they think is best for their own society. So I say that if you want to fight those organizations you will not win by decorating their murderers. Let us not forget that the state is there to fully protect society, and nice speeches will not make our fellow citizens feel more secure.

Let us get down to the job of reforming our whole Criminal Code, and let us stop wasting time repeating 10 or 15 year old speeches. In the meantime, let us keep the principle of capital punishment, even if the Solicitor General has his mind set on commuting all sentences to at least reassure a bit our people who are waiting impatiently for something new in criminal legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, in view of the speech I made in the House on May 14, 1973, and the many memos and papers I prepared and distributed on the subject of capital punishment, I shall refrain from elaborating on any arguments with which I dealt in the past. My approach means that many substantive points relating to capital punishment per se will not be made in this particular speech. I have chosen, instead, to deal with six aspects of the problem relating to capital punishment and crime in Canada: first, the general attitude of the public toward violence; second, my general approach to peace and security; third, the exaggerated perception of violence in society and one of its primary causes; fourth, the facts relating to violent crime in Canada, as I have determined through research; fifth, the new peace and security package, and a critique on it; lastly, capital punishment itself, on which subject I intend to make a few remarks.

Events in the past few years have created a condition in which the public are demanding sterner measures for the prevention of crime and the retention of criminals. Public clamour for sterner measures is both understandable and justifiable. The public's clamour and concern stem largely from the following considerations, as I see them: a perceived increase in violent and other types of criminal activity; a feeling that the criminal law is too lax that the judicial system imposes too light a punishment for many crimes that our prisons are insecure that our parole system is too lax in granting paroles generally and that temporary leaves and day passes are abused that the government itself is hesitant if not downright opposed to implementing capital punishment even when it is on our law books and that there is too much consideration for the criminal and too little consideration for the victim and society as a whole.

● (2150)

There is a feeling that dangerous criminals are too readily released on bail. There is a feeling that more emphasis is given to the rehabilitation of criminals rather than the protection of society. There is a general rebellion against the permissive society that all of us have lived through since the end of World War II. My approach to the general disposition of society largely parallels the concerns as I perceive them to be.

I am convinced that the vast majority of Canadians want to be assured that they and their children will be safe on our streets and not become the victims of criminal activity. I am inclined to believe that what we really need is new and tougher legislation covering a broad range of criminal offences, not just murder. I think the public to some extent feel that capital punishment through some miraculous means will in fact achieve those objectives. There are others, and there are many parliamentarians among that group, who feel that in fact the retention of capital punishment will not facilitate the return to a more peaceful and secure society.

We must be assured that those who are imprisoned for criminal offences are held in institutions which are secure. That is self evident. We must also be assured that our parole boards do not grant temporary paroles or temporary leaves to prisoners if their release into society would pose a threat to the peace and security of the public at large.

We must take steps to guarantee that our law enforcement officers at every level are given adequate protection under the law and are provided with an appropriate legislative base so that they may perform their function of protecting society effectively.

We must ensure that our prisons are secure and that prison guards are given the maximum degree of protection in the performance of their dangerous work.

We must review our rehabilitation procedures so that the term of imprisonment itself will be conducive to rehabilitation. We must have special provision in the law to deal with the case of the "habitual criminal" so that such persons will not be released into society at the termination of a sentence if the court feels that they will constitute a continuing threat to the community as a whole.

The whole Criminal Code needs to be reviewed to ensure that penalties match the crime and to guarantee that sentences will be served so that we can maximize the deterrent effect of the criminal law. We need appropriate and reasonable control of firearms in our society so that we can minimize the incidents of their misuse. I have spoken more specifically on firearm control in a separate speech in the House of Commons and I will not go into detail on that today.

We require bail reform to ensure that bail is not granted to individuals whose release pending sentence would be a threat to society. We need to re-define first and second degree murder, and to increase substantially the pre-parole period for such offences. Police powers need to be substantially increased to assist them in successfully combating organized crime. In order to give more emphasis to crime prevention we need to broaden government activities by every level of government.

Efforts must be increased to identify the causes of alienation within our society which give rise to anti-social behaviour. Concentrated effort must be put forward to restore public confidence in the criminal law and its application through the courts and our law enforcement agencies. These and other things have to be done if we are to have a peaceful and secure society. However, governments and members of parliament must not only take into account the reality of the situation but also bear in mind the general attitude of our people.

Many Canadians are deeply disturbed by a persistent belief that their governments and institutions are "soft" on crime; there is a belief that there is more concern for the criminal than the victim. Neither of these beliefs are adequately based on fact. However, in a democratic free society the facts are almost irrelevant. The perception of the public is extremely important and governments and our institutions must behave in such a way as to restore their fundamental confidence.

Aside from taking the measures already outlined, we must also take positive action to prevent the occurrence of crime. This is a very complex subject area and to deal with it we need to reconsider our present approach to education, mental health, recreational and employment opportunities, and a broad host of social measures. The conditions that give rise to young people turning to crime should be eliminated. The proposals for legislative change inherent in the preceding suggestions are reasonable but tough measures to provide greater security in our society. Such measures, however, will not satisfy everyone because some in our society have an exaggerated perception of the problem of violence in society. Radio, television, and the press have created in the minds of many a situation where they believe that there is more violence than actually exists.

A friend and constituent, Ann Farquhar, forwarded me the April, 1976, edition of *Psychology Today*. In that issue there was a research article dealing with violence on TV. The thrust of this article indicates that one of the more far-reaching effects of violence on television is to create a condition where people equate the violence they see on TV to the real world around them.

Violence on television thus has a two-fold effect. First, it suggests that violence is the appropriate and traditional means of settling disputes. Second, it creates in the heavy TV viewer a feeling that the world in reality is as violent as he sees it on television. This fear, the article indicates, may also bring increasing demands for police protection and election of law and order politicians. This has already happened.

I will continue later and call it ten o'clock now, Mr. Speaker.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF PLANNING FOR IMPROVED SURVEILLANCE, SEARCH AND RESCUE IN VIEW OF POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION TO 200 MILES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-Ste. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question which I directed to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) on April 8 is important enough to take up a lot more time than that which is allotted tonight. The planning and implementation of a surveillance policy for Canada involves air-sea rescue and the patrol capability, not only to protect fishing vessels, but on a much broader base.

In his reply the minister stated that the imposition and extension of a 200 mile limit was hypothetical. However, he knows that Canada will declare either a 200 mile fisheries or economic zone and that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) and the Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc) must now be making plans for such a course of action because there is little likelihood the Law of the Sea Conference now drawing to a close in New York will achieve international agreement.

The reason I continually raise the question of surveillance is because it appears that not too many appreciate the mission that Canada must undertake to provide a surveillance capacity and the enormous funding that will be required if one can imagine the area that will have to be patrolled. We must recognize the size of Canada, the length of its coastline, the massive extent of the part of the globe we occupy. We are far from ready to provide the surveillance which is required even though the minister has told us that the Department of National Defence plans to increase the amount of equipment available for this purpose.

● (2200)

Looking over the various departments concerned I find that the available strength is far below what is required. For example, the Canadian Coastguard Service operates 10 offshore cutters of between 70 feet and 224 feet, only one 33 foot shore based hovercraft, six 40-foot shore based launches, nine 15-foot inflatable inshore rescue boats, 14 44-foot lifeboats, and 33 helicopters which can respond only under ideal weather conditions. In addition, the Coastguard operates 65 other vessels with a secondary search and rescue role.

The Department of the Environment is increasing its inadequate patrol capability with a 205-foot helicopter-equipped patrol vessel, and two high speed aluminum patrol boats.

Moving to the navy, I feel I should quote from articles written by two of our learned retired admirals. This is what Vice-Admiral J. C. O'Brien had to say:

> It is vital for us to invest in a strong navy with a realistic number of aircraft if we are to exhibit a real presence in all the ocean areas for which we consider ourselves responsible. I have always suggested a strong naval capability to at least 1500 miles off our coasts and this requires a much bigger effort than we are exerting now.
>
> Clearly, we must have more ships. But the most direct way to meet this shortcoming initially would be to implement a composite plan involving a common fleet in which naval aircraft, support ships and destroyers would team up with a force of armed trawlers manned by a para-military reserve. This reserve would, I suggest, be directed by the navy because only the navy has the command and control facilities as well as the professional know-how to undertake the responsibility.

The writer goes on to recommend the formation of other para-military forces.

My second quotation is from an article by Rear-Admiral R. W. Timbrell who says:

> For a number of years our government has expounded that both in the national and the world's interest our seabed out in the continental shelf or at least two hundred miles will be preserved and protected, and the point is rapidly approaching where this must be accepted either at this month's resumption of the Law of the Sea Conference (now taking place in New-York) or by unilateral action.
>
> Such action will be meaningless unless we are prepared to provide a visible force of sufficient credibility in size and determination to enforce our declaration effectively. These forces will be required to patrol hundreds of thousands of square miles frequently and must be able to follow up immediately with on-the-spot investigation. The occasional patrol is clearly insufficient and of little value in view of the vastness of the area to be surveyed and the difficulties encountered in all the forms of weather to be found off Canada's seaboard. It would be simple, say, for a large group of foreign fishing trawlers with their

factory ships to move into a declared area, reap a harvest of fish in 12-24 hours and proceed outside the national limits without being spotted, let alone apprehended, unless we provide constant patrols and presence.

The time allotted to me does not allow me to refer to more examples. It is obvious that with the task force report due to surface by this summer, and following the recommendations from the Canadian Coastguard, there must be co-ordination of effort on the part of all. The report to which I have referred should be carefully considered by a joint committee at which time witnesses such as Rear-Admiral Timbrell and Vice-Admiral O'Brien should be heard. My colleague tells me that the Americans now have a contingency plan. We must plan to improve surveillance immediately and must consider the report since in the very near future we will have to provide a massive capability, requiring a massive infusion of funds, to protect not only our fishing resources but our oil and mineral resources, as well as to build up the economy of Canada and—

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

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to say that I think the hon. member is quite right to question the capability of Canada to patrol and survey, as well as provide search and rescue facilities in, an expanded zone off our coasts. However, when he put his question in the House on April 8 the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) made it clear at that time that the various departments involved are preparing plans to carry out that task. He also made it clear that, as the need arose, additional equipment would be acquired to carry out the tasks referred to by the hon. member.

In his question the hon. member referred to foreign fishing fleets operating in our economic zone if and when we declare a 200 mile limit, and I share his view that we will definitely declare such a zone. I agree this is a legitimate concern. However, it is worthy of note, I think, that perhaps the best way to preserve our fishing stocks, particularly in that expanded zone, is through negotiated agreements and then being able, following agreement, to put them in force. Canada has already negotiated agreements with the four major fishing nations off our coasts. I think it is also worth nothing that some figures I saw the other day, which I believe the hon. member also saw, indicated that it was not foreign fishing fleets off our shores but Canadian vessels which were the biggest offenders in regard to the ICNAF quotas.

I should also point out that at the present time the boundaries of Canada's search and rescue responsibility are much larger than the 200 mile zone, and they are recognized both by the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Consultative Organization. The military air search facilities for which my minister is responsible are located at Summerside, P.E.I., right at the hub of the active search area, and as I say they cover a far greater area than 200 miles.

While the 200 mile economic zone has not yet been established, the Department of National Defence is making plans to cover this is limit adequately once it is established. Planning is being conducted with the Department of the Environment. Surveillance of the zone will be conducted by increasing the number of ship days at sea and by increasing the number of aircraft patrols over areas of interest.

I also point out that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) has undertaken to study marine rescue and has advised the House that he will be reporting on planned improvements before mid-summer. I cannot speak for him tonight; we will have to await his announcement before mid-summer with regard to increased marine capability.

In closing I want to thank the hon. member for asking the question, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to put on record the fact that plans are being carried out to cover—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the parliamentary secretary but his allotted time has expired.

TRANSPORT—POSSIBLE ABANDONMENT OF RAIL SERVICE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO AVOID CRISIS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, the question I am raising tonight is a follow-up to the question I put to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) on March 26 having to do with the possibility of rail line abandonment in Prince Edward Island. The importance of this subject has been stressed as recently as last Saturday, in an article in the *Globe and Mail* on Prince Edward Island's rail situation, entitled "Railways in Danger."

● (2210)

At the time I put my question on March 26 I asked the Minister of Transport mainly to comment on the statements made on more than one occasion by the provincial minister of highways with regard to the very serious situation concerning the railroad in Prince Edward Island, and the report which came from one of the minister's colleagues, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard) before the Standing Committee on Regional Development, a report which said that the situation in respect of transportation in Prince Edward Island was in fact reaching a crisis stage and should be dealt with very shortly if we were not to be faced with a situation which would literally be irreversible. The reason I raise this matter again this evening is that apparently there have been meetings between the Minister of Transport and the provincial minister of highways, Mr. Stewart.

Perhaps it would be useful to give the nature of the problem in brief form through quotations which have appeared in articles over the last month and a half. I shall quote first from the *Globe and Mail* of last Saturday which is perhaps the best article at this stage in respect of the situation as it pertains to Prince Edward Island. It states:

Prince Edward Island, the first province to have all its steam locomotives replaced by diesels and the first to lose passenger service, may soon be the first to do without the railway entirely.

At a glance, the rail system looks adequate. True, 22 of 27 railway stations have been closed but derelict stations are national landmarks. And, although Canadian National hopes to gain permission from the Canadian Transport Commission to scrap a couple of branch lines this

year, there are still more than 200 miles of track, down only 20 or 30 miles from the railway's peak.

However,—

This is really the important part of the question before us this evening.

—the railbeds have been allowed to deteriorate to the point where all trains are forced to move at a crawl and the ancient and inadequate cars relegated to hauling island produce are being scrapped at the rate of more than 100 a year.

The situation has been reported in the provincial legislature at its sessions this year. Again I am quoting from an article in the Summerside *Journal*. It refers to a statement by Mr. Stewart:

'The handwriting is on the wall,' he said, 'road bed maintenance has deteriorated with all trains running on' "slow order". He said in some cases there are areas where train traffic is slowed down to 10 miles per hour on road beds.

Unfortunately this is not a new but rather a continuing situation which indicates again the lack of study and the totally dreadful approach taken by the CNR in respect of its obligation to Prince Edward Island. I say it is doubly disturbing not only because this Crown corporation is committed to providing some form of national railway service, and it has certainly shown a great default in this instance, but in addition there is the fact that one of the major commitments the federal government made at the time of Confederation in 1873 was not only to maintain a continuous ferry service from Prince Edward Island to the mainland but also to provide a train service to transport basic Island produce.

This is the situation which confronts the government today. I think it should take swift and definite action in respect of the CNR. It is perhaps a little ironic that we are discussing this matter at a time when the CNR has already announced increases up to 69 per cent on the car ferry service operating between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. This is a case in which the CNR has definitely defaulted on its obligation.

One of the reasons why I put this question down for the adjournment debate—and I do not like to say this—is the rather cavalier attitude of the Minister of Transport. His answer to me on March 26 was:

Mr. Speaker, we always attempt to analyse trends in traffic and to look ahead to the steps that have to be taken to accommodate them, and this is what we are doing in this case.

That, Mr. Speaker, is no assurance at all. It is a denial of the federal government's obligation and responsibility.

It is a well known fact that there is no way possible—and the minister of highways reaffirmed this in the legislature recently—in which we can make an orderly transfer from the utilization of the railroad traffic both to move our basic produce out of the province or to bring in items to P.E.I., except perhaps over a five to ten year period. Both the time period required to upgrade the highways and to handle the amount of increased traffic that would occur through lack of railroads as well as additional cost, which would certainly be in the order of $20 million or more, would make it an almost prohibitive option at this time. Therefore I trust that my good friend, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale), parliamentary secretary to the minister, will be able to assure me and the people of P.E.I. tonight that in fact the government is taking definite action to make sure that CNR does not achieve by its neglect the total abandonment of railroad service in P.E.I.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, to begin with I must say I regret the reference which the hon. member has made to some sort of cavalier attitude on the part of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) in this situation, or in any situation with regard to transportation matters in Canada. His attitude is surely not that, as I think has been amply demonstrated in the House and in public forums outside the House, and certainly at his meetings with his provincial counterparts from the Atlantic region and other regions. I regret indeed any inference to the effect that his attitude can be interpreted in any way as being cavalier. It is a very serious one, and he does wish very much indeed to develop in this country from coast to coast the very best kind of transportation system that we can possibly develop.

My hon. friend on March 26 first raised this issue concerning the possible abandonment of rail service by CNR in Prince Edward Island. I would like to assure the House that no application has been made by CNR to the Canadian Transport Commission for such an abandonment.

May I also assure the House, and my hon. friend as well, that both the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act seek to protect shippers for the sake of the public interest with respect to the provision of essential services. That is to say that within the normal process that is established by statute, railway services are not allowed to be abandoned unilaterally by the railways. The railways must first make an application to the CTC and then, as hon. members know, the CTC holds public hearings in the national interest, and one of the key matters which is always considered is whether or not an alternative transportation facility or service is available to the area being served. Only after such hearings, and after due consideration has been given to the provision of alternative means would the CTC make a decision on an application.

At this point there is only one CN application in front of the CTC for the abandonment of nine miles of spur track. A hearing on this 1972 application has tentatively been scheduled by the CTC for later this year, but this will depend on priorities, such as passenger hearings for example.

There does not appear to be imminent danger that the existing rail system would not be adequate to meet immediate requirements. As to longer term needs, Transport Canada is working in conjunction with other federal departments, the railways, the provincial governments, and the local market boards to determine the nature and shape of an efficient and economic transportation system which could be implemented to deliver products to the major market areas. CN in conjunction with the Potato

Marketing Board is presently testing an intermodal transportation system.

Present load restrictions on highways would hamper potato movements during the spring break up period. The extent of the problem and the cost to upgrade the roads cannot be established at present until conclusions are drawn from the present testing of the intermodal system.

Generally speaking, on the question of federal support for provincial highway strengthening work in the Atlantic region, as my hon. friend knows the four provincial highway ministers, recently at a federal-provincial ministerial conference, presented a joint report to the Minister of Transport entitled, "Atlantic Provinces Primary Highways—Ten Year program". This report represents a statement of needs as seen by the Atlantic provinces, and results directly from previous federal-provincial meetings—

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

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

21804—68

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 4, 1976

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

TRADE

SUGGESTED COMMITTEE STUDY OF DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED AS RESULT OF CANADA-UNITED STATES AUTO PACT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to propose a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. This matter is the current $2 billion plus deficit Canada is running under the Canada-United States auto pact, with devastating consequences to the Canadian auto parts industry in particular and to the over-all economies of Ontario and Canada. Inasmuch as the government is not acting to deal with this crisis, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander):

That this House constitute a special committee to inquire forthwith into, report upon and make recommendations with respect to the problems and difficulties of the Canadian auto and auto parts industries under the Canada-United States auto pact.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 43 the motion requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBILITY RATIFICATION OF NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY BEING REQUIREMENT PRIOR TO SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTORS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister, particularly in view of the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. My question concerns the four countries to which Canada is committed to sell nuclear reactors, the countries being India, Pakistan, South Korea and Argentina.

In view of the fact that none of these four countries has yet ratified the non-proliferation treaty, and considering the increasing concern expressed in many quarters of this country with regard to these sales, I wonder if the Prime Minister could indicate whether in fact before any final sales occur the ratification of the non-proliferation treaty will be a requirement.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will have to inquire, but my impression is that the facts as stated by the hon. member do not explain the case as we understand it. That ratification is to come from at least one of those countries. I do not know about the others.

REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF NUCLEAR EXPORTERS' AGREEMENT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): It would be very helpful if the Prime Minister could confirm that none of them has ratified. One has initialled or signed the first part of the agreement, but none of them has ratified. In addition, in light of the increasing lassitude with which certain countries seem to be interpreting the agreement reached in London by the Nuclear Exporters' Consultative Group, would the Prime Minister reveal to the House the specific terms and conditions of this agreement, as the secrecy provisions of this particular agreement will certainly prevent any public censure being invoked when in fact the agreement is violated?

● (1410)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will discuss the matter with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Part of the agreement, of course, was reached in secret on the understanding that no one country would make the terms of it public. If the terms are being made public in a general way I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs would not object to making it public also. I would not want him to break that agreement unilaterally, however, nor would I undertake to ask him to do so.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the Prime Minister is checking into these questions I wonder if he would also inquire whether the recent agreement includes some kind of threat of collective sanctions by the exporters in terms of an embargo on future distribution of either nuclear materials or technology. I think the present situation with regard to the unwarranted secrecy makes it difficult for public opinion in this country or elsewhere to determine whether our government acted responsibly.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of the conference and the active role Canada played was predicated on the realization that it was an act of futility for one country like Canada to upgrade its safeguards unilaterally—as we did—and impose more stringent safeguards if other exporting countries of nuclear technology or ma-

terials were to continue individually to lower the safeguards. That was the purpose of the congress. As I indicated I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to inquire and I will report to the hon. member.

* * *

ENERGY

REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF AMOUNT OF LOSS ON SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR TO ARGENTINA

Mr. Allan Lawrence (Northumberland-Durham): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In light of the meeting held earlier last month when officials of the Argentinian nuclear project were brought back to Canada, presumably for discussion with the department, and in view of the minister's admission that even after renegotiation the Canadian taxpayer is going to have to pick up the multimillion dollar tab for these nuclear adventures in Argentina, can the minister now tell the Canadian public exactly how much we are going to lose on the Argentinian deal and if not, why not?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the House the other day and perhaps the hon. member was not present at that time, these matters are not yet concluded. They are still under negotiation but very substantial progress has been made.

Mr. Lawrence: A supplementary question. In view of the fact that a report commissioned by the United States energy resources development administration indicates that the Canadian vendors of nuclear power "lost their shirt" on the sale to Argentina, the sale to India and the sale to Pakistan, could the minister clarify, now that he has had these discussions on renegotiations, just exactly what progress he is talking about? How much "progress" are we losing on this matter?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has followed debate on this, as I am sure other hon. members have, he will realize that the issue is the inflation rates in the two countries. When the Argentinian commercial contract was originally negotiated there was a certain assumption about the level of inflation in Canada; unfortunately, the inflation rate turned out to be greater than the basic assumption at that time. Similarly, there was no accurate forecast of the rate of inflation in Argentina; no one foresaw at that time that the inflation rate for Argentina was going to be somewhere between 300 per cent and 400 per cent, which is what it is running at on an annual basis right now. That was the basis of the renegotiations to protect our trading interests.

Mr. Lawrence: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can we therefore assume that the cost to the Canadian taxpayer is going to be between 300 per cent and 400 per cent greater than the initial cost envisaged by the government? Is that what the minister is telling us?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member understands arithmetic. I was trying to explain the situation to him. Perhaps we could find the time outside the House when I could go through the sums with him. Clearly, the object of the exercise was to reduce the possibility of extra exposure because of inflation rates which had not been foreseen. I indicated that substantial progress had been made.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED OBJECTION OF UNITED STATES TO CANADIAN SUBSIDIARY OF PRATT-WHITNEY ENTERING INTO CONTRACT WITH ROLLS-ROYCE—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. As a result of the extra-territorial intervention of the United States Department of Justice, preliminary development work on a new engine being developed by the Canadian Pratt and Whitney Company in Montreal was recently brought to an abrupt halt. Last Friday the Prime Minister said he would investigate the situation and report to the House. Is he now in a position to do so?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that an answer was supplied to the minister, but unfortunately he is at the UNCTAD conference. I will ask the parliamentary secretary to inform himself of the answer, and perhaps tomorrow he can give it to the House.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the question involves broad, general principles which will interest the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Perhaps either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce will say what the government intends to do to ensure that the more than 1,000 jobs which would have been created in Canada in that high technology industry will not be lost. I suggest that the matter applies not only to this company, but to other companies which find themselves in a similar situation.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. member a partial answer. We have been aware of this matter for some time and have kept close watch on developments in Washington particularly. As the hon. member may know, two engines are involved, a large engine and a relatively smaller one. I understand there is no difficulty with regard to the arrangements between United Aircraft and Rolls-Royce on the larger engine but there is some question about the smaller one which is of particular interest to Canada.

There has not been a resolution of it yet; but neither has there been any development which could be classed as a prohibition or anything which would inhibit development in Canada. We are keeping a close watch on this. I assure the hon. member that we shall use whatever influence we possess and do our best to make sure that the Canadian interest is not affected adversely.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, since, as I understand, the United States Department of Justice has ruled on the matter, and, as a result, the parent company in the United States ordered its Canadian subsidiary to stop forthwith

its development work; and since that seems to be contrary to what ministers said, as, apparently, development is no longer underway, would the minister clarify the situation. Is work underway, and will it continue?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the matter is complex. I hope the hon. member will appreciate that I will be glad to give him a written explanation of the situation. To the extent that I can explain it orally, I will. I understand—I am not exactly sure of the legal word—that a more or less informal opinion was sought from the U.S. Department of Justice. In other words, it was not a formal representation. The next step—and I hope the hon. member will understand my difficulty in not wanting to be too open; I do not want to become involved at this stage in a public way—is, as I understand it, to seek a more formal ruling. That is my information. I am subject to correction but I understand that may be the next step.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON FIXING OF PRICES OF OIL

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs the following question.

In view of the fact that for two and a half years already an inquest on price fixing of petroleum products has been conducted by the federal Department of Consumer Affairs, which seems to be the most important one ever made by that ministry, would the minister indicate to the House what stage has this inquiry now reached?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall inquire tomorrow if possible, even perhaps this afternoon, and shall contact the hon. member directly.

[*English*]

EFFECT ON PRICES OF IMPORTATION OF EGGS BY MARKETING AGENCY—AGENCY CONTROL OF IMPORTS

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. As eggs were imported into Canada last week and purchased by CEMA at a price substantially lower than usual, can the minister say if this substantial saving in price is to be passed on to the Canadian consumer and, if not, why not? Does the minister believe, as his colleague the Minister of Agriculture appears to, that CEMA is justified in indirectly disobeying government policy by seeking control over licensing for egg imports?

● (1420)

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not agree that the Minister of Agriculture would condone in any way, fashion or form anybody circumventing government policy. The question is, is there a government policy? The government policy on egg imports, as I understand it, is that CEMA has 48 hours to make up any deficiency in Canadian production after which private importers, selected by IIC, have the opportunity of importing those eggs that are needed for local consumption. I do know, for instance, that the eggs sold last weekend in a local chain store in Montreal were selling at 14 cents less than the prevailing rate the week before, probably the result of importing.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

POSSIBLE INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS REGARDING IMPORTATION OF EGGS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Last week he reported that there were complaints regarding these egg transactions and imports, and that an investigation would ensue. Can the minister report to the House on the progress or otherwise of this investigation?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, last week I said that one complaint had been made to the RCMP and that they were assessing that complaint, but that no investigation would take place until they felt it was warranted. I have no information that they have proceeded further.

* * *

TRADE

IMPORTATION OF EGGS—POSSIBLE TIGHTENING OF PROCEDURES

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I will direct my final supplementary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is it the intention of the minister's department to tighten up procedures vis-à-vis applications for permits to import eggs? Can he report to the House on the status of CEMA's application to have sole receivership rights for eggs imported into Canada at the present time?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if "tighten up" is the word. However, I have had two meetings, one late yesterday afternoon with my officials in which I made it perfectly clear to them, although it was not necessary because they had already taken certain steps, to make sure the process was in fact monitored on an ongoing and continuing basis. I am following that up by further discussion with some of my colleagues who have even more direct responsibilities in this regard. On the second part of the question, no licences will be issued to CEMA for direct importation as long as the current policy stands.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REASON EGG MARKETING AGENCY USED PORTER COMPANY AS BROKER

Mr. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of

Agriculture. It arises from the reply he gave last Thursday to a question from the hon. member for Windsor West when the minister said:

In essence, they are using a perfectly legitimate broker bringing eggs into Canada and CEMA is paying them only the brokerage fee.

Can the minister confirm that, in addition to the one quarter cent a dozen brokerage fee, the Porter Produce Company also received, at CEMA's expense, a windfall income of three cents a dozen for handling the eggs? May I ask the minister why the eggs CEMA imported were not sent directly to the distributors to whom they were ultimately destined, thereby eliminating some of the delays encountered in shipping the eggs through the Porter Company and eliminating the need for CEMA to pay Porter the three cent handling fee?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, from the information I have received, they would actually have to do some work in handling the eggs before they would be compensated. I do know if a brokerage firm is doing the normal work involved they are entitled to a brokerage fee. That is all they are entitled to. I will have to investigate this further and check it out.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's reply and his willingness to investigate that. Can the minister confirm that the Porter Company has also been used as a first receiver for western eggs shipped into Ontario and has received a handling fee which has not been paid to other distributors? What is the reason the Porter Company was chosen? Why have they received a handling fee that has not been paid to other distributors, and how many cents per dozen was Porter paid to handle western eggs?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, all I know is that the Porter Company is a licensed brokerage firm. If they are doing anything illegal, I will have to determine this through my inquiries. However, no one has pointed this out to me previously.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

POSSIBILITY OF FULL-SCALE CONFERENCE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the first ministers' conference on May 6 will deal primarily with the question of the domestic price of oil and gas, and that the subsequent conference in June will focus on federal-provincial fiscal arrangements, and since it appears that the issue of the constitution will be dealt with only tangentally at both these meetings, will the Prime Minister tell us whether he intends to propose to the premiers on Thursday the convening of a full-scale constitutional conference similar to the Victoria Conference of 1971 to discuss the proposal contained in his recent correspondence with the premiers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make that proposal to the provincial premiers. My intention is to report to them on the evaluation of the situation since we all agreed one year ago to explore ways of patriating the constitution with an amending formula—we agreed we should not get into any other areas such as the division of powers. I intend to report to them, to hear their reaction to the report I put in writing to them about a month ago and then to assess the situation. If they wish an open conference on a patriation formula, I have no objection to that.

Miss MacDonald: Given the emphasis which the Prime Minister has placed on patriation, can he assure us that he does not intend to negotiate this vital issue simply via the mails, in which case it might take another hundred years to deal with? Or does he intend to consider this important matter in the time left over after other issues have been dealt with, in which case it would appear he is prepared to regard the discussion of constitutional matters as a footnote to these meetings? Can he give us an assurance that this will not be the case?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I made it quite clear to the premiers that the item would be raised at this meeting and at the following meeting. I must remind the hon. lady that the premiers, in April a year ago, unanimously decided we should attempt to patriate with an amending formula. This was not something that I alone was pressing for; there was agreement. I still hope this agreement will be carried forth with the consent of all the premiers.

* * *

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

POSSIBILITY JUNE CONFERENCE OF FIRST MINISTERS WILL BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Would the Prime Minister indicate whether the June conference of first ministers, which will focus, I understand, on renegotiation of tax-sharing arrangements and the equalization formula, matters vitally affecting all Canadians, will be open to viewing by the Canadian public in part or in whole?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I made it clear, I believe, two or three years ago in this House when responding to this type of question that I, as chairman of these first ministers' conferences, would adopt the course which appeared most acceptable to the majority of first ministers. I indicated then, and repeat now, that I am completely indifferent to whatever option they prefer. In other words, if they prefer an open conference it is my slight preference to have an open conference at all times; if it is the collective assessment that we would make more progress at a closed conference, my preference would be for a closed conference. There is an in-between solution which we shall also examine: it is to have a wider conference than that of first ministers—as will be the case on Thursday—but one not quite as wide as to include invitees from the public and members of various parliaments and legislatures; in other words, a full conference with other ministers and advisers present, but still not open to the press. I repeat that as chairman of the conference I shall

not attempt to impose my views on the other members. It is a matter for collective decision.

* * *

COMBINES

REQUEST THAT DIRECTOR INVESTIGATE ALLEGED INTERFERENCE BY UNITED STATES WITH CANADIAN PRATT AND WHITNEY

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The new section 31(5) of the Combines Act recently adopted by the House authorizes the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission to issue orders blocking the application of foreign law in Canada. I am therefore asking the minister whether he will ensure that the director of the combines branch carries out an inquiry into the Pratt and Whitney matter so that where appropriate the director can make application to the commission for an order preventing the application of any U.S. department of justice ruling in Canada that could prevent Canadian Pratt and Whitney from doing work here that would provide jobs for hundreds of Canadians.

● (1430)

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, that matter has already been brought to the attention of the director.

* * *

INDUSTRY

IMPORTATION BY FIRESTONE OF DUNLOP TIRES FROM UNITED STATES—POSSIBILITY CONDITIONS SET BY FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW AGENCY BEING BREACHED

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It concerns the phasing out of production in the former Dunlop tire plant at Whitby. It seems as though the minister is going to have another foreign trademark case on his hands. The information that has been brought to my attention is that Firestone Tire, which bought out the Dunlop tire plant in 1974, has relinquished the right to use the Dunlop brand and tires under that name will be imported from the Unites States, so that no manufacturing under that name will take place in Canada. Would the minister therefore tell the House what he knows about this particular situation, and if he does not have the information today, would he assure the House that he will bring the information to the House at the earliest moment?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I regret that it will have to be the latter. It is not a case with which I am personally familiar, but I will make inquiries.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While the minister is checking into the details of that particular situation, would he also inquire as to the conditions that FIRA attached to the Firestone takeover in 1974 and whether those conditions have been met in terms of national benefit? Since the Firestone firm is cutting back on production and reducing the number of its employees, it does not seem to be meeting the test of national benefit.

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

* * *

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF TENDERING PROCEDURES FOR DE-ICING EQUIPMENT—AMOUNT EXPENDED ON EQUIPMENT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Elmer M. MacKay (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which relates to the central aircraft de-icing facilities at Mirabel international airport. I know the minister is familiar with this since I have correspondence addressed to him on this subject. Would the minister confirm that in fact proposals, in the first instance, and tenders, in the second instance, were cancelled in relation thereto, and would he state whether reports that the system in question has never functioned properly are accurate?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the system is a new one and therefore the developmental phase obviously involves some trial and error. That is the only comment that I will make with regard to the second part of the question. It is accurate to say that initial tenders that were called were cancelled when a further technical examination did determine it would be important to have each user of the facility made responsible for his own aircraft, and that is the way the matter is now proceeding.

Mr. MacKay: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister further state whether GENAC, a joint venture of Air Canada and General Aviation, to whom the operation of the de-icing facility at Mirabel was ultimately awarded following the cancellation of tenders at the last possible moment, are in fact still ready, willing and able to continue their operations? Would the minister also indicate what is acceptable practice in the government with respect to notices of cancellation of tendering procedures? Does a telegram sent the night before purporting to cancel tenders to be opened the next morning meet the criteria?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that, as is usual in a tendering procedure, we are in the position that we need not accept any bid, and indeed at any point we can make a change in our over-all view of the situation. Obviously, we would not do so frequently or lightly because of the problem that it would create for people who were considering putting in bids. In this particular case, however, when it was apparent that technical advice was in favour of individual operation and responsibility on the part of the owners of the aircraft, it was decided that this was the right procedure to follow and therefore the bids were cancelled. That could have taken place after the bids were opened rather than the day before, as the hon. member suggests.

However, I believe he will find that he is in error in saying that the matter was turned over to GENAC. It may be the case in this particular operation in relation to Air Canada and other contracts with Air Canada for other aircraft, but essentially as I understand the situation the individual owners of aircraft have responsibilities for the operation of the de-icing of their aircraft.

Mr. MacKay: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm that well in excess of $4 million has been expended on this reportedly unsatisfactory de-icing facility, and will the minister advise the House whether his department is now considering any alternate plans, including a possible retendering of the concept?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any thought of retendering. As I understand it, the technical advice still continues to be strongly in favour of responsibility for an individual aircraft. I will, of course, be glad to supply on the order paper the other information that the hon. member seeks. As I understand the situation, the difference between different aircraft is sufficiently significant that it seems wise to allow the owner of the aircraft, the person responsible for the aircraft, to determine the exact technique of de-icing, and that is the reason for the change in plan.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EFFECT OF VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION OF VANCOUVER GRAIN HANDLERS' DISPUTE

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In light of what appear to be favourable conditions for a voluntary arbitration of the grain handlers wage contract dispute, would this suggest Vancouver greatly enhancing its trade reputation for the handling of grain? I have one short supplementary to that question.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to indicate to the hon. member that the grain handlers and operators have come to an agreement on voluntary arbitration binding on both sides, which I think is significant and something of a breakthrough in labour negotiations in Canada. I think it also ensures that grain will move through the port of Vancouver without the dislocations that have unfortunately marked this industry for some years, and we are very happy about that.

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH RAILWAY WORKERS

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): One short supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also comment on the labour negotiations taking place with the railway workers, and whether or not the grain will get to Vancouver?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the situation there, I would advise the hon. member, is that the negotiation committee for the railway unions recommended Mr. Justice Emmett Hall's report to the general conference of chairmen numbering approximately 150. The general chairmen rejected the recommendation of acceptance of the negotiating committee, so it is now in the process of going out to the rank and file railroaders in Canada who will indicate their preference by a vote. That process will take approximately two to three weeks, perhaps marginally longer, but I am still hopeful, and so are some of my officials involved, that this matter may be resolved without either a strike or the intervention of parliament.

USE OF ARBITRATION TO SETTLE DISPUTES—NAMES OF INDUSTRIES ADOPTING ARBITRATION PROCEDURE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question in this general area. I am pleased to hear that the minister acknowledges that the arbitration route taken by the grain handlers is one that does call for some thanks. Seeing that his ministry is moving in this direction, is the minister now in a position to advise whether he has had any success with other major industries under federal jurisdiction in adopting such a procedure as arbitration and, if so, would he give the House some indication of the industries involved?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, much of the innovative work that has been conducted on an experimental basis in terms of broader based bargaining has been going on in the grain handling industry with the co-operation of myself, the labour movement and the operators, so I think it is to be expected that this type of development might occur in that industry first. As the hon. member might also know, some months ago I appointed a commissioner to make recommendations that would improve the unhappy state of industrial relations in the industry, and that set the favourable backdrop for this type of approach that is now being adopted in connection with the grain handlers.

It was hoped that we might proceed to look at other industries, such as the air industry and others, through the Canada Labour Relations Council, but there has been what is, I hope, a temporary withdrawal by labour there which is not speeding up the process. However, I hope this will set the example—similar to the example set for the steel industry in the United States—and will bring about a satisfactory, civilized resolution of disputes which other unions and management will follow.

METHOD USED TO ATTEMPT TO AVERT A GENERAL STRIKE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister does have another problem with regard to the CLC. Documents released yesterday by the CLC indicate that 40 of the 440 resolutions submitted by local unions and affiliates for consideration by the upcoming CLC convention call for increased political pressure to halt controls, one at least calling for the mobilization of a general strike.

● (1440)

Given the withdrawal of the CLC from both the Economic Council of Canada and the Canada Labour Relations Council, and in light of our concern about strikes,

general or otherwise, can the minister outline those liaison mechanisms through which he is attempting to head off such a general strike, which would be disastrous to the economy of this country?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): I have said that that would be an eventuality which the government and, I am sure, every hon. member of this House would like to avoid. What we are doing is continuing talks in a bilateral way with leaders of the labour movement, and I think there is a good possibility that meetings will carry on. They will not carry on in the multilateral context of having management, labour and government at the same table, as takes place within the Canada Labour Relations Council, but directly between the government and the business community to try to develop a consensus to arrive at some satisfactory solutions through that technique, and that process is going on.

Mr. Alexander: Without the CLC.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

CRIMINAL CHARGE AGAINST HOWARD BUCHAN, FORMER PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE EMPLOYEE—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the RCMP laid charges of fraud against one Howard Ernest Buchan, former chief of field operations, PFAA, a 1973 appointee of the Minister of Agriculture, has the minister conducted an in depth investigation as to whether that employee acted on his own initiative or on the instructions of another?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the courts have thoroughly investigated what it was alleged this man did wrong. I forget the legal terminology for it, but I understand that the case has not gone any further in the court because it was felt that there was not any evidence against him.

Mr. Towers: Since someone must be held responsible for such personal appointments and for the conduct of those employees while carrying out their assigned duties, does the minister accept that responsibility?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I accept the ruling of the court.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DATE OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF REORGANIZATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of National Defence. Is the minister in a position to give us a fairly firm date when he might expect to announce the reorganization of the infrastructure in Canada for the Canadian forces?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, that subject is before cabinet. I cannot predict how long it will take for those deliberations to be completed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH

WORK STOPPAGES AT HOSPITALS IN QUEBEC AND SASKATCHEWAN—POSSIBILITY OF INQUIRY

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, I would like to direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Considering the problems caused by labour disputes, particularly in Quebec and Saskatchewan hospitals, would the Prime Minister advise the House whether his government is conducting an inquiry in these two provinces to ensure that in spite of the reduction of required and necessary services, no patient's life has been placed in jeopardy, as rumours would have it? I would like to add that last week a Montreal physician declared that he had to resort to war time medicine.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to bring this question to the attention of the minister who is away on official duties.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

MEASURES TO ASSIST ENTRY OF FRANCOPHONE LEBANESE

Mr. Charles Lapointe (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Labour and Immigration.

In view of the intensification of the fighting in Lebanon, could the minister tell the House whether he intends to set up a special team within his department to ensure that Canada welcome a greater number of Lebanese who are facing serious problems in their country? Lebanese citizens wishing to emigrate to Canada would thus allow us to take more humane measures to reach a more equitable linguistic balance in our country.

[*English*]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we have been watching the situation with regard to Lebanese very closely, and I am considering some further measures upon which I will be in a position to make a decision very shortly.

Oral Questions

ANTI-INFLATION BOARD

SUGGESTED EARLY ACTION ON WAGE SETTLEMENT WITH EMPLOYEES OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—DATE OF CLEARING BACKLOG OF CASES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he is aware of the fact that CBC employees who will be working on televising the Olympics reached an agreement with the management of CBC six weeks ago. Since that time that contract has been before the Anti-Inflation Board without any disposition of the case. The employees have set a deadline of May 15, and if after that time they still have no settlement, they will resort to strike action. Would the minister take up the case with the AIB to see that there is some disposition of it, thus avoiding a strike which would have very serious effects on the televising of the Olympics?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to pursue this.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could confirm the truth of reports that the Anti-Inflation Board now has a backlog of close to 6,000 agreements with which it has not yet dealt, and will the minister explain to the House how long employers and employees will have to wait after they reach an agreement before they know what their situation will be for the coming year or possibly two as a result of the board's decision?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I had occasion to refer to that in debate last week. My understanding is that a very substantial number of the agreements will have been dealt with either by this time or within a very short time. Of course, there will still remain some outstanding and difficult cases, particularly cases in which the question of historical relationship is involved. Naturally, the board will do its best to dispatch these matters as quickly as it can.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

ALLEGED DIFFICULTY OF UNITED STATES MAGAZINES IN OBTAINING WORK VISAS FOR CORRESPONDENTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I asked a question on Friday which is recorded at page 13031 of *Hansard*. In an article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of Saturday, May 1 the following quotation can be found:

> An immigration department spokesman said there is a general policy that Canadians be placed in vacant positions in Canada if they are qualified for the post.

I am asking the minister if he is saying that by withholding work visas or extensions of work visas for foreign correspondents that the government will insist that openings for these correspondents in Canada will have to be filled by Canadians. I suggest that it would be similar if the United States were asking that CBC openings in the United States be filled by Americans.

[Mr. Andras.]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to require foreign correspondents of periodicals or media institutions to have work permits if they are reporting on Canadian affairs to a foreign audience. On the other hand, if a visitor from some other country were to apply for a job in a media servicing organization within Canada which serviced the Canadian public, that would be a different matter, and we would then examine the question of his eligibility to work in terms of the availability of Canadians. However, this would not apply in the case of truly foreign correspondents representing foreign publications.

Mr. Epp: This being an intricate matter, I want to confirm with the minister that when U.S. newsmagazines or news service agencies post correspondents to Canada, they will receive work visas without any disruptions, such as have occurred in the last few weeks.

Mr. Andras: With regard to the first category, absolutely. That is to say, a foreign correspondent of, say, *Newsweek*, covering the Canadian scene for *Newsweek* and a foreign audience, would be exempted from the requirement of an employment visa. The second category might be slightly different if it is a foreign person taking a job in, say, UPI to service a Canadian news service where certainly there is no foreign audience involved. That might be slightly different.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REASON FOR LATE PAYMENTS TO MILITIAMEN

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is it true that the department is now three months behind in paying militiamen? Can the minister give the reason or reasons for this, and can he assure the House that something will be done about the situation at once?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that not only will something be done, but also that something has been done. We were putting the matter of militia pay on a computer—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Richardson: —in order to improve the pay system. It took a little time to achieve that, but the bugs are now out, and the cheques are going forward.

* * *

● (1450)

PENITENTIARIES

ARCHAMBAULT—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON HOSTAGE-TAKING

Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General and it relates to the hostage-taking which is underway at present, unfortu-

nately, at Archambault penitentiary where a guard and an instructor, namely Léopold Mercier and Michel English, are being held and there is a demand for two mediators, Mr. Robert Sachitelle and Mr. Laplante who is presently in Alberta. I wonder if the minister is in a position to give us a report as to the situation with respect to this hostage-taking incident and whether he is in fact considering the appointment of a mediator as requested by the inmates.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the two inmates asked for the attendance of Mr. Laurent Laplante and Robert Sachitelle who had been acting as negotiators in the strike which is taking place. Mr. Laplante is in Alberta and is unable to attend but Mr. Sachitelle has gone to the prison and is attempting to work out a settlement.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I gather from the answer of the minister that he is in fact prepared to allow a mediator in these circumstances, since it seems a reasonable request.

Mr. Allmand: I understand that Mr. Sachitelle has gone to the prison to act more as a representative of the inmates in discussions with the administration than as a mediator, but he had been acting as a mediator until now.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

LAW OF SEA CONFERENCE—REQUEST FOR REPORT OF RESULTS AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Lafontaine-Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Fisheries.

Following the visit of the minister—who was accompanied by his colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce—last Friday to New York, on the occasion of the 4th Conference on the Law of the Sea, which is to end next Friday, can the minister tell the House whether he expects concrete results, if not considerable progress, from this 4th conference, and whether the participating countries have agreed to meet again for a general assembly in July of 1976, even before the meeting which had originally been scheduled for early 1977?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)): Mr. Speaker, I have no idea whether the report to be tabled this week will indicate as much progress as we had hoped, but there is no doubt that if the majority of countries agree to meet again in July, it will be because they expect to be able to come to an agreement. As for Canada, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and several of us have already clearly indicated that 1976 will be a decisive year for us.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

REASON FOR ERADICATION PROGRAM TO DEAL WITH BLUE TONGUE DISEASE

Mr. Ken Hurlburt (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the fact that the United States has had the cattle disease blue tongue for over 15 years and has never instituted an eradication program, would the minister inform the House why he has allowed an eradication program to take place in the Okanagan when the health of animals department has admitted they do not even know what type of blue tongue exists in Canada or its seriousness?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we have instituted an eradication program because there is evidence of the disease and history shows that this is by far the best way to deal with any virus infection such as this. The hon. member knows full well that the virus infection is difficult to identify, but it is not worth taking a chance because leaving it in abeyance and hoping things will go away by themselves is too risky. The health of livestock is much too important to us. Many things are being done in the United States that we do not do.

* * *

GRAIN

SUGGESTION PRESSURE NOT BE USED TO PREVENT OPTING OUT OF STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the fact that producer contributions to the western grain stabilization plan became effective on April 1 and it has been very difficult if not impossible for producers to opt out, can the minister give the House an assurance that undue pressure will not be used to prevent opting out?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be taking every possible step—and I hope the hon. member and his colleagues will join me—to bring the advantages of the stabilization plan to the attention of each individual farmer. To the extent that we do that, if the hon. member wants to call that undue pressure, I will gladly not only confess to it but claim it. There is no difficulty in opting out. The producers should realize as well that there is no particular hurry in doing so, even if they want to opt out for this year, because if they opt out at the end of or just after the end of 1976 their entire levies for 1976 will be returned to them. I hope therefore that the hon. member will join me in making farmers aware of the financial advantage to them and to the prairies this plan will be, so that they will not end up a year or two later being hurt when payments are made to all their colleagues in the farming business.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EFFORTS TO CONTINUE OPERATION OF FERRY SERVICE TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND IN EVENT OF WORK STOPPAGES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a brief question to the Minister of Labour, and it is really supplementary to some earlier questions. What progress is his department making toward an arrangement which would allow the continuation of the operation of the main ferry services to P.E.I., on which all surface travel is dependent, in the case of a work stoppage on the CNR?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the policy that we have been adopting in conjunction with the Department of Transport and with the union leadership is to have a voluntary agreement that the strike weapon would not be resorted to, despite what happened throughout the rest of the industry, with respect to this particular ferry service. I have received a very encouraging word from the union leadership to the effect that they think they can accommodate this particular objective, so I am hopeful that a successful conclusion along those lines can be reached.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES

ARCHAMBAULT—ALLEGED INSENSITIVITY TO WARNINGS OF TROUBLE

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the one asked by my colleague, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar about the hostage taking at Archambault. It is directed to the Solicitor General. Surely in this case the penitentiary service of Canada had ample warning that serious trouble would ensue. Can the minister comment on the fact that there was a good deal of insensitivity on the part of the penitentiary service with regard to the warnings that many of us had in our ordinary duties as members of parliament?

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the inmates at the Archambault penitentiary have been on a type of strike for some time now. They had made certain suggestions to the administration. It is my understanding that the administration came to an agreement with them on all suggestions expect one, which was that they be allowed to have open visiting. That was refused by the penitentiary service on the basis that this was a maximum security penitentiary, a lot of contraband had been going into the penitentiary, and open visits should not be permitted. Open visits are permitted in the medium and minimum security penitentiaries and in part at a few of the maximum security penitentiaries, but they felt that if inmates at Archambault wanted open visiting they could improve their conduct and in time be transferred to either Leclerc or Cowansville or one of the medium security penitentiaries where they could get that.

On the whole, the administration was very open to negotiation and came to an agreement on all the proposals except this one. After all, it is the administration and not the inmates that is running the penitentiaries.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DATE OF PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF DR. HALL ON RAILWAY PENSIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can he say whether he has yet received the report of Dr. Noel Hall who has been working on the question of railway pensions for quite some time?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that Dr. Hall has communicated with the department. He has indicated that the actuaries are taking a great deal of time but they are doing a thorough job of examining the present methods and basis for funding plans. Another area that is taking him more time than he anticipated is comparing railway pension plans which, as you will recall, the terms of reference call for, with the plans in the public service, Crown corporations and other plans in the private sector. All this is of greater complexity than he first anticipated when he gave his deadline. I hope to have a new prognostication from him as to when he will have it ready within the next few weeks.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

ADVANTAGES OF CONTRACTUAL LINK WITH EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—NATURE OF SUBMISSIONS TO GATT

Mr. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and is in two parts. Since the government has placed such great importance on contractual links with the European Common Market, can the minister give the House examples of advantages to the agricultural industry as a result of this relationship? Second, on a very relative subject, what submissions are planned by agriculture Canada, either directly or indirectly, through our negotiators at the present GATT discussions?

● (1500)

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, on the last part of the question about representations to GATT, I am sure the hon. member is aware that our department and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce have had consultations with their provincial counterparts asking them for input. We also asked the farm organizations for input. This is being done in preparation for the talks at GATT. With regard to formal arrangements, the fact that we have a European Community representative in Canada now is very important to us for exchange of trade and of agricultural products, including cereal grains, livestock of all descriptions, farm implements and many other things. I think this is most impor-

tant and also the fact that we can talk directly to them about exporting subsidized cheeses to Canada.

Mr. Wise: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister intend to encourage and promote discussion regarding Canada's need to convert from our traditional method of tariff calculation to the constant percentage of value, or ad valorem, particularly during periods of high inflation?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can be assured that all these things are being discussed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF LAW REFORM COMMISSION REPORT ON FAMILY LAW

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, in both official languages, the Law Reform Commission report on family law, pursuant to Standing Order 41(1).

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following 167 questions will be answered today:

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blais: They are: 2,708, 3,120, 3,706, 4,154, 4,620 to 4,765, inclusive; 4,931, 4,933 to 4,939 inclusive; 5,097, 5,117, 5,132 to 5,135, inclusive; and 5,235.

[*Text*]

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP DURING WEEKEND COMMENCING JUNE 6, 1975

Question No. 2,708—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. In regard to the trip by the Prime Minister during the weekend commencing June 6, 1975 to certain places in southeastern Ontario (a) what specific government aircraft were used for any aspects of transportation and, in each case, what is the cost per hour of keeping such aircraft in the air including fuel, salaries, and all other factors (b) what was the total cost involved for all flights (c) where did each flight begin and terminate and what are the names and functions of all persons who travelled in the aircraft carrying the Prime Minister and in any other accompanying government-owned aircraft?

2. What are all the details of the use of government-owned aircraft in advance party arrangements for the trip including (a) number and description of aircraft involved (b) names and job designations of all those on board at any time (c) cost per hour and total cost?

3. Will the Prime Minister discontinue using government-owned aircraft at public expense for purposes of political or personal travel and (a) if so, on what date (b) if not, for what reason?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of National Defence, Transport Canada and the Prime Minister's Office as follows: 1. National Defence: (a) Three CH 135 utility helicopters. $570.59 per flying hour for each helicopter. (b) $15,805.35. Transport Canada: (a) MOT Jetstar CF-ETN. Cost per hour—$970. (b) Total MOT cost—$1,445. (c) The itinerary was as follows:

Date	Leave	Arrive
June 6, 1975	Toronto 0830	Muskoka 0915
June 6, 1975	Muskoka 1010	Collingwood 1050
June 6, 1975	Collingwood 1330	Barrie 1350
June 6, 1975	Barrie 1600	Hamilton 1650
June 7, 1975	Hamilton 1015	Waterloo 1045
June 7, 1975	Waterloo 1445	St. George 1500
June 7, 1975	St. George 1615	Port Dover 1640
June 7, 1975	Port Dover 1900	Toronto 1945

MOT Jetstar: Ottawa-Muskoka: Prime Minister, Bob Murdoch—PMO, Colin Kenny—PMO, Ian Macdonald—PMO, Derek Brown—Industry, Trade and Commerce. DND Helicopters: Muskoka, Collingwood, Barrie, Hamilton, Waterloo, St. George, Port Dover, Toronto. Aircraft I: Prime Minister, Bob Murdoch—PMO, Colin Kenny—PMO, Insp. Wagner—RCMP, Dave Glaikie—Press. Aircraft II: Muskoka, Collingwood, Barrie: Derek Brown—Industry, Trade and Commerce, Peter McGuire—PMO, Sgt. Turnbull—RCMP, Catharine McQueen—Press, Geoff Scott—Press, Neil Sandy—Press. Waterloo—St. George: Hon. Judd Buchanan, Penny Lipsett—Indian Affairs and Northern Development. St. George, Port Dover, Toronto: Hon. John Munro, Ferd Viola—Labour. Aircraft III: Ian Macdonald—PMO, Orland French—Press, James Ferrabee—Press, Hal Jones—Press, Bert Plimer—Press, Chris Rose—Press, Cpl. George Duggan—RCMP. MOT Jetstar: Toronto, Quebec City: Prime Minister, Bob Murdoch—PMO, Colin Kenny—PMO, Ian Macdonald—PMO, Hon. John Munro, Ferd Viola—Labour, Hon. D. S. Macdonald, Mrs. Macdonald.

2. (a) and (c) See Part 1. (b) Mr. C. Kenny—PMO, Mr. P. McGuire—PMO, Two members of the RCMP.

3. See reply to question 69 answered February 3, 1976.

PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Question No. 3,120—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Prime Minister take a holiday trip with his son to and from the Northwest Territories during the recent Parliamentary recess and, if so, what was the cost to the taxpayer?

2. (a) What government aircraft was used (b) what was the cost per flying hour (c) how many flying hours were involved (d) what was the cost per hour of waiting time on the ground for such aircraft (e) how many waiting hours on the ground were involved?

3. (a) What are the names, addresses and job designations of all persons at any time on board such aircraft from the time it left Ottawa until it returned (b) on what date did it (i) leave Ottawa (ii) return to Ottawa (c) what are all the places it took-off from or landed at during the intervals involved and, in each case, for what purpose?

4. What are the (a) names (b) job designations (c) annual salaries (d) total cost of expenses for each member of the crew on the trip?

Order Paper Questions

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): 1. The Prime Minister visited the Northwest Territories during the Parliamentary recess last summer.

2. (a) MOT Jetstar. (b) $970. (See reply to question 4,110 answered March 12, 1976). (c) Twelve hours. (d) See 2(b). (e) 15½ hours.

3. (a) The Prime Minister, Master Justin Trudeau and guest. (b) (i) August 23—Ottawa to Frobisher; (ii) August 29—Frobisher to Ottawa. (c) See 3(b).

4. See reply to question 69 answered February 3, 1976.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL PARTICIPATING IN PUBLIC SERVICE CLOSED COMPETITIONS

Question No. 3,706—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Is the Minister of National Defence aware of the answer to Question No. 2,849 and, if so, does he accept its implications as to the ability of members of the Canadian Armed Forces born in the Atlantic Provinces but not stationed there to enter closed competitions offered by the Public Service but restricted to residents of the Atlantic Provinces?

2. Does this policy and its workings advance morale within the Canadian Armed Forces for those members finding themselves affected by the policy and, if so, in what manner?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes. The concept of closed competition in the Public Service is to provide career opportunities within a region and a designated section of the Public Service, when competent candidates are considered to be available in the region and section designated. The regulations for such competitions are applicable to all public servants, including members of the Armed Forces. The place of birth of a member of the Public Service has no bearing on his or her eligibility for the competition.

2. There is no evidence that this policy has affected morale in the armed forces.

REGISTERED CANADIAN CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS—OXFAM

Question No. 4,154—**Mr. Brisco:**

1. Does the Department of National Revenue list OXFAM as a charitable organization and, if so, are donations tax deductible?

2. Do liberation movements in Africa receive support from OXFAM and, if so, does the government (a) approve of each liberation organization receiving such support (b) financially support such liberation movements and, if not, is it considering giving such support?

3. Does the government register organizations which engage in funding of political liberation movements as charitable organizations?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of National Revenue and the Canadian International Development Agency as follows: 1. OXFAM-Canada, an Ontario Part II no share capital corporation, has been registered as a Canadian charitable organization with Revenue-Canada since January 1, 1967. Accordingly, donations to it are tax deductible by the donor within the provisions of paragraph 110(1)(a) of the Income Tax Act.

2. Some liberation groups in Africa have received support from OXFAM, and OXFAM has sought financial contributions from CIDA for such assistance projects as might qualify under Canada's humanitarian aid program for southern Africa. To date, CIDA has given financial assistance to OXFAM/Quebec for its humanitarian assistance program for the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union. This involved a grant of $5,000 to OXFAM for the purpose of sending clothing, food and medical supplies for refugees who fled from Rhodesia to neighbouring countries. At the present time CIDA is considering a request from OXFAM-Canada for assistance to the South West Africa People organization in Namibia for a project involving Adult Education. (a) The Government approves the receiving by liberation organizations of support by Canadian non-governmental organizations for humanitarian purposes. However, firm assurances are required that the aid is utilized for purely peaceful purposes involving strict accountability by sponsoring bodies for any CIDA funds. Funds are not made available directly to the liberation movements. While it is obvious that the ultimate recipients of this type of humanitarian aid will include both those who are politically militant and those who are not, the ultimate test of the value of this aid is the peaceful and humanitarian nature of the project itself.

This humanitarian aid goes to sponsoring bodies that have in mind medical, educational, agricultural and other humanitarian projects. Under this program, CIDA considers requests for contributions from reputable Canadian non-governmental organizations and international bodies for projects of a humanitarian nature in Namibia, Rhodesia and South Africa. (b) No, and it is not considering giving such support.

3. Revenue-Canada in its determination of what is and what is not charitable in the legal sense, relies heavily on common law established over a period of some 300 years. It has been held at law that if the purpose of a trust is the attainment of a political object, the purpose will not be charitable. The financial support of a liberation movement would be a political purpose and an organization engaged in this activity would not qualify for registration as a charitable organization with Revenue-Canada. A Canadian charitable organization may, on occasion, find it necessary to utilize the facilities of an organization outside of Canada to assist the Canadian organization to carry out its charitable activities outside of Canada. The intermediate organization may be a political organization but if the activity is charitable and is carried on in the name of the Canadian organization the activity normally would not be considered to be a political one. Revenue-Canada is seeking further information in regard to OXFAM-Canada dealings with a liberation movement in Africa.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW AGENCY—MONITORING OF UNDERTAKINGS

Question No. 4,620—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. How many court applications to enforce compliance with undertakings attached to the approval by the agency under the Foreign Investment Review Act have been made to date?

2. How many persons or corporations have been deemed eligible under the Foreign Investment Review Act and what are their names?

3. (a) How many persons or corporations satisfying the conditions of non-eligibility under Section 3(2) of the Foreign Investment Review Act have been deemed eligible on the grounds of actual control (b) what was the evidence for actual control in each case (c) what are the names of such persons or corporations?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: 1. None. In the Agency's monitoring of undertakings to date, no investors have been found to be in default of their undertakings. Undertakings are in principle binding and enforceable through the courts. However, where it is established that a foreign investor has not fully complied with his undertakings due to unforeseen circumstances such as a major change in market conditions, every effort will be made to negotiate new or substitute undertakings so that the original objective of significant benefit to Canada is achieved. Enforcement action through the courts is likely to be a procedure of last resort.

2. As of March 12, 1976, 28 corporations were found to be eligible persons. The following is a list of names of those corporations: Bow Valley Industries Ltd.; Brascan Limited; Canadian Enterprise Development Corporation Limited; Canadian Keyes Fibre Company, Limited; Commonwealth Holiday Inns of Canada Limited; Denison Mines Limited; Federal Industrie Ltd.; Hastings West Investment Ltd.; Horne & Pitfield Foods Limited; The International Nickel Company of Canada Limited; The Metropolitan Trust Company; Alcan Aluminum Limited; Nordair Ltd.; Numac Oil Gas Ltd.; Oakwood Petroleums Ltd.; Panarctic Oils Ltd.; Ventures West Capital Ltd.; The White Pass and Yukon Corporation Limited; Asamera Oil Corporation Ltd.; Voyager Petroleums Ltd.; Waltec Enterprises Ltd.; Chieftain Development Ltd.; Consumers Glass Company Limited; Peyto Oils Ltd.; Placer Development Limited; The Big "0" Drain Tile Company Limited; Ranger Oil (Canada) Limited; Maritime Agencies Limited.

3. (a) The 28 corporations referred to in 2 above were deemed to be non-eligible under Subsection 3(2) and were considered to be eligible persons on the basis that control in fact resided with Canadians. (b) Information submitted to the Minister in the course of the administration of the Act is privileged under Subsection 14(1) of the Act. However, as all the eligibility opinions have concerned corporations, the Minister has considered all pertinent information as to where "control in fact" actually lies. In general, this information includes the following: (i) the identity and holdings of substantial non-Canadian voting blocks; (ii) the identity and holdings of substantial Canadian voting blocks; (iii) the description of the proxy practices of the company; (iv) the identity and holdings of each Canadian and non-Canadian director; (v) the identity and holdings of each Canadian and non-Canadian senior officer; (vi) the description of decision-making practices of the management; (vii) the details of agreements or arrangements with outsiders which may affect control of the company's affairs. (c) See 2 above.

PROPOSAL BY HUDSON'S BAY OIL AND GAS CO. LTD. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,621—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas Co. Ltd. to acquire control of certain assets of Sulpetro of Canada Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: 1. The privileged information provisions of Section 14 of the Act specify that the Minister may not be required to disclose undertakings given by an investor where in the opinion of the Minister the disclosure of such undertakings would prejudicially affect the person who gave the undertaking in the matter of conduct of his business affairs. Accordingly, as a matter of policy and consistent with the Act, undertakings are only disclosed when and to the extent that such disclosure is not prejudicial to the business interests of the parties concerned. In such circumstances the undertakings are indicated in press releases issued by the Minister announcing the decisions of the Governor in Council with respect to the cases concerned. The Government is reviewing the nature and extent of the information that may properly be made public concerning proposed investments reviewed under the Foreign Investment Review Act. However, with respect to cases that have already been reviewed, the disclosure of information and undertakings given in confidence, and in the knowledge of the government's existing practice and policy regarding disclosure, would be improper. The Foreign Investment Review Agency monitors and reviews compliance by an investor with all undertakings, at appropriate intervals after allowance of the investment by Governor in Council. As was indicated in the first Annual Report to Parliament on operations under the Foreign Investment Review Act, it is normally impractical to commence the monitoring process until approximately one year after allowance of the investment by the Governor in Council.

2. As the monitoring of undertaking in this case has not commenced, the information specified in the question is not available. Even if it were available, public disclosure of such information with respect to the specific business would not be permitted under Subsection 14(1) of the Foreign Investment Review Act.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,622—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of BP Oil Ltd. to acquire control of Retail Gasoline-car wash of Golden Triangle Oils Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial

efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,623—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Furnco Construction Canada Ltd. to acquire control of Walker Vacuum Services Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,624—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Crown Zellerbach Ltd. to acquire control of Elk River Timber Co. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,625—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Henry Siegal Co. Inc. to acquire control of Monarch Wear under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,626—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Zapata Canada Limited to acquire control of assets of Ocean Maid Foods Div. of Atlantic Consolidated Foods Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,627—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Emerson Electric Co. to acquire control of A.B. Chance Co. of Canada under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,628—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Childers Products Co. Inc. to acquire control of Terkel Insulation Products Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,629—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Graphic Controls Canada Ltd. to acquire control of EIL Inc. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,630—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Sunbeam Corp. to acquire control of Schaefer Canada under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,631—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Cotts Beverages Ltd. to acquire control of Private Brands Beverages Ltd. and Stewart Hall Co. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new

investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,632—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Granada TV Rental Ltd. to acquire control of Colorvision Rentals Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,633—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Leonard Monheim KG to acquire control of Comet Confectionary Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,634—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Liquid Flavour Associates of Canada to acquire control of certain assets of Liquid Carbonic Canada Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,635—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Tonolli Company of Canada Ltd. to acquire control of H. Bernard (Canada) Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,636—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Dental Depot (Canada) Ltd. to acquire control of United Dental Supply Corp. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services

(iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,637—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Japan Oil Sands Co. Ltd. to acquire control of Japan Oil Sands Co. Primrose Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,638—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Midco Equipment Co. to acquire control of Ferguson Supply Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,639—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Kaladar Planing Mills to acquire control of L.E. Welk Lumber Manufacturing under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,640—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Roboserve Ltd. to acquire control of Gilron Holdings Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,641—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of West Fraser Timber Co. Ltd. to acquire control of Pacific Inland Resources Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,642—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Cargill Grain Co. Ltd. to acquire control of National Grain under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Insofar as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: 1. The privileged information provisions of Section 14 of the Act specify that the Minister may not be required to disclose undertakings given by an investor where in the opinion of the Minister the disclosure of such undertakings would prejudicially affect the person who gave the undertaking in the matter or conduct of his business affairs. Accordingly as a matter of policy, and consistent with the Act, undertakings are only disclosed when and to the extent that such disclosure is not prejudicial to the business interests of the parties concerned. In such circumstances the undertakings are indicated in press releases issued by the Minister announcing the decisions of the Governor in Council with respect to the cases concerned. The Government is reviewing the nature and extent of the information that may properly be made public concerning proposed investments reviewed under the Foreign Investment Review Act. However, with respect to cases that have already been reviewed, the disclosure of information and undertakings given in confidence, and in the knowledge of the Government's existing practice and policy regarding disclosure, would be improper. The Foreign Investment Review Agency monitors and reviews compliance by an investor with all undertakings, at appropriate intervals after allowance of the investment by Governor in Council. As was indicated in the first Annual Report to Parliament on operations under the Foreign Investment Review Act, it is normally impractical to commence the monitoring process until approximately one year after allowance of the investment by the Governor in Council.

2. Public disclosure with respect to the specific business is not permitted under Subsection 14(1) of information obtained in the course of the administration of the Foreign Investment Review Act.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,643—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Babcox and Wilcox Refractories Ltd. to acquire control of Holmes Insulations Co. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,644—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Royal Industries to acquire control of Pacer Trailer Man. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced techno-

logical development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,645—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of The Canadian Fuel Marketers Group Ltd. to acquire control of St. Lawrence Tankers Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,646—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Delaware Brunswick Corp. to acquire control of Ozite Corporation of Canada Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,647—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Suntrack Manufacturing Ltd. to acquire control of Mulder (Canada) Limited under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,648—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Maremont Corporation to acquire control of Van der Hout Associates under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

Order Paper Questions

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,649—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Orenstein & Koppel Aktiengesellschaft to acquire control of IM Division of Clark Equipment of Canada Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,650—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Cosmair (Canada) Ltd. to acquire control of Du Barry Cosmetics Division of Warner-Lambert Co. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,651—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Hughes Tool Company to acquire control of BJ Well Services Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,652—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Tomeson-Alexander Associates to acquire control of Retirement Plan Services Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,653—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Bestpipe Ltd. to acquire control of Flex-Lox Industries under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation

occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,654—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Proline Pipe Equipment Company Ltd. to acquire control of Conspec Controls Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: The Government has not considered an investment proposal involving the parties specifically named in this question.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,655—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Newconex Holdings Ltd. to acquire control of Union Tractor Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,656—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Griffith Laboratories Inc. to acquire control of Griffith Laboratories Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,657—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Mont Ste. Marie Ltd. to acquire control of Lac Ste. Marie Ski Lifts Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,658—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Sparkford Estates Ltd. to acquire control of Rocking Chair Ranch under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for

compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,659—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Imperial Oil Ltd. and the Canadian Fuel Marketers Group to acquire control of St. Lawrence Tankers Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,660—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Felten & Guilliaume Carlswerk Aktiengesellschaft to acquire control of Fabricon Manufacturing Ltd., under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,661—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Canadian Auto Carriers Ltd. to acquire control of Atlantic Automobile Transport Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,662—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Kleen-Flo Corp. to acquire control of J.A. Tumbler Laboratories Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,663—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Black Clawson Co. to acquire control of Hydrotile of Canada Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource

processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,664—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of to acquire control of Consumers Glove Co. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,665—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Cow and Gate (Canada) Ltd. to acquire control of Foxboro Cheese Company Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,666—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Robert McAlpine Ltd. to acquire control of Robert B. Somerville Co. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,667—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Nashua Canada Limited to acquire control of Johnson Photo Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

Order Paper Questions

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,668—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Seren Ltd. to acquire control of Consolidated Northern Exploration Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,669—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Canada Bluebird International Inc. to acquire control of J.H. Corbeil Ltéehe under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,670—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Barcley-Lane's Shoes to acquire control of Savage Maher under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,671—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Brown Boveri to acquire control of Canron under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,672—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of CIL to acquire control of Hutton Farm Supplies under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,673—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Canadian Industries Limited to acquire control of J.D. Lee Engineering Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,674—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of EG&G Inc. to acquire control of Reese Power Products under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,675—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Feru to acquire control of «office building in Westmount» under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,676—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Four-Phase Systems to acquire control of Parvac Corp. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,677—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of W.R. Grace to acquire control of under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and

industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,678—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of International Paper to acquire control of General Crude Oil under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,679—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Res Star Express Lines to acquire control of Marcoux and Marlese under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,680—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Sun Oil Co. to acquire control of Forest Oil under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,681—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Theany Vertriebs to acquire control of Lippens Inc. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,682—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Union Carbide to acquire control of Roncar Oxygen under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with

the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,683—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of George Wimpey to acquire control of Richter—McLeod under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,684—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Exprover SA to acquire control of Galaxy Glass under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,685—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Eyelet Inc. to acquire control of Candylet under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,686—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of George W. Endress to acquire control of Toronto Mill Stock under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,687—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Gulf Agricultural to acquire control of Perkins Adhesives under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Cana-

dian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,688—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of HMK Manufacturing to acquire control of Skiroule under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,689—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Maurice & Godbout to acquire control of Lewis Apedaile & Hanson under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,690—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Pacific to acquire control of Wizard, Clover & Brassard under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,691—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Permaseal to acquire control of Weatherseal under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,692—Mr. Leggatt:

1. In the case of the proposal of Standard Industries to acquire control of Haldimand Quarries under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,693—Mr. Leggatt:

1. In the case of the proposal of Southampton Sawmills to acquire control of Southampton Contractors under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,694—Mr. Leggatt:

1. In the case of the proposal of Reed Paper to acquire control of Alpa Industries under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,695—Mr. Leggatt:

1. In the case of the proposal of American General to acquire control of Financial Life under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,696—Mr. Leggatt:

1. In the case of the proposal of Crown Cork and Seal to acquire control of International Lab. Foreign Investment Review Act under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation

occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,697—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Franklin Pipe to acquire control of Franklin Pipe under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,698—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Newconex to acquire control of Industrial Sales under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,699—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of HBOG & Pacific to acquire control of Candel under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,700—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Philadelphia to acquire control of Key Oilfield under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,701—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of GWS Krupp to acquire control of Edmonton Structural under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced techno-

logical development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,702—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of ASEA to acquire control of Harland Systems under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,703—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Continental Can to acquire control of International Spring under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,704—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Golden Eagle to acquire control of *St-Laurent & Frères* under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,705—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Liquid Carbonic to acquire control of Alberta Oxygen under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

Order Paper Questions

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,706—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Liquid Carbonic to acquire control of Leclair Gas & Welding under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,707—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Pettibone (Canada) Ltd. to acquire control of Consolidated Dynamics under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,708—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Marks and Spencer to acquire control of Peoples Department Stores under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,709—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Pacific Petroleums Ltd. to acquire control of Buffalo Creek Oil Field under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,710—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Climax Molybdenum to acquire control of United Chieftain under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and

industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,711—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Congdon and Carey to acquire control of Hallmark Resources Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,712—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Easton Holdings to acquire control of Crownco Holdings under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,713—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of General Crude Oil Northern to acquire control of Hunter Explorations under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,714—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of General Crude Oil, Northern to acquire control of Canadian Hydrogas under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,715—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Leows Corp. to acquire control of CNA Insurance under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced techno-

logical development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,716—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Leows Corp. to acquire control of Canadian Premier Life Insurance under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,717—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Phoenix Assurance to acquire control of Century Insurance under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,718—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Marvel Lighting Corporation to acquire control of Commercial Lighting Products under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,719—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Bestpipe Limited to acquire control of Vibrapipe Concrete Products under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,720—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Columbia House to acquire control of Capital Record Club under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,721—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Ceutsche Canada to acquire control of Trizec (Calgary Place) under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,722—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Generics Corporation to acquire control of Micro Chemicals under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,723—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of International Harvester to acquire control of B.C. Equipment Co. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, dirèctors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,724—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of J.K. Smit & Sons Diamond Products to acquire control of Federal Drilling Supplies under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and

industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,725—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of McGean Chemical Co. to acquire control of Armalite Company under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,726—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Simpson Timber Co. to acquire control of Swan Valley Sawmills under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,727—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Sun Oil to acquire control of Ponderay Exploration under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,728—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Turner Valley Holdings to acquire control of A-1 Rentals (1956) under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,729—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Sun Oil Co. to acquire control of Aldona Mines under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Cana-

dian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,730—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Union Carbide Canada to acquire control of Borstad Welsing Supplies under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,731—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of AMAX Petroleum to acquire control of Production Operators under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,732—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Canadian Ingersoll Rand to acquire control of Canada Machinery Corp. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,733—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of The American Packaging Corp. to acquire control of Wrap-O-Matic Machinery under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

Order Paper Questions

PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE CONTROL

Question No. 4,734—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Cyanamid of Canada to acquire control of Canada Machinery Corp. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: the Government has not considered an investment proposal involving the parties specifically named in this question.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,735—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Dead River Ltd. to acquire control of Bayshore Lumber Co. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,736—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Esmark, Inc. to acquire control of Playtex Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,737—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Gelco-feld Corp. to acquire control of Transport International Pool under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,738—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Georgia-Pacific Building Materials to acquire control of Evans Products under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and

industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,739—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Gulf Resources & Chemicals to acquire control of IRECO of Canada under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,740—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Keen Industries to acquire control of Tompkins Contracting under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,741—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Petrofina to acquire control of Tom Pollock Services under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,742—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Sony of Canada to acquire control of General Distributors under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,743—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of State Automotive Corp. to acquire control of Combines Automotive Products under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial effi-

ciency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,744—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Citicorp Leasing International to acquire control of North American Business Equipment under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,745—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Anchor Hocking Corp. to acquire control of Amerock Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,746—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Bell Pole Co. Ltd. to acquire control of Bell Sawmill Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,747—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Dow Chemical of Canada to acquire control of Iroquois Chemicals Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,748—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Frank W. Horner Ltd. to acquire control of Demver Laboratories (Canada) under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,749—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Harthind Corp. to acquire control of Arrow-Hart under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,750—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Lucerne Foods Ltd. to acquire control of Oakville Dairy Co-operative under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,751—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Multi-Elmac Company to acquire control of Multi-Elmac of Canada under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,752—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Stauffer Chemical Co. to acquire control of Marine Colloids Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of

Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,753—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Turner Development Ltd. to acquire control of Van Hil Realty (3 office buildings) under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,754—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Turner & Seymour to acquire control of J.I. Dick Manufacturing Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,755—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Canadian Occidental Petroleum Ltd. to acquire control of Squamish Industries Inc. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,756—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of CIBA-CEIGY Corp. to acquire control of Airkem Industries Inc. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,757—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Continental Can. Co. of Canada Ltd. to acquire control of Packaging Converters Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as sharehol-

ders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,758—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Hayes-Dana Ltd. to acquire control of Byers Truck and Trailer Equipment Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,759—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Diversified Products Corp. to acquire control of Nadco Health Equipment Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,760—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Prentice Holding Co., Inc. to acquire control of E.V. Prentice Co., Inc. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,761—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Tricil Waste Management Ltd. to acquire control of LaSalle Oil Carriers Inc. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

Order Paper Questions

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,762—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Turner Development Ltd. to acquire control of Petrona Atlantic Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,763—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of CIBA-CIEGY Ltd. to acquire control of Stewart Seeds Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,764—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Allis Chalmers of Can. and National Steel of Can. to acquire control of certain assets of Falconbridge under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL BY COMPANIES TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS

Question No. 4,765—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Altana Exploration Co. to acquire control of Intercontinential Energy Corp. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

NEW INVESTMENT PROPOSAL BY WORLD-WIDE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES INC.

Question No. 4,931—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Was a new investment proposal made by World-Wide Construction Services, Inc. of Witchita, Kansas, requiring the dismantling of a petroleum refinery located in East St. Louis, Illinois, and its redesign, transport and reconstruction near Lloydminster, Alberta and to render its services to the Husky Oil Limited Company, also of Lloydminster, for the completion of the Husky Project and, if so, what is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

2. Who are the principal shareholders of World-Wide Construction Services, Inc. of Witchita, Kansas?

3. Does World-Wide Construction Services, Inc. of Witchita, Kansas control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by per cent of control and value?

4. What will be the effect of the establishment of this petroleum refinery on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada (b) resource processing in Canada (c) utilization of parts, components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada?

5. How many persons will be employed once the new plant is established?

6. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

7. How will the establishment of this plant be (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the new plant?

8. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the transaction?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: a new investment proposal to establish a business near Lloydminster, Alberta was made by World-Wide Construction Services, Inc. The proposal was allowed by the Governor in Council on March 2, 1976 (P.C. 1976-487). All information with respect to a person, business or proposed business obtained in the course of the administration of the Foreign Investment Review Act is privileged and may not be released except as provided in section 14 of that Act.

PROPOSAL BY INCHCAPE CANADA LTD. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF UNIVERSAL FASTENING DEVICES LTD.

Question No. 4,933—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Inchcape Canada Ltd. to acquire control of Universal Fastening Devices Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL OF SIMPSON TANKER CO. (ALBERTA) LTD. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF MEUNIER LUMBER CO.

Question No. 4,934—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Simpson Timber Co. (Alberta) Ltd. to acquire control of Meunier Lumber Co. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL OF THANK YOU STAMP CO. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF CERTAIN ASSETS OF GOLD STAR SALES LTD.

Question No. 4,935—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Thank You Stamp Co. to acquire control of certain assets of Gold Star Sales Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL OF FIRESTONE TIRE AND RUBBER CO. OF CANADA TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF DUNLOP TIRE AND RUBBER CO. OF CANADA

Question No. 4,936—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Firestone Tire and Rubber Co. of Canada to acquire control of Dunlop Tire and Rubber Co. of Canada under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions

(c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,642.

PROPOSAL OF BAKER OIL TOOLS INC. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF REED TOOL COMPANY OF CANADA

Question No. 4,937—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Baker Oil Tools Inc. to acquire control of Reed Tool Company of Canada under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL OF MACDONALD TOBACCO INC. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF SIMON CIGAR CO. LTD.

Question No. 4,938—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of MacDonald Tabacco Inc. to acquire control of Simon Cigar Co. Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

[Mr. Leggatt.]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

PROPOSAL OF STANDARD BRANDS LTD. TO ACQUIRE CONTROL OF TEA AND SOUP OPERATION OF POWELL FOODS (1973) LTD.

Question No. 4,939—**Mr. Leggatt:**

1. In the case of the proposal of Standard Brands Ltd. to acquire control of Tea and Soup Operation of Powell Foods (1973) Ltd. under the Foreign Investment Review Act (a) what conditions were attached to the approval respecting (i) increased employment (ii) new investment (iii) increased resource processing or use of Canadian parts and services (iv) additional exports (v) Canadian participation (such as shareholders, directors or managers) (vi) improved productivity and industrial efficiency (vii) enhanced technological development (viii) improved product variety and innovation (ix) beneficial impact on competition (x) compatibility with industrial and economic policies (b) what time was permitted for compliance with the attached conditions (c) what was the last date of government review of compliance with the attached conditions?

2. As of the last date of review or as of January 31, 1976 (a) how many new jobs were created (b) what was the level of increase in new investment (c) what was the increase in resource processing or use of Canadian parts or service (d) what improvement in Canadian participation has occurred (e) what has been the increase in productivity and industrial efficiency (f) in what respect has technological development been enhanced (g) in what respect has product variety and innovation occurred (h) in what respect has competition been beneficially affected?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 4,621.

EXPANSION OF ST. LAWRENCE ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 5,097—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development receive a letter, dated March 12, 1976, from the Honourable Leo Bernier, Ontario Minister of Natural Resources on the subject of the proposed expansion of the St. Lawrence Islands National Park and, if so (a) did Mr. Bernier express Provincial Government «misgivings» on the expansion (b) did Mr. Bernier suggest the possibility that ownership of the present St. Lawrence Islands National Park be turned over to the Province of Ontario?

2. What is the policy of the government with respect to all the matters raised by Mr. Bernier in his letter?

3. Will the government review its expansion plans for the St. Lawrence Islands National Park because of expressed Provincial Government opposition, and (a) if so, on what date will this review take place (b) if not, for what reason?

Mrs. Iona Campagnolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes. (a) Yes; (b) Yes.

2. Our policy is to create a National Park of a character and size which adequately preserves and presents the important natural values of the Thousand Islands area.

3. No. (a) (b) However, it is proposed, in co-operation with an independent Advisory Committee, to develop options from which a «best concept plan» for the Park can be determined. This will take up to two years. It is expected by the end of this period that a plan for a more suitable National Park will have evolved that will not only be welcomed by the local population but which will be supportive of both Provincial and National objectives.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASING PROPOSALS TO CANADIAN BUSINESSES

Question No. 5,117—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Since 1971, has the government made purchasing proposals to Canadian businesses under the Foreign Investment Review Act and, if so, how many?

2. Were any such proposals accepted and, if so, in each case (a) how many (b) what was the name and address of the business concerned (c) in what year was it accepted (d) what was the amount negotiated?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: 1. The Foreign Investment Review Act was promulgated on December 12, 1973. Its first stage, namely, the acquisition of control of existing Canadian businesses by foreigners, was implemented on April 19, 1974; the second part, which prescribes the review of some categories of new enterprises established in Canada by foreigners, was implemented on October 15, 1975. The purpose of this law is to ensure that the acquisition of Canadian businesses and the creation of new Canadian enterprises by foreign Companies would result in significant advantages for Canada. There is nothing in the text of the Act concerning the acquisition of businesses established in Canada, by a Canadian buyer, whether it is a government or a private company.

2. Please refer to the second paragraph of the reply to the first question.

COMPANY TAKEOVERS

Question No. 5,132—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. In the takeover of Carson Northern Division of Alltrans Express Ltd. of Burnaby, British Columbia. which is controlled by Thomas Nationwide Transport Ltd. of St. Peters, New South Whales, Australia by Soo-Security Motorways Ltd. of Winnipeg, Manitoba, what percentage of control will Soo-Security Motorways Ltd. of Winnipeg, Manitoba, which is in turn controlled indirectly by British Electric Traction Company Limited acquire?

2. What is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

3. Who were the principal shareholders of Carson Northern Division of Alltrans Express Ltd. and what control, if any, will they retain in the company?

4. Who are the principal shareholders of British Electric Traction Company Limited of Piccadilly, London and what are their holdings in the company?

5. Does British Electric Traction Company Limited, of Piccadilly, London control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by per cent of control and value?

6. What will be the effect of the takeover on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada (b) resource processing in Canada (c) utilization of parts components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada (g) employment within Carson Northern Division of Alltrans Express Ltd. and within the industry?

7. (a) How many persons did Carson Northern Division of Alltrans Express Ltd. employ before the takeover (b) how many are presently employed?

8. (a) What are the unions, if any, who represented the employees (b) did they approve or disapprove of the takeover (c) was their opinion sought?

9. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

10. How is the takeover (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the takeover?

11. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the takeover?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 3,954, answered March 2, 1976.

COMPANY TAKEOVERS

Question No. 5,133—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. In the takeover of Netherlands Overseas Corporation Canada Limited and Canneth Corporation Limited, both of Toronto, both wholly owned by Bank Mees & Hope Groep, by Algemene Bank Nederland N.V. of Amsterdam, Netherlands, what percentage of control will Algemene Bank Nederland, N.V. of Amsterdam, Netherlands acquire?

2. What is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

3. Who were the principal shareholders of Bank Mees & Hope Groep and what control, if any, will they retain in the company?

4. Who are the principal shareholders of Algemene Bank Nederland N.V. of Amsterdam, Netherlands and what are their holdings in the company?

5. Does Algemene Bank Nederland N.V. of Amsterdam, Netherlands control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by per cent of control and value?

6. What will be the effect of the takeover on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada (b) resource processing in Canada (c) utilization of parts components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada (g) employment within Netherlands Overseas Corporation Canada Ltd. and Canneth Corporation Limited and within the industry?

7. (a) How many persons did Netherlands Overseas Corp. Canada & Canneth Corp. Ltd. employ before the takeover (b) how many are presently employed?

8. (a) What are the unions, if any, who represented the employees (b) did they approve or disapprove of the takeover (c) was their opinion sought?

9. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

10. How is the takeover (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the takeover?

11. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the takeover?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 3,954, answered March 2, 1976.

COMPANY TAKEOVERS

Question No. 5,134—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. In the takeover of Paul Gendron Electrique Inc. of Trois-Rivières, Quebec by Westinghouse Canada Limited of Hamilton which is controlled by Westinghouse Electric Corporation of Pittsburgh, Pa., what

percentage of control will Westinghouse Canada Limited of Hamilton acquire?

2. What is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

3. Who were the principal shareholders of Paul Gendron Electrique Inc. of Trois-Rivières, Quebec and what control, if any, will they retain in the company?

4. Who are the principal shareholders of Westinghouse Electric Corporation of Pittsburgh, Pa. and what are their holdings in the company?

5. Does Westinghouse Electric Corporation of Pittsburgh, Pa. control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by per cent of control and value?

6. What will be the effect of the takeover on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada (b) resource processing in Canada (c) utilization of parts components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada (g) employment within *Paul Gendron Electrique Inc.* of Trois-Rivières, Quebec and within the industry?

7. (a) How many persons did Paul Gendron Electrique Inc. of Trois-Rivières employ before the takeover (b) how many are presently employed?

8. (a) What are the unions, if any, who represented the employees (b) did they approve or disapprove of the takeover (c) was their opinion sought?

9. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

10. How is the takeover (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the takeover?

11. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the takeover?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): See reply to question No. 3,954, answered March 2, 1976.

NEW INVESTMENT PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A NEW BUSINESS IN BRAMPTON, ONTARIO

Question No. 5,135—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Was a new investment proposal made by Selly Oak Diecastings Ltd., of Worcester, England, which is 51 percent controlled by A.L. Dunn (Holdings) Ltd., of Nuneaton, England, which in turn is controlled by Central & Sheerwood Ltd. of London, England, to establish a new business in Brampton, Ontario, under the name Selly Oak Pattern and Mould Ltd., to be engaged in the production of moulds, patterns and tools for general industrial use and, if so, what is the total and/or per share price of the transaction, including the value of share transfers or other considerations?

2. Who are the principal shareholders of Central & Sheerwood Ltd.?

3. Does Central & Sheerwood Ltd. control and/or partially own, directly or indirectly, any other businesses in Canada and, if so, in each case, what are the holdings by percent of control and value?

4. What will be the effect of the establishment of this petroleum refinery on (a) the level and nature of economic activity in Canada (b) resource processing in Canada (c) utilization of parts, components, materials and services produced in Canada (d) exports from Canada (e) productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada (f) competition within any industry or industries in Canada?

5. How many persons will be employed once the new plant is established?

6. What is the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise or new business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the business enterprise or new business forms or will form?

7. How will the establishment of this plant be (a) compatible (b) incompatible with national industrial and economic policies, taking into consideration industrial and economic policy objectives of any province likely to be affected by the new plant?

8. What is the significant benefit to Canada of the transaction?

[Mr. Nystrom.]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as the Foreign Investment Review Agency is concerned: a proposal was made by Selly Oak Diecastings Ltd., of Worcester, England, to establish a new business under the name Selly Oak Pattern and Mould Ltd. in Brampton, Ontario. The proposal was allowed by the Governor in Council on March 9, 1976 (P.C. 1976-545). All information with respect to a person, business or proposed business obtained in the course of the administration of the Foreign Investment Review Act is privileged and may not be released except as provided in section 14 of that Act.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

Question No. 5,235—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. Is the position as head of the Equal Opportunities for Women Section of the Department of Agriculture filled by Ms. Helen Hogan and, if so, within what salary range is the position?

2. What are Ms. Hogan's projected expenses for 1976?

3. Does Ms. Hogan have any staff working directly for her and, if so, what are the costs for such staff?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): 1. Yes. Salary range—$14,937—$16,934.

2. 1976-77—$50,000, including salaries.

3. Yes. Salary range—$10,394—$11,364. (CR 4).

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 4,083 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

VIETNAMESE IMMIGRANTS

Question No. 4,083—**M. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):**

1. How many Vietnamese citizens are residing in the National Capital Area in (a) Ontario (b) Quebec?

2. What does the government offer to those who come to Canada as immigrants from Vietnam under the special programmes for (a) direct financial assistance (b) assistance through the provision of native food (c) shelter (d) clothing (e) furniture (f) basic medical services (g) basic dental services (h) educational facilities to enable them to learn English (*i*) tuition assistance (j) job training (k) child care services (l) other social services?

3. Which of the services in Part 2 are offered by the government and/or regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

STARRED QUESTIONS

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred questions 2,679 and 5,339?

[*Text*]

*PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO JUNE 6 TO 8, 1975

Question No. 2,679—**Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain):**

1. Were any government aircraft used in the advance preparation of the tour of Southwestern Ontario, on the weekend of June 6 to 8, 1975, by the Prime Minister and, if so (a) which aircraft (b) for how long was each used (c) what was the exact itinerary of each (d) what was the cost of use of each (e) what reimbursement was (i) sought (ii) received from the Liberal Federation of Canada or the Liberal Party of Ontario (f) what was the (i) name (ii) job description and who was the employer of each individual taking part in any of the trips?

2. Is it general practice of the government to allow government aircraft to be used by individuals making advance arrangements for trips by the Prime Minister, which include partisan functions and, if so (a) what is the authorization for such practice (b) what guidelines cover such practice?

3. For each year 1974 and 1975 (a) on how many occasions (b) on what specific dates were government aircraft used for such purpose and, in each case (i) what was the name (ii) who was the employer (iii) what was the job description of each passenger (iv) what was the exact itinerary of the aircraft (v) what was the cost of the use of such aircraft (vi) what remuneration was sought or received from the Liberal Federation of Canada or any other organization and what are the identities and amounts paid by any such organization?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Here is the answer, Mr. Speaker. Paragraph 1. (a), (b), (c), (d) see reply to question 2,708. (*e*) None. (*f*) See reply to question 2,708.

2 and 3. It is not general practice. This is the only instance in the calendar year 1974-75.

[*Text*]

*PRIME MINISTER'S TRIP TO JAMAICA—1976 EASTER HOLIDAY

Question No. 5,339—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did the Prime Minister use a government owned aircraft for his 1976 Jamaican Easter holdiay and (a) if not, who is the owner and what is an exact description of the aircraft (b) if so, what was the (i) cost per hour of flying time (ii) cost per hour of waiting time (iii) amount of fuel consumed and its cost (iv) total cost to the taxpayer of all flights made?

2. What is the (a) name and job designation (b) reason for being on board the aircraft, at any time, of all persons (i) from Canada to Jamaica (ii) from Jamaica to Canada (iii) during other flights?

3. (a) What were the (i) names and job designations (ii) annual salaries of the crew (b) did they remain in Jamaica while the Prime Minister was there and, if so (i) what were their total salaries earned for the period of the trip (ii) in what locations did they stay (iii) what was the total cost of their accommodations, meals etc. to the taxpayer?

4. Were any expenses paid by the government other than transportaton for the Prime Minister or anyone in his party and, if so, in each case (a) for whom (b) for what purpose (c) in what amounts?

5. What was the overall total cost to the taxpayer of all aspects of the Prime Minister's Easter holiday?

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer, to question

No. 5,339 is as follows. In so far as the Prime Minister's Office is concerned the answer to paragraph 1. is no. (*a*) Schedule commercial flight. (*b*) Not applicable. 2. Not applicable. 3. Not applicable. 4. Not applicable. 5. Nil.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED GOVERNMENT FAILURE TO DEVELOP EFFECTIVE ENERGY STRATEGY FOR ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Mr. James Gillies (Don Valley) moved:

That this House regrets the government's failure to develop an effective energy strategy for the Atlantic provinces and in particular deplores the callous attitude shown by the government to the plight of hundreds of those families living in the Atlantic provinces who in many cases can no longer afford to heat their homes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to raise the subject of this important motion as a member from central Canada because, unlike government members, I believe Canada can only prosper when all Canada prospers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillies: It is imperative, if we are to have an energy policy, for Canada, that it is a policy for all Canadians and not just western Canada or, indeed, central Canada.

The policy document "An Energy Strategy for Canada" presented an opportunity that has been sadly wasted—the chance to take leadership on the Atlantic power issue. In 23 pages of policy recommendations, Atlantic Canada was mentioned only eight times. No new policies were announced which will answer the special problems the region faces. Moreover, the policy of moving to world prices, aside from whatever other benefits may accrue, will certainly put a heavy strain on already fragile economies. the Atlantic region, consuming 40 barrels of oil per capita, uses a third more oil per head than Quebec, the next largest consumer. Half of the region's electricity is oil-fired.

Even with subsidies, the escalation of oil prices in the past two years has created real hardship. In Nova Scotia, electricy prices have risen by approximately 70 per cent in one year. There is only a vague reference to the problem in the report, as follows:

—(the government will be) encouraging substitution of electricity generated from domestic energy resources, including hydro and coal, for electricity generated from imported oil.

Beyond this the government has nothing to say about this crucial problem. The people of the Atlantic provinces do not want jam tomorrow; they want leadership today. The arrogance of this government is summed up by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie)

who seems to believe that what benefits central Canada is in the national interest, but what harms Atlantic Canada harms that area alone. The federal government offers no special assistance of any kind to alleviate the region's pressing problems. To date, the principal forms of aid offered by the federal government have been grants to cover 50 per cent of the cost of nuclear power stations, grants to cover half the cost of regional interconnections between provinces, and Fundy tidal power studies, but nothing has been done to help alleviate the problems—and it is obvious from ministerial pronouncements that nothing will be done.

● (1510)

The federal policy of giving grants to cover half the cost of the first nuclear station purchase by a province is not motivated by any compassion for the east coast's energy problems, but is simply a loss leader for nuclear sales. Aside from considerable doubt about the safety of nuclear power stations, their reliability and the hazards of waste disposal, the economics of nuclear power are coming into serious question. Last month it was announced that the anticipated costs of the New Brunswick nuclear power station had increased by $100 million to $600 million, an increase of 20 per cent. The net result is this: at present coal prices of about $30 per ton delivered, nuclear and coal-fired electricity cost about the same.

Despite not knowing what the impact of nuclear generating will be, the government insists on going ahead with nuclear generators. Would it not be a great deal better for the provinces concerned if the construction of coal-fired electricity plants was encouraged, thus avoiding the problems associated with nuclear power and encouraging the growth of an indigenous coal industry.

An examination of the proposal for research and development as it affects Atlantic Canada shows that it is totally inadequate for meeting the needs of the Atlantic provinces. The policy document spells out exactly where the special research and development needs of the Atlantic provinces are as far as federal research funding priorities are concerned—namely, at the end of the line. Renewable energy, which includes as its biggest component the Fundy tidal power scheme, is second to last in terms of federal priorities. Transmission system research ranked last. But transmission systems are of vital importance to the Atlantic provinces if the full benefit is to be derived from a regional or national grid. Transmission losses from ordinary power lines over long distances are substantial. Research taking place at the moment indicates that supercooled conductors could reduce power losses almost to zero. Yet the federal government put research and development in this area at the very bottom of the list. Another area of research taking place in Britain is in wave power. Preliminary findings indicate that more power generators may well be economic at current oil prices and could generate a significant proportion of base load electricity in the Atlantic provinces. Yet the government has neglected this area entirely.

It could be said that the Nova Scotia power crisis is partly the fault of the province's Liberal government. Nova Scotia, as a province, is hit hard. It is to some extent a victim of the provincial government's own energy policy. Following the provincial takeover of the industry, Nova Scotians were subjected to a barrage of advertising designed to encourage the growth of all electric heating. There was substantial response: some areas, such as new developments in Halifax's Sackville suburb, are virtually all electrically heated. Home owners now pay as much as $350 in power costs every two months during the winter. In a significant number of cases, individuals have had to sell their homes because of power costs.

We now need some scheme in the Atlantic provinces which will encourage home owners whose principal residence is electrically heated to convert to more efficient fossil fuel fired heating systems which should take the place of their electrical heating systems. A given quantity of heat in an electrically heated home in Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island requires three times as much oil as the same home would require if heated with an oil furnace. In addition, great strides have been made in coal fired central heating in Europe. Some of this technology could be applied in the Atlantic provinces.

In summary, my party believes that an adequate energy policy for Canada must include a positive program for dealing with the high cost of fuel which the people of Atlantic Canada must pay. We do not think that the policy of continuing to support the Atlantic provinces' energy costs with the type of subsidy which has been paid in the past is viable. We think it essential that the federal government should take strong action in research and development so that the Atlantic provinces can use their potential energy resources for the generation of power. That part of the country should not be dependant on changes in price governed by OPEC countries. It should not be the victims of the federal government's insatiable need for tax revenues. Its energy program should be indigenous, using the resources of the area so that the people of Atlantic Canada may have energy at prices appropriate to their incomes.

It was totally unacceptable for the minister to bring down a report on energy strategy for Canada which ignores totally the substantial needs of the people of Atlantic Canada. In the report, the government showed, again, that it is interested in technology and techniques but is not at all interested in people. The report should have dealt with an energy policy for all Canadians. It ought to have evaluated what the people of Canada, of all regions, need—not just of the west, of the central part or of the eastern region. But it did not do this. Also, this report does nothing at all for the people of Atlantic Canada.

We ask the government to reconsider what it is doing in research and development, to reconsider its priorities, to reconsider its proposals for nuclear energy and to provide realistically for the energy needs of Atlantic Canada. We ask it to develop an energy program which will meet the needs, not in 15 years, not in 10 years, but immediately. The government is responsible for developing a realistic energy program for Atlantic Canada. We must move in that direction. The purpose of the opposition motion today is to bring to the attention of the government as forcefully as possible the need for responding to the energy requirements of the people in an important part of this nation, namely, in the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Andy Hogan (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) for introducing the important topic of energy

on a Tory opposition day. Nova Scotia now has the dubious distinction of having the second highest power rates in Canada, next to Prince Edward Island. These rates, combined, are now about double the national average, Nova Scotia being some 27 per cent above the national average.

Let us briefly summarize our position from the point of view of power sources and our position relative to other Canadian provinces. Prince Edward Island uses oil for 100 per cent of its generating capacity. New Brunswick generates about 40 per cent of its power from oil, 50 per cent from hydro and 10 per cent from coal. Nova Scotia depends on oil for 70 per cent of its requirements, on coal for 16 per cent, which is contractually tied to the price of oil, and on hydro for 14 per cent. Newfoundland and Quebec derive between 90 per cent and 95 per cent from hydro sources. Ontario derives about 50 per cent of its energy from hydro, but also has a substantial nuclear base and depends on United States coal as well to fuel thermal stations. United States coal used by Ontario has increased but has not gone up at the same percentage rate as oil in the Atlantic region.

The western provinces have substantial hydro generation in their systems. Their thermal operations use coal, in most cases from their own leases, which is provided through what the English call open cast mining and which we usually call strip mining. The price of coal there is less than $5 per ton.

In early 1974 the Canadian wellhead price of oil was $3.80 per barrel. It rose to $6.50 and on July 1, 1975, to $8. We know that very likely it will rise to $9.50 or $10 per barrel by July. The federal government is pursuing its goal of allowing the producing provinces to go to parity with the world monopoly price established by the OPEC cartel. Meanwhile, oil which in 1971 was brought from Venezuela and the Middle East to the east coast for less than $2 per barrel now costs more than $13 delivered by tanker from the same two sources.

The federal government estimates that for the fiscal year 1976-77 it will cost some $1.41 billion in subsidy payments to make up for the difference between the Canadian and the world price. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), when replying to a question of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) on April 27, 1976, as reported on page 12915 of *Hansard,* misled the House, I think, when he said:

● (1520)

The numbers I have seen indicate that very close to $1 billion has been paid indirectly to the consumers of Atlantic Canada as a result of the compensation program; that is, very close to $1 billion will have been paid to them by this summer.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Trudel), when he used the figures for compensation payments in the House on March 16 in replying to me, used the figure quoted earlier of $1.41 billion for the 1976-77 fiscal year as referring to all the territory east of the Ottawa Valley line. This means that anywhere from two-thirds to 75 per cent of the total compensation payment was going to the province of Quebec. On that premise, I conclude the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources misled us, perhaps inadvertently, on the compensation payments made to the Atlantic region.

Last year, power rates in Nova Scotia increased by 50 per cent. As every member from Nova Scotia knows, there have been citizen protest meetings held all over the province. Now, if we assume an increase by July 1 of $2 a barrel, the province's power rates are estimated to increase by an additional 10 per cent. However, that is not the end of the story for Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotia Power Corporation gets about one-half of its heavy fuel oil from Imperial Oil. A long-term contract with that company expires at the end of the year. We are purchasing that oil now at $1.75 a barrel. There will be another 20 per cent increase in our electrical costs when that contract expires. Incidentally, Imperial Oil has the Power Corporation before the courts on the interpretation of this contract which, if the Power Corporation loses, could cost the province another $100 million more or less.

In any case, Nova Scotians are faced with a maximum increase of 100 per cent in cost over a two-year period. In a have-not province, these are formidable obstacles to development, even with a special federal government subsidy which cabinet members who have spoken so far seem to frown on. It is estimated that it would take a total subsidy of $15 million to $16 million to bring Nova Scotia's electrical costs in line with the Canadian average.

The fuel bill for the Nova Scotia Power Corporation in the fiscal period which began April 1 is forecast to be $85 million. On the basis of 1972 oil prices, this would have been $20 million to $25 million. This I submit, Mr. Speaker, is a valid indicator of the extra burden now being shouldered by Nova Scotians and Prince Edward Islanders and, to a lesser extent, citizens of New Brunswick and Newfoundland. With the exception of Ontario, where imported coal from the U.S. would have a much less significant impact, this unfair situation applies to no other electric consumers in Canada outside of the Atlantic region.

Some of Ottawa's energy planners have, through the press, suggested that the present Liberal government in Halifax has brought the trouble upon its own head. The reference by the hon. member for Don Valley to electrical heating that was promoted by the Nova Scotia Power Corporation is, in my opinion, valid. I hold no brief for the government in Halifax, especially since they, along with the Tory government which ran the province before them, badly messed up the redevelopment and modernization of the vitally important steel plant in Sydney. However, I find it difficult to fault Nova Scotia's claim that they were led down the garden path on power costs by the federal government.

It is a fact that the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald), who was then minister of energy, mines and resources, in 1973 tabled a document in this House entitled "An Energy Policy for Canada". That document projected that foreign oil would be less than $4 per barrel by 1976 and would not reach $7 per barrel until the year 2000. On March 30, in response to a question of mine, the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, said that they offered Nova Scotia the opportunity to participate in a regional nuclear reactor. He went on to say: "That offer was not taken up." As I understand it, that offer was one of a loan, or loans, to help build a second nuclear reactor at New Brunswick's Point Lepreau nuclear complex which is slated to be on-stream by 1980. The last estimate that I saw

for the Lepreau plant amounted to $650 million. That was a couple of years ago. I understand—and maybe the minister can give us a better figure—it is now estimated to cost well over $1 billion.

The power officials in Nova Scotia said they would not take part in the Lepreau complex because they could not get a guarantee on the price power and they were concerned about escalating capital costs over which Nova Scotia would have no control. They also argued that Nova Scotia would not get any economic spin-off if the plant were built in another province, and from their point of view it would be unsound to get a large block of power from a single source susceptible to breakdowns in an electrical system as isolated as that of Nova Scotia. I doubt whether the minister can claim that nuclear-powered electricity will be cheap at the New Brunswick plant. The experience of these plants in the United States has not shown that to be so. In fact, nuclear costs keep rising at a great rate.

Ottawa claims that its other offer was to pick up 50 per cent of the tab for the study of a regional power grid, plus 50 per cent of the capital cost. The Nova Scotia government denies flatly that they ever refused that offer. In fact, the Premier of Nova Scotia tabled a submission in the Nova Scotia House recently showing that is 1971 the Nova Scotia Power Commission, as a member of the maritime power pool, made an offer to the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion for assistance toward an accelerated generating transmission program between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. No federal action was taken on that submission.

A regional power grid involving the five eastern provinces would be helpful, but it requires the co-operation of all provinces and it seems that they have not been eager to go ahead. In fact, New Brunswick has given notice that it will charge what the market will bear for any electricity crossing its territory between Labrador, Quebec and Nova Scotia. It was at Nova Scotia's suggestion that the interprovincial advisory council on energy was established in late 1974. Last September, on the initiative of Premier Bourassa of Quebec, the premiers of the five eastern provinces agreed to a study to determine the availability and the economics of transmitting any surplus power. The manager of the Nova Scotia Power Corporation, Mr. Kirkpatrick, told the industry committee of the Nova Scotia legislature at the end of March that the preliminary report was not optimistic. It appears that there will be no surplus power from Quebec or Labrador in the near future. Every indication points to the fact that the regional power grid would not bring in cheap power from Nova Scotia.

I was glad to see, in the minister's submission last week, the renewed effort to get the Fundy tides studied again, but I think we have to be realistic on this score and realize that if this is going to be a steady power contributor, rather than one depending on the peaks of the tide, it will be extremely expensive and very capital-intensive. What the government of Nova Scotia should do is open two additional coal mines in the Cape Breton area, one at Lingan on the Phalen seam, and one at Donkin, which was recommended in 1971 after the closure of No. 2 mine in Glace Bay by the then special adviser on coal to the federal government, Mr. Alex Brown.

[Mr. Hogan.]

• (1530)

I think that in terms of British thermal units, one ton of coal is equated to four barrels of oil. The usual estimate for Cape Breton coal is 26 million Btu's per ton; for one barrel of oil it is six million Btu's. If oil is to cost the Power Corporation of Nova Scotia between $15 and $17 a barrel by 1980, then surely, given the high rate of unemployment in Cape Breton and the diseconomies which come from depending on buying nuclear power from New Brunswick or obtaining cheaper power from the regional grid, the province should return to coal to provide a great deal of its thermal needs, although we must admit that up to now the reserves capable of being mined are not accurately known. However, Devco intends to carry on an active program of offshore drilling.

Of course, it takes time and money to open new coal mines and the only answer to the short run problem of Nova Scotia from now until 1982 is a special subsidy or special equalization grant from the federal government to keep that have-not province from becoming even worse off economically. If we neglect to do this, not only will development be hindered but many pensioners and others in low income groups will face an unbelievably cruel situation as human beings and as citizens of this nation.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this difficult and complex subject I thought that there would be somebody on the government benches with at least enough interest, if not enough comprehension, to rise and take part in the discussion. The minister waves his hand and says they want to hear me first.

Mr. Gillespie: It is an opposition day. It is your day. I hope the hon. member will have something better to say than we have heard so far.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If the minister wants to make a speech, why does he not get up and make it?

Mr. Stanfield: I do not think the minister is anxious to make a speech, in view of what he has been saying today and what he has said in the past. Regardless of what they believe the approach to this problem should be, every one has to agree that the maritime provinces, especially Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, are confronted by an alarming prospect. Whether a solution is difficult or whether it is reasonably within everybody's grasp, one gets the impression here in the House that the minister and the government are not really sympathetic in terms of finding an approach to this problem.

There can be no question about the prospect in store for a good many individuals, some of whom are obliged to get along on low incomes. In any event, I assume the government of Nova Scotia will have to show some leadership, hopefully in association with the government here, in finding some way of alleviating the conditions in which those individuals find themselves.

I want to take the limited amount of time available to me today to talk about the effect of higher increased fuel costs, both the increase which has already taken place and the increase which is to be expected, on the economy of the

region. In doing so, I do not in any way play down the effect of those increases upon individuals, but I am concerned this afternoon to place before the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie)—who is in the House and who is the responsible minister—the effect of those increases in power costs upon the government's whole program for fighting regional disparity in the maritime provinces. This is a subject in which the minister responsible for DREE should have an intense interest.

Fighting regional disparity has been an important aspect of government policy during the lifetime of the administration under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and, indeed, prior to that time. The results have not been particularly sensational, but the government has made this a priority and certainly it has spent a good deal of the taxpayers' money in an effort to reduce regional disparity by encouraging the development of the maritime economy. Ever since 1968, the year in which the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was established, I have contended that one of the great weaknesses of the government's program of regional economic development has been the lack of co-ordination within the government of Canada itself. The minister responsible for DREE would take some initiative which would be helpful, only to find it counterbalanced by action taken, for example, by the Minister of Transport.

Today we are discussing a striking example of a development which will clearly undermine the efforts of DREE to develop the economy of the maritime provinces generally. I do not want to be unfair to the minister, but in my opinion he, as the minister responsible, has shown a most cavalier attitude toward this whole question. I am not referring to the minister responsible for DREE, but to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Here is a striking example of a development which is taking place and threatening to escalate, one which is most discouraging to the development of industry in the eastern provinces. It affords a striking example of lack of co-ordination in terms of government effort.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) said in the House the other day that the government of Canada is not likely to get into the business of equalizing power rates across the country. I accept that statement, but I have to ask the question: What will be the economic consequences of what is taking place with respect to power costs in the Atlantic provinces? What is likely to be the effect of increases in power costs on the movement of the economy in those provinces? Is it possible to develop some answer, if only a partial answer, which will not have the effect of offsetting any forward thrust which has been generated by DREE, by the provinces or by the people themselves? Is it possible to develop such an approach, rather than simply taking the attitude the minister seems to have taken, that the government of Canada has already done a great deal for the people of the maritime provinces, and let it go at that?

● (1540)

I accept the minister's point that a good deal of money has been spent in terms of tax-sharing and equalization. But I would ask the minister: What is the sense in the government of Canada involving itself in the kind of expenditure about which the minister has boasted, and then letting the effects of all this go down the drain by allowing an increase in power rates? Let us give the minister and his government whatever credit they may seek for equalization payments and other special programs; but if they accept that credit then they must explain to the people, not only of the maritime provinces but of Canada why, having embarked on those programs, why they are sitting back coolly and allowing to happen what is happening to power rates while permitting the price of oil to move up toward world prices.

The minister and other spokesmen for the government have inferred from time to time that there are solutions available to the province of Nova Scotia, but they try to leave the impression that somehow the government of the province of Nova Scotia, or somebody down there, did not take advantage of the wisdom handed out in various emanations from the federal government from time to time.

What are the alternatives in Nova Scotia, for example, to the development of power from oil? There is the possibility of a switch to coal. The hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) and my distinguished colleague from Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) of the NDP spoke about this. I should like to think that there is some prospect of a significant increase in the use of Nova Scotia coal in the development of power, but this would represent a substantial investment that would take a fair amount of time. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond understands all too well that we do not open a coal mine, for example, in six months, a year or even two years. It takes time.

I want to be frank with the House, Mr. Speaker. How much would a switch to coal really reduce the cost of power in Nova Scotia? I think it is an excellent idea in that it would involve additional employment in Nova Scotia and would add to the economy of the coal mining areas there. But I rather suspect that the price of coal from the mines would tend to follow upward the price of oil. I see the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond nodding his head in agreement. So that I am not misunderstood, certainly I favour the use of coal in the development of power in Nova Scotia, but I doubt very much whether, in terms of Btu's, over the years, coal would be a cheaper source of electrical power than oil. I gather from his nod that the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond tends to agree that that is probably the case, though like me he has indicated that he favours the use of coal for this purpose in view of the development and employment opportunities involved. In any event, any movement in that direction would take time.

Federal ministers have also talked about development of an interprovincial grid. That, too, takes time. Recent inquiries have indicated that there is not likely to be any power available from sources outside the maritime provinces for a good number of years. There is no reason to believe that if a grid could be constructed, even within six months, it would result in the availability of cheaper power for Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. There is absolutely no indication that any such power would be available from Quebec, Newfoundland or Labrador for many years to come.

Another alternative is nuclear power. The station in New Brunswick, I understand, will not be finished until 1980. But how much is this power going to cost? For the sake of

New Brunswick, I hope it is not going to cost too much. I doubt that we will get any firm indication today from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of what will be the cost of power generated by that nuclear power station. If the minister and his colleagues are going to talk to the House about sources of power other than oil, and are going to push nuclear power in Canada and its use in the maritime provinces, then they should be prepared to give us some pretty firm prices.

If these ministers are going to suggest to members of parliament in this country that this source of power constitutes an alternative—leaving aside for the moment any questions of safety in the CANDU system—and if the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is going to suggest to the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island that they should turn to nuclear power, then they have to be able to give some pretty firm assurances as to cost, and I do not think they can do so. So I suggest that some of these alternative sources are pretty dubious. It seems difficult to put a firm cost on nuclear power.

Access to cheaper power through a grid seems to be based on the assumption that cheaper power from somewhere else is available, whereas in fact inquiries reveal there is no such power available, at least for quite a number of years into the future, if then. Where does that leave us, Mr. Speaker? I think it leaves the government of Canada in the position where it will have to stop talking in general terms and get down to actual cases. The government was told in the House today that there is no power available in the future under a grid system. Use of nuclear power has been questioned on the basis of how much it is going to cost. Is it going to be any cheaper than power generated by oil, even with oil at world prices?

I do not want to talk too long, Mr. Speaker, but may I just say that these alternatives will take years to develop. I do not think it is any exaggeration to say that it will take ten years to bring about any significant change in the cost of electric power in Nova Scotia by turning to an interprovincial grid or to nuclear power to any extent. I should like the minister, as well as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard), to indicate to the House what they think is going to happen to industry of all kinds in the maritime provinces during that ten-year period. I think the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources should get together with the power authority down there with a view to working out a longer term solution which would hold together, not just generalities such as they have cast out to date. Certainly that is part of the answer. Part of the answer is for the responsible minister in the federal government to work out a longer term solution with the maritime provinces. They have not done that yet, at least I do not see any sign that the minister has put forward concrete, hard-headed alternatives to the way in which power is presently being developed there, unless one wants to talk about coal.

● (1550)

I ask my colleagues opposite what will happen to the economic development of the maritime provinces during the ten-year period when they switch to an alternative which the government of Canada has not yet developed. Does it make any sense to have embarked upon a program of regional economic development in that area and let all else go down the drain by simply sitting back and refusing to work out some kind of interim solution?

I was amazed, in the committee on regional development, to find that the department has not had any study made of the effects of the anticipated higher power costs on the economic development of those provinces. They can ascertain very easily what the projections are about power rates. The Nova Scotia Power Corporation and the authorities in New Brunswick and in P.E.I. can tell the ministers what they expect the power rates will be, based upon changes in oil prices. But the responsible authorities in this government have not conducted any studies to ascertain what the effects of those high power rates will be on the economic development of the maritime provinces.

How can one possibly justify such a lack of interest? I do not pretend that the problem is easy to solve, but I cannot accept what seems to me to be the very cool, detached, cavalier attitude of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to this problem. I do not want to be unfair to the minister. I do not think it makes sense for the government of Canada, having involved itself deeply in a program of regional economic expansion, to refuse now to attempt to work out a selective and transitional program which will enable the economy of those provinces to continue to move forward.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: There is probably a pretty fair percentage of the industry—I am not talking simply about the manufacturing industry, but I am referring to farmers, fishermen, and so on—which will be hurt by the higher power rates but which can carry on and still continue to develop because power costs will not be a large proportion of their costs. On the other hand, there is probably a significant proportion of the economy of those provinces which could well be obliterated completely if those industries had to operate with the anticipated power rates for a period of five to ten years. Yet the indications are that this government has not even attempted to find out what those industries are likely to be and what might be done in conjunction with the provinces to enable them to carry on. I think that is inexcusable.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are starting to rise in order to remind me that my time is up. I am almost ready to sit down, in any event. I call upon the ministers present, and the members behind them, to ask themselves whether they are not sufficiently committed to the program to fight economic disparity, both in terms of commitments already made and moral commitments to the people of the maritime provinces and the people of Canada, and whether they are not sufficiently committed to the policy of fighting regional economic disparity to come seriously to grips with the effects of the anticipated higher power rates on the economy of these provinces. Are they not prepared to sit down with the provinces and work out, perhaps not a solution—that would be too much to ask for—but a method of enabling the economy to go forward, to work out what I call a selective and transitional program? It is not good enough for the government simply to say they have already done a lot for the maritime provinces. Maritimers

can talk about what they have done for the people of Canada, as far as that is concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It is not good enough simply to talk in these terms and to waste the taxpayers' money that has already been spent by allowing industry after industry to go down the drain as a result of higher power costs. So I say to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that he should come to grips with this problem, face it, and for goodness sake I hope he does not get up and talk in general terms about long-term solutions that are vague. I ask whether he is not prepared in principle to accept the program of selective and transitional aid to preserve the validity of the government's program of fighting regional economic disparity.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I very much welcome the opportunity that this debate provides for us to discuss a very important question to Canadians, particularly to Atlantic Canadians. But I do not think we should see the problem just in Atlantic terms. As important as that problem is to Atlantic Canada, it is quite clear to me that other communities in Canada can make their own claims for special treatment. However, that is not the debate today. The debate today is on special concerns of Atlantic Canada—and I want to address myself to that debate.

I listened with great care to the energy critic of the official opposition. Indeed, I had already had the benefit of reading his new release which went out yesterday, in which he stated:

During this debate the Progressive Conservatives intend to press home the government's responsibilities to the people of Atlantic Canada and make positive suggestions to ameliorate the situation.

I listened very carefully to hear what those positive suggestions were that he would offer us and the people of Canada, more particularly the people of Atlantic Canada. Quite frankly, I have to say that I could not find them in his words. I listened carefully to the former leader of the opposition, and if the Tory party has some ideas, I hope during the course of the debate there will be more specific information provided to us.

● (1600)

Quoting the lead-off speaker, I think he said that his party does not want to hear from the government about grants toward the future and that they want something for today. I may not have quoted him exactly, but he seemed to opt out completely from the problem in Atlantic Canada. The former leader of the opposition was careful to point out and explain to us the problem and its over-all effects. He pointed out the long-term problem and the problem with respect to the industrialization of Atlantic Canada. I can understand that, but I had great difficulty when I listened to the energy critic, the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies), turn his back on the long-term solutions. He referred to nuclear power as if that was something we should not even consider for Atlantic Canada. He called it a loss leader for nuclear sales in Canada. That was his phrase. It was a great phrase, but that is the problem with his party; it is faint-hearted when it comes to the best piece of technology Canada has ever developed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: The CANDU system has already demonstrated that it is a system which is second to none. If the hon. member disagrees with me or questions that, I ask him to ask his colleague from a provincial riding very close to his, the minister of energy for the province of Ontario, Mr. Timbrell. It seems to me that is the only basis upon which the Ontario government can justify spending millions, if not billions of dollars in the future. We in Canada have the best nuclear system in the world. I think it might be useful if I were to spend a few minutes dealing with the dimensions of the problem and, more particularly, with the reasons for there being a specific problem.

Mr. Gillies: We know the questions; what are the answers?

Mr. Gillespie: That is the glib, superficial approach of the hon. member for Don Valley. He would like to be instant expert, without knowing what the problem is.

An hon. Member: Better an instant expert than no expert at all.

Mr. Gillespie: It is suggested time and time again that the only problem the Atlantic provinces have is that they are dependent upon foreign oil and that a very large proportion of their electrical energy is generated from oil. The hon. member for Don Valley said so. That came through. That is all that usually comes through. There is very little recognition of the fact—I have not heard anyone opposite say this—that probably the most important fact is that the energy efficiency of generating plants in Atlantic Canada is about 50 per cent of those in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Hogan: That is because they use oil.

Mr. Gillespie: It has nothing to do with the fuel; it has to do with the size of the plants and their efficiency. That is why grids and interconnections are important. They are important because the people of Atlantic Canada can benefit from very much larger, more efficient generating units. If the hon. member would listen, he might recognize where some of the leaders of Atlantic Canada have been rather shortsighted.

Mr. Gillies: To say nothing of the leaders of the federal government.

Mr. Gillespie: If we look at the generating efficiency of plants in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, we find that in Ontario roughly 665 kilowatt hours per barrel of oil can be produced. In Nova Scotia, that figure is 550 and in P.E.I. it is 445. If we put the fuel requirement ration for Ontario down as 100 per cent, we find that Nova Scotia's is 120 per cent and Prince Edward Island's is 150 per cent. In other words, the ration is very important when it comes to the cost of generating and converting oil into electrical energy.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Gillespie: I would be pleased to answer questions at the end of my remarks. The second problem is that of dilution. Every increase in the price of oil will have a greater effect on Nova Scotia and P.E.I. than elsewhere because of the higher proportion of their electrical energy which is generated from oil. The net effect of these two factors, lower efficiency and greater dependance on oil, is the real problem as far as the increase in electrical energy costs in Atlantic Canada is concerned, particularly with respect to Nova Scotia and P.E.I.

There are several other problems which I think are important to place on the record at the present time. One has to do with the rate of change of electrical energy costs. The Nova Scotia government did not increase the price of electrical power between 1958 and 1974, a period of 16 years. During that period most of the public utilities of the other provinces were moving the cost of their power up, so that their consumers were becoming adjusted to higher power rates. The Nova Scotia Power Commission, on the other hand, waited a full year and a half after the oil price increase before it moved its price up. Subsequently, of course, it had to move it up very much more dramatically, with all that that entails for the people and the squeeze on their incomes. Perhaps it might be worth noting that the real cost of electrical power today in Nova Scotia and in the Atlantic provinces, when compared with the average hourly wage of Nova Scotians and those in the Atlantic area, is lower today than it was ten years ago. To put it another way, wages have increased much more rapidly than power costs over that ten-year period, so that they have to work 35 per cent less time to purchase the same amount of electrical energy in 1976 compared with 1966.

Mr. Gillies: What about the last two years?

Mr. Gillespie: I am not trying to make the case that electrical energy is cheap, but I am trying to put it in some kind of context so that hon. members can understand the problem. Another point which the hon. member for Don Valley overlooked was the whole question of insulation standards. His remarks were really geared to the electrically-heated house. As I understood him, the one measure he would promote and advocate would be some kind of temporary assistance to convert from electrically-heated houses to houses heated by coal or some other form of energy; but he did not spell that out. If he has any particular views as to how that should be done or what amounts of money should be devoted to it, I would be very interested in hearing from him. The point which has to be made is that in many electrically-heated houses the costs have gone sky high, and they have done so because electric heat has gone into the wrong kinds of houses. The houses have been either poorly insulated or not well designed for using electric heat. Hon. members pointed out a number of very unfortunate incidents, but I think they are for the Nova Scotia Power Commission to deal with. I think they should introduce insulation standards and regulate the use of their own resources.

● (1610)

Over the years, the federal government has put together a number of particular thrusts with respect to the energy future of Atlantic Canada. I think the best way for me to deal with this is to put them into five different categories.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Let me start with those policies which are aimed at increasing access to large units of generating capacity. I refer to the efficiency of the average-sized generating station in Atlantic Canada. The federal government has provided assistance for the upgrading of the size and financing of power generation. I am referring, of course, to the Gull Island project in Newfoundland. The federal government said it would underwrite the transmission costs for this with loans to cover half the transmission costs, providing access to a larger unit. There is the interconnection from the mainland to Prince Edward Island, with loans and grants of $27 million to provide, for Prince Edward Island, access to larger units of generating capacity. There is also the access of which New Brunswick took advantage, namely, to an interconnecting grid arrangement.

In July, 1972, officials of my department made proposals to the electrical utilities departments in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for a joint power pool plant in the Atlantic provinces which would give access to larger, more efficient units. These proposals were made more than a year prior to the oil crisis of October, 1973. I regret to say that these types of initiatives have not been picked up as we would have liked.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) pointed out that grid arrangements are not going to solve the problems of the Atlantic provinces and that, indeed, this would take some years. He is right. But if the Nova Scotia government, in its wisdom, had chosen to avail itself of some interconnecting possibilities several years ago—

Mr. Stanfield: Where?

Mr. Gillespie: —it might today be using the power which is now exported to Maine.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: Does the hon. member realize that New Brunswick is exporting power to Maine?

Miss MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Yes. And the other way around; it is coming back.

Mr. Gillespie: I would invite hon. members opposite to look at a missed opportunity when it comes to grid interconnections. I have referred to larger units, Mr. Speaker. I would hope it would be possible to bring on the Gull Island development project, at least in the transmission stages. In that connection, the government has an offer on the table of $343 million, being 50 per cent of the estimated transmission cost.

I have already referred to the other interconnections that the federal government is involved in with Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. Perhaps I should put on the table an overview of the amounts which the federal government has made available to the provinces of Atlantic Canada over the last ten years through grants or loans. I am speaking now only of electrical generation, not the total picture.

There is the oil import compensation program just for electrical energy, which is modest when you compare it with the total; the grant to the New Brunswick interconnection; the grant to the Prince Edward Island interconnection; grants for interconnection studies for Prince

Edward Island and Newfoundland; grants for the tidal power program; grants for present tidal review; Atlantic Development Board grants for electrical projects; grants for coal subventions under the Atlantic Provinces Power Development Act, 1958-1969, and the losses which have been picked up by Devco on the pricing of coal, which is a form of subsidy to the electrical users of the Atlantic provinces. These grants total $269 million.

In addition to these, Mr. Speaker, loans were made available to the Atlantic provinces under the Atlantic Provinces Power Development Act for transmission and thermal power plants, to the Prince Edward Island interconnection, to the Point Lepreau nuclear plant, and the offer for Gull Island transmission. These total $927 million. That does not include grants under the oil import compensation program which have been paid to Atlantic provinces consumers directly or indirectly over and above the oil import compensation program of approximately $90 million for electrical generation noted above.

The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) asked some questions about this, and I think I can satisfy him on the reconciliation of the two sets of figures. The first point is access to large units of generation. The second point is that the thrust has been made to provide alternative sources of power which are not subject to the same kind of escalation as oil prices when they are under the control of the OPEC nations' cartel. Clearly, I am talking about nuclear power and the offer made to the province of Nova Scotia. I would hope the province would find it in their interest to re-examine plans for their participation in a nuclear plant for the province, probably in conjunction with other provinces in the region.

With regard to research and development for new types of energy such as Fundy power, I have referred to grants made with respect to tidal power. There have been demonstration projects in Prince Edward Island on solar and wind power, and Iles-de-la-Madeleine this summer will have a wind power demonstration project, costing roughly $250,000, which should provide enough electricity to light approximately 600 houses. These are alternative sources of power and I believe each has a particular relevance to a particular type of community need.

The opposition has made no reference to Petro-Canada. I can understand their reluctance to give it any credit. After all, they held up debate in this House for weeks last summer when they tried to stop passage of the bill establishing Petro-Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: I find it passing strange that when Petro-Canada puts together a deal along with two other oil companies, a consortium, which in all likelihood would not otherwise have been formed—a deal of $25 million a year on the Scotian shelf for five years—to stimulate the search for oil and natural gas off that coast, there is no comment by the opposition. Mr. Speaker, you might ask about the long-term plans. I would ask you to look at the operations of Petro-Canada in the eastern offshore: you would discover some real benefits for eastern Canada.

Mr. Jarvis: You told us yesterday in the House that that was hypothetical.

Mr. Gillespie: If you would read the question and answer, you would discover it was right on. Over the years the federal government has provided a good deal of assistance to the Atlantic provinces in regard to coal, and for very good reason: it hopes to assist consumers in the Atlantic provinces to use their indigenous resources. But we also have to recognize that some of that coal has pretty high sulphur content. I should like to hear how hon. members opposite would rationalize using high-sulphur coal in a dense urban environment.

● (1620)

Mr. Forrestall: Is the minister worried about the environment?

Mr. Gillespie: I am talking about environmental concerns. Many in the Atlantic provinces, particularly in urban areas, are concerned about the environment. The hon. member may not be, but I am sure many of his constituents are.

A number of times in the House I have referred to the need for energy conservation. I should like to be able to say that all provinces in the Atlantic region have adopted conservation as a major priority. Unfortunately, I am not sure that their heart is in conservation. It would not be helpful to identify particular governments, but I can say that some governments are reluctant to accept the federal government's suggestions about conservation. I am talking about speed limits, which are important.

I do not think there is any comprehensive program in the Atlantic region concerning insulation or building code standards. If heating costs in Atlantic Canada are high, it is up to the people of the area to ask why there is no building code and why the provincial governments have not established insulation standards. Why have they not insisted on certain insulation standards?

Mr. Hogan: But they have.

Mr. Gillespie: If they are in place, it is not clear they are being properly enforced. I think my time has nearly ended, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Gillespie: I refer to the point made by the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Stanfield). He said we should work with the provinces. I assure him that we are anxious to work with the provinces and have taken initiatives in the past to work with them. We tried to interest them in interconnections We tried to work out with them new regulations governing existing resources off their coasts. I admit that we made progress slowly. Regulations concerning offshore drilling have been in a sort of hiatus condition for two years. I hope that that particular problem which affects Newfoundland, perhaps uniquely, and involves the federal government and the other maritime provinces will be solved this summer.

I assure the hon. member that the federal government is anxious to sit down and work out the rules. I hope that particular bottleneck can be broken. Until it is broken, the oil companies will not show much interest in drilling offshore in eastern Canada. They will stand off, and that is not in the interest of the people of the Atlantic provinces.

We wanted to discuss interconnections, or grids, with the provinces. So far the provinces have regarded this as being a matter for their public utilities bodies. In a sense, the various provincial public utilities must work out the problem. Until we are invited to take part in the discussions we shall have no way of influencing grid arrangements or interconnection arrangements other than through the sort of measures already taken; that is to say, with conditional loans or the sort of grants made in the past. I hope the Atlantic premiers will show an increased awareness of the possibilities of joint action in these areas. I hope, also they will show a growing commitment to energy conservation—because, as hon. members know, a large part of the energy conservation job is the responsibility of the provinces. They must consider building standards for houses, and insulation standards. They must consider speed limits on highways and lighting standards in buildings. In these areas we think we can assist.

Mr. Forrestall: How are you doing in Ottawa with your lighting standards?

Mr. Gillespie: We hope, also, to work out with the provinces the kind of fuel use which the energy strategy document makes clear. We want to encourage greater use of nuclear fuel, greater use of coal and of tidal power. For our part, we are committed to working with the provinces. I invite hon. members opposite to put forward any specific suggestions, and I invite hon. members from the Atlantic provinces present in this House to work actively in their own backyards to encourage their provincial governments to move forward in this area.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) may ask a question only if he has consent.

Mr. Gillespie: Certainly.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister many questions. I grant the importance of pursuing conservation even more vigorously than the government of Canada has, but I wonder how this will meet the problems of industry in Nova Scotia. I grant that Petro-Canada is looking for oil off our coasts, and hope it succeeds, but I wonder how this will reduce electric power costs in Nova Scotia.

I grant that the size of electrical generator units has an important relationship to costs. Does the minister contend that any generating units built in Nova Scotia in the last 10 or 20 years, since the Nova Scotia system was tied in with that of New Brunswick with federal aid almost 20 years ago, should be abandoned? There is an interconnection between the systems of which the minister may not know. Does the minister suggest abandoning some of the smaller plants built in earlier days, as a means of reducing the cost of electric power? That is the real question. Further, am I correct in assuming that the minister will not recommend this year or in the next few years any method for overcoming this problem but, rather, that he is counting entirely on working out some long-term solutions with the provinces concerned? Is that the minister's position?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked a series of questions. I shall do my best to answer. The longer run strategy for electrical generating is that it must be based on more efficiency. That means access to larger units. It also means interconnections.

Mr. Stanfield: But there are interconnections. Am I to understand that that is the minister's long-term solution?

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to carry on the debate, I shall be pleased to do so. I was trying to say, succinctly, that there must be access to large units and that interconnections are important for that purpose. I do not think existing interconnections are sufficient to look after the longer term needs of Atlantic Canada, and in Atlantic Canada I include Newfoundland and Labrador. I do not know whether the hon. member includes those parts of Canada. Perhaps he does not.

My second point was that nuclear power will be a most important future source of energy; that nuclear costs for electrical generation do not escalate in the same way as for coal or other fossil fuels which are subject to the influence of a cartel. The comparison probably is a good one between the cost of generating power from hydro projects, which are capital-intensive initially, and nuclear. That is the reason I think nuclear power is very important for the future of Canada, including Atlantic Canada.

• (1630)

Mr. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the recently proposed energy strategy for Canada tabled in this House by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) was received with great disappointment and some disillusionment in Atlantic Canada because the strategy does not seem to fully contemplate or to appreciate the severity of the impact of increasing electricity costs on consumers who live in an area which suffers from the effects of chronic regional disparity.

Hon. members may recall that people in Atlantic Canada, where wages in many cases are one-third below the national average, were among the first to feel the sharp edge of the government's anti-inflation program when the Irving firm dared to raise the wages of its employees above the guidelines. Some people in Atlantic Canada, particularly in the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, are facing electricity increases of 200 to 300 per cent and they have absolutely no hope of seeing wage increases to compensate for it. It is important that members of parliament from the Atlantic provinces make our colleagues in this House aware of this situation, and in my opinion it is imperative that any energy strategy for Canada should contain a thorough discussion of this situation if it is to be national in scope. Any attempt to ignore this problem or to avoid it is to tell maritimers to go back to the wood stove and furnace.

There is an uprecedented need for real statesmanship from our federal and provincial government leaders, and a greater need than ever for objective thinking and technical competence on the part of all professional people dealing with the short-term and long-term energy perspective. Compared with other nations, we are fortunate in that our problems are more in the nature of making choices between different energy sources and designing export poli-

cies in relation to surplus resources rather than of allocating supplies and rationing consumption.

In the field of energy development in Atlantic Canada, the federal government has not given the necessary leadership in developing, with the provinces, a master plan to provide a complete assessment and future development of the tremendous energy resources of Atlantic Canada which have been placed too far in the background in the minister's considerations and in his energy strategy. Without a full evaluation of the abundant hydroelectric and tidal resources of Atlantic Canada, the energy strategy for Canada and its policies for self-reliance are inadequate. The development of these resources for use in concert with other energy sources will provide an energy surplus for possible export at prices that can ameliorate the effect of accelerating fossil fuel costs.

One has to go no farther than the maritime provinces to see the sharp difference emerging in the cost of electrical energy produced in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, from basically a fossil fuel base, with the cost of electrical energy produced in New Brunswick where the development of hydro resources now in place has diluted the effect of fossil fuel increases. An energy strategy for Atlantic Canada must consider the combined uses of our four basic, potential energy sources. These are: nuclear, fossil fuels, the tides, and hydraulic resources.

The escalation of fossil fuel prices has placed a burden on economic development in the Atlantic provinces in general, and in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island in particular, to the extent that producers and manufacturers in these provinces have a very grim future indeed, and that future may very well be complicated by the existing restraint policies of this government.

I would like to outline some of the region's power resources. First, hydraulic resources. The major undeveloped water power resources of the Atlantic region total 38,130 gigawatts per hour annually. Of this amount, Newfoundland has some 36,000 gigawatts of undeveloped hydro potential, of which the Gull Island site on the Churchill River would produce 12,000 gigawatts, and Muskrat Falls 4,000 gigawatts per hour. The Saint John River in New Brunswick has an undeveloped potential of some 1,160 gigawatts in three sites. The 20 sites in Labrador amount to 35,000 gigawatts of the total potential. In addition, there are two sites in Newfoundland, five in New Brunswick, one principal site in Nova Scotia and miscellaneous smaller sites there. Of the five sites in New Brunswick, one contemplates the addition of units five and six to the Mactaquac dam site, and this is just about accomplished. The site in Nova Scotia that I was referring to is Wreck Cove in Cape Breton. This is under construction.

The maritime provinces coal reserves are set out in "An Energy Policy for Canada," volume 2, page 59. These indicate a total of 1,286,000 units of coal reserves measured in terms of thousands of short tons. Of this number, all but 10,000 units located in New Brunswick are in Nova Scotia. The price of coal in Nova Scotia has been tied to the price of oil and this has been a factor in the elevation of the price of coal. Obviously, coal will continue to make a major contribution to the generation of thermal power in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Most certainly, one worthy federal project is to inventory the lower grades of coal and include in that peat moss and continue to support the modernization and mechanization of the coal industry in the maritimes. The gasification of coal and waste wood has reached a relatively high degree of technology and it, too, should be considered.

With regard to oil and gas, it is thought that most of Canada's ultimate potential for conventional oil remains to be discovered, with a large proportion of these resources being found in the frontier areas such as the continental shelves and the slopes of the Atlantic coast. Since 1959, some tens of millions of dollars have been spent there on geophysical surveys, and some hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on exploratory drilling. Over 200 million acres are now under permit.

The first offshore discovery was made by Mobil Oil on Sable Island in 1971, with significant oil and condensate finds. With 83 wells having been drilled, some would have been commercial discoveries had they been drilled on land, but with the high cost of collecting the oil and gas they will not likely come into commercial production until cheaper sources have been exhausted.

With regard to tidal power, the tides of the Bay of Fundy have, with possibly one or two exceptions, the greatest amplitude in the world. In Minas basin, the eastern branch of the upper bay, the maximum spring tide reaches an amplitude of 53 feet, and in Chignecto bay 46 feet. Thus, an immense volume of water moves in and out of these inlets every 12 hours and 25 minutes, which is the period of a tidal cycle governed by the rotation of the earth and its position relative to the moon and the sun.

Obviously, the energy contained in the moving mass of water is enormous. For centuries man has pondered way of recovering this energy. In recent years the problem has been studied in great detail. The dynamic and physical problems have been largely solved, and our technology and capital resources exist whereby there is no question of the capability of man to harness the tides. There are, however, a number of difficulties in the way of successfully and economically generating firm electrical energy from the tides. The first is the fluctuating nature of the tide, which means that in its present form there is no firm energy available except by adopting what is known as the two-basin scheme, which adds greatly to the capital cost of the structures. Thus, the form of processing or retiming involving additional generating facilities must be introduced before the tidal energy can serve a normal electrical power system.

● (1640)

A second difficulty lies in the magnitude of the structures and the problem of building these in what is essentially the open sea. The schemes which are being considered for the Bay of Fundy consist of dams across the inlets containing a large number of turbines connected to generators and a series of sluice gates. When the tide is rising, water flows through the gates and to some extent through the turbine openings into the basin formed by the dam. The basin can thus be filled to approximately the same level as that of the incoming tide. The gates and turbine passages are then closed and remain so until the tide has dropped sufficiently to create the head necessary to turn the turbines. The turbine intakes are then opened

and the water passes from the basin through the turbines and into the open bay. Thus, during every 24 hours and 15 minutes there are two periods of roughly four hours when generation takes place. There are many other arrangements of generation and filling cycles, but I shall not go into these as the one I have briefly described is the simplest.

Present studies indicate that the easiest site to develop on Minas basin would produce about 8,000 gigawatt hours per annum, and the two other most attractive sites on Chignecto bay could together produce about the same amount. Other arrangements might be found which would produce more energy. Studies carried out in 1967-1969 resulted in the conclusion that the cost of this energy was not competitive with that of other sources at the assumed interest rate of 7 per cent and considering the market price of fossil fuel at that time.

Subsequently, serious doubts have arisen as to whether these findings are applicable under conditions prevailing now. Retiming the tidal energy through hydro pumped storage or other means can serve the peak or middle range of the load demand. As such, it would be much more valuable than it would be as fuel replacement. Furthermore, with today's confused oil supply situation and current rates of inflation, a source of energy which once built can serve for decades at an assured cost is very tempting. Fossil fuel, nuclear and even hydro plants create some disruption of the environment. The environmental effects of a tidal development would be minimal.

The annual energy available from these principal sites that have been studied is just about equal to the total electrical energy consumption annually of the Atlantic region at the present time. It would provide for seven years' growth requirements of the region. To generate this energy in an oil-fired plant would require some 28 million barrels of oil a year.

Five potential pumped storage sites in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were examined in a preliminary way in 1968. The smaller sites of the order of 100 megawatts were found to have a cost of $90 to $130 per kilowatt at that time, excluding transmission, while sites of the order of 50 megawatts were estimated at $65 to $80. These sites will become particularly attractive for peaking purposes when nuclear plants are added to the system, with their low incremental energy costs. The pumped storage plants would also complement the development of tidal projects by upgrading the tidal energy from secondary to primary.

If nuclear power is used for load purposes, tidal power can be retimed to supply maximum and intermediate demands above the base load of an interconnected system. A power pool in eastern Canada involving the four Atlantic provinces and the province of Quebec, with interconnections to central Canada and the United States, has tremendous potential for both the economic development of the region and the provision of power from renewable resources for all of Canada. This consideration should be heavily weighted in any energy strategy for Canada, but it is not mentioned in the paper presented to us.

The maritime electric utilities have made more progress in deriving benefits than interconnections and integration of their electrical systems and from interconnections with neighbouring regions than any other area of Canada. Since the action taken on October 17, 1973, by a number of Arab states, the whole world has suddenly become aware of the fact that drastic changes in our supply and use of energy, and no doubt changes in much of our social and economic structure, are a reality which must be faced. The era of cheap energy is passed. Every effort will be needed to conserve, especially, expendable fossil fuels.

We are told that oil and gas upon which our present society depends so greatly could be depleted within the next three decades if the ever-increasing rate of consumption is continued, and certainly the cost of these present basic energy sources will continue to increase at rates which will place further severe stress on our economic structure. It has been stated by most authorities that in the decades ahead the rate of consumption of oil and gas must decline drastically. However, the prospect is for a sixfold growth in the demand for electrical energy in the next three decades, and by the year 2000 some 50 per cent of Canada's increasing energy consumption will be in the form of electricity. In the future, our basic electrical energy supply will tend no doubt toward nuclear fuel generating plants, and the variable component of this massive electrical demand will be carried by such facilities as conventional hydro plants operating at low load factors, smaller existing thermal units and tidal power plants.

The maritime region is most fortunate in that there exists within its boundaries the largest tidal power potential in the world, a source of energy the cost of which, after being constructed, will not be affected by inflation. Another very important natural resource which the region possesses is the availability of large bodies of cold water which cannot ecologically be degraded by thermal pollution and which are essential to the nuclear or high load factor component of future integrated electrical systems.

The maritime region has a very great potential in meeting the energy needs of the region for the future at the lowest possible cost, and it is suggested that this challenge can only be effectively met by a very close co-operative and completely co-ordinated effort by all the Atlantic provinces and the government of Canada, and in giving leadership in this field the government of Canada has been more distinguished by its omissions than by its acts of commission.

In the longer term search for new energy options, the government places in the same category the feasibility of using renewable resources represented by solar, wind, tidal, geothermal and biomass techniques. From this one can infer that the foot-dragging which has marked the government's performance to date in regard to the Fundy tidal power potential will continue. The government has not learned the lesson that the New Democratic Party taught so effectively, namely, "tomorrow begins today". There is a real need to develop blocks of energy in excess of the immediate needs of the region and the necessity of integration with other power systems in regions of Canada and the United States. A great deal of mutual benefit has resulted from the existing transmission interconnections New Brunswick has with Nova Scotia, Quebec and New England.

The New Brunswick Electric Power Commission, for example, has demonstrated great leadership and courage in pioneering much activity which has lead to these benefits.

There is no doubt that these benefits will be shared by Prince Edward Island when the cable interconnection is completed. However, there seems no doubt that if the maritime region is to acquire full use of its natural advantages in supplying the electrical energy needs of its people, and at the same time meet the challenge created by the oil crisis and the magnitude of the future requirements, then, as emphasized before, it is essential that the federal government provide an imaginative plan and give leadership and work in co-operation with the provincial governments who own the assets that this nation needs so greatly.

The energy from the three tidal power sites would save Canada, in balance of payments, at least $3 billion each decade and would generate electrical energy to the equivalent of 28 million barrels of oil per year every year. The sooner the tidal projects are developed, the more likelihood of lower capital costs due to inflationary trends. Even if present and future contemplated studies are accelerated by a crash program, the lag time to in-service would likely be 12 to 15 years. Very lucrative markets now exist for surplus energy which would be developed over the immediate requirements of the region. This could provide a return on investment to the region and would certainly assist in the amortization of borrowed capital. Contracts for the sale of this surplus could also provide collateral for borrowing in the United States in particular.

Some of the major power generating facilities on the Columbia River were built and owned by small rural communities through the use of taxes and bonds and contracts for the sale of power. These avenues of financing the tidal projects warrant investigation and have not been mentioned in the so-called "Energy Strategy" paper. An energy strategy for Canada should treat as a priority the development of the great potential in Atlantic Canada so that the region can take giant strides forward in its battle against economic adversity and all Canadians can share in the benefits of these great resources. All we need is a government which has the wisdom and courage to undertake great tasks and perform great deeds. It is a pity we did not have it ten years ago.

● (1650)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert)—Industry—textiles—Refusal of Dupont to put into production new polyester yarn plant because of low-priced imports—Government position; the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Post Office—Closing of canteen at Calgary—Government position; the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens)—The Canadian Economy—Request for estimate of unemployment rate and level of inflation for the year.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED GOVERNMENT FAILURE TO DEVELOP EFFECTIVE ENERGY STRATEGY FOR ATLANTIC PROVINCES

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

That this House regrets the government's failure to develop an effective energy strategy for the Atlantic provinces and in particular deplores the callous attitude shown by the government to the plight of hundreds of those families living in the Atlantic provinces who in many cases can no longer afford to heat their homes.

Mr. Leonard C. Jones (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in indicating quite clearly that I support the motion presented by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies). It should not be necessary for the House to spend time debating a motion of this type, but the philosophy behind the government's paper on energy seems to indicate that something happens to Canadians from parts of Canada other than the Atlantic provinces. Some of these people, particularly cabinet ministers, seem to be obsessed by the belief that Canada ends to the east at the St. Lawrence River. Believe you me, Mr. Speaker, it does not.

Let me remind the House, and in particular the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), that Canada started in the Atlantic provinces, the provinces by the sea where the natural energy is. The document called "An Energy Strategy for Canada" presented to the House by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources seems to be mainly dedicated to a solution of our oil problems, oil being a depleting resource. Little or no reference is made to the renewable resources in this country. In the maritime provinces, our seaside provinces, the good Lord has provided us with a natural, renewable resource. I refer to Fundy tidal power to which the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie) has already referred. This power is, proportionately, cheaper than a barrel of oil.

For most of my adult life I have heard time and again of studies being undertaken of Fundy tidal power. Again this year I understand another study is being made. One of the consultants is also one of those who made a study as far back as 1946. The studies in 1946 concluded that the harnessing of Fundy tidal power was possible, feasible and practical. The Fundy tides are not only the highest in the world, but the strongest. Anyone who has watched them and observed their effect knows that this is true; you do not need a study to find that out, Mr. Speaker.

One study that I know of had to do with the erection of facilities in Shepody bay, one of the bays in the bay of Fundy, at the junction of the Petitcodiac and Memramcook Rivers. In 1946, harnessing the tides was considered possible. Owing to the way the tides flowed in that particular location, it was possible to get the benefit of them, not once or twice a day but four times a day; and there was provision for storing power. This sort of thing has been done successfully in European countries and I see no reason why Canada cannot do it in the maritime provinces.

Since the forties, some progress has been made in the Atlantic provinces in relieving regional disparity. In addi-

tion, since that time the federal government has seen fit to spend millions of dollars on the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, even though this had a detrimental effect on the ports of Atlantic Canada.

The solid solution to the shortage of energy in the Atlantic provinces is the immediate development of tidal power. We need it now. There have been enough studies made of the question. It is essential that the federal government realize that the people of Atlantic Canada are as true blooded Canadians as those in any other part of this nation. We want to share in the progress of this nation along with the rest of Canada. We think we are part of confederation, yet when we read the document tabled by the minister we wonder if we are considered at all by those who prepared it.

In order to share in the growth of Canada, the people in the Atlantic provinces must be given greater attention by harnessing the power of the Fundy tides. I suggest that the minister of energy become more cognizant of what are the energy problems in Atlantic Canada. I take issue with the misleading conclusion reached by the minister today, though perhaps he did not intend to do so. He stated that the New Brunswick Electric Power Commission exported power to the state of Maine. That is true, but he did not indicate just how much power was imported by the province of New Brunswick through its electric power commission. As late as last night I was speaking to one of the ministers in the cabinet of the province of New Brunswick, and he told me that he believes imports and exports of power by the province of New Brunswick either balance or that the province is in a deficit position. This was not mentioned by the minister today.

The minister also made reference to insulation. I happen to be one of those in the maritime provinces who acted in response to the advertisements placed by all governments across the country for the installation of electric power. I put it in, but I put in the kind of insulation required by the power commission. There is a code and there are rules in the maritime provinces, and I suggest that the minister misled the House when he said there were no regulations. He also referred to speeding on highways. I contend that speeding in Ontario and other provinces in Canada is far more prevalent than in the maritime provinces. Our roads are not that good, Mr. Speaker.

There are several other items to which the minister and his department should direct their attention when it comes to providing electric power in Atlantic Canada. We need electric power immediately, and this energy is there. The good Lord put it there, and as minister responsible for energy, he can do something about it. An energy report of this nature so far as the maritime provinces is concerned is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity to make a few brief comments on the motion before the House moved by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies). It relates to the government's energy strategy paper which was introduced in the House last week. The motion makes particular reference to Atlantic Canada, whereas the document placed before the House last week refers to an over-all strategy for Canada. I think it is regrettable that the hon. member for Don Valley did not make specific proposals for overcoming the increased cost of power in the maritime provinces, especially in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. He indicated that he would do so, but today he did not give any specifics when he spoke.

I was interested in the speech of the former leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), who spoke about the regional development aspects of the problem. As a member who comes from a designated regional development area, I have great concern, along with him, for that particular aspect.

● (1700)

I think the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie), when he spoke about the need for co-operation between the four Atlantic provinces and the federal government made an important point. This is really the key to solving the problem before the House today, especially the electrical power rates in the maritimes. This has been the approach that the federal government has taken through the years to the problem of providing assistance to provincial governments on a regional basis. Surely this is a region with special problems in that regard.

I want to refer briefly to the strategy paper, because it is important. I believe that all parts of it have significance for Atlantic Canada. The over-all plan laid out in the strategy paper is to reduce demand in the country through an active and aggressive energy conservation program and to balance this demand, which has been increasing at a rapid rate, with increased supplies of energy. Indeed, the paper foresees a reduction in the kind of growth of energy which we have had from 1970 to 1973 of about 5.7 per cent to about 3.5 per cent and perhaps much lower than that over the next ten years.

I think the government's program on conservation as introduced in February and as implemented now is very commendable. It has tackled the problems of the automobile. It has told auto manufacturers in this country that they must manufacture cars with an average fuel consumption of 24 miles to the gallon by 1980, and 33 miles to the gallon by 1985. It has indicated that the National Research Council has to produce a new set of minimum building standards for insulation which will be implemented by the end of this year either through a federal energy conservation bill or through provincial building code systems. It has provided an outline of minimum standards of energy efficiency for appliances, furnaces and home equipment. It has provided a proposal for the reduction of energy in industry.

Last month I had an opportunity to attend a conference of some 300 people from major industries across Canada which was attended by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson), the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand). It was interesting to see representatives from each sector of the economy outline how they would reduce, during the next six to ten years, energy consumption in their industries even though the industries are growing. Most of them indicated they would affect a 10 per cent to 15 per cent reduction in the energy consumption of the industry. The chemical industry, for instance, suggested they would be able to reduce their

consumption by some 11 million barrels of oil a year by 1980. The federal government, in its own in-house use of energy, uses a large percentage of energy in Canada and it has indicated that its target for this coming year will be a 10 per cent reduction of energy and that that level will be maintained during the next ten-year period. These are positive plans and proposals to reduce the increase in use of energy in this country to less than 3.5 per cent during the next ten years. At the same time, the paper outlined how we plan to increase the production of energy through exploration and development by doubling the exploration effort during the next three years in offshore areas and in the Arctic region to increase our supply of energy.

Likewise, the paper indicates that the pricing of our crude oil will move up during the next two to four years to world prices, not necessarily equalling world prices but approaching them. I think it is rather interesting that many of the newspapers in the country have extrapolated this figure to 25 cents a gallon increase. If we look at the price of oil, at $8.80 a barrel in the east, and the world price of around $13, we see a difference of $4.20. The figures given to me indicate that this would result in an increase in the cost of gasoline by some 12 to 15 cents a gallon, rather than 25 cents a gallon. By moving up toward the world price we would reduce the amount of compensation that has to be paid for oil imported from offshore to eastern Canada, we would increase the incentive for exploration and development, and the increased price would have a strong effect on conservation.

The paper also indicates there will be increased resource information so that companies exploring in the offshore areas or in the north, at least under federal jurisdiction, will have to make this information available earlier than they presently do, which will provide more information for the exploration of hydrocarbons.

The paper also indicates that interfuel substitution will be an important aspect of the strategy—the use of coal for gasification and to back up oil and natural gas, and the increased use of nuclear energy to save on oil and gas-fired thermalgenerating plants.

It also suggests that there be new delivery systems, whether they be pipelines from the Arctic, pipelines across Canada from Sarnia to Montreal, or other delivery systems which would be required with the new, increased use of western oil in Central Canada. It also talks about emergency preparedness. We are a member of the international agency, and we have responsibilities there. In the event of curtailment of energy supplies from offshore, there would be a sharing of shortages. This agency also provides us with an opportunity to exchange information on research and development in energy use. This is a very important aspect of that International Energy Agency.

Increased research and development is another point in the strategy. Our budget in the past year has been some $113 million. This will be increased during the coming year by some $10 million, which will put additional funds into the research and development programs for energy conservation, the policies which the hon. member for York-Sunbury spoke about, increased studies in tidal energy and the other renewable resources of wind and wave action, as well as solar energy.

Energy

The last point in the strategy relates to increased Canadian content and participation in our energy programs through Petro-Canada and through the oil and gas regulations which will be tabled in the House later this year. If we look at the special problems of Atlantic Canada and their use of crude oil and fuel oil, whether for heating, gasoline or electrical generation, we find that during the past 2½ years from January 1, 1974, to the end of June this year over $900 million will have been spent in subsidizing the crude oil used in Atlantic Canada, whether for use in automobiles, for heating or for electrical generation. This is part of our plan for one price oil and it gives Atlantic Canada a price which is competitive with other areas of our country.

● (1710)

Likewise, the coal which is used in Nova Scotia for thermal uses, whether for heating buildings or for use in generating electricity, has been indexed. The coal which is produced by the Cape Breton Development Corporation has been indexed to the price of crude oil. Up until the last couple of years the price of crude oil in the maritimes has always been lower than the oil coming from western Canada, and this coal has been indexed to the crude oil price. This amounts to a significant subsidy to Nova Scotia through the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

The problem is electrical energy. Prince Edward Island uses 100 per cent crude oil. Nova Scotia uses some 62 per cent of oil in generating its electrical power supply, and about 24 per cent is from coal. I have already indicated that both these commodities are presently subsidized by the federal government. In fact, for heating oil used for electrical generation about $120 million in subsidies has been paid or will have been paid between January 1, 1974, and June, 1976.

I think it would be well for hon. members to remember that the generation of electricity and the running of provincial electrical utilities is primarily under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments and they jealously guard that jurisdiction. In fact, when considering matters of emergency before the Energy Supplies Allocation Board it was pointed out that the provincial governments have primary jurisdiction for the generation of electrical energy. However, in spite of this, I think it would be well to note that during the past decade or so the federal government has made significant contributions toward the generation of electricity in Atlantic Canada. These include the subsidies I already mentioned for the fuel used in electrical generation.

Under the Atlantic Provinces Power Development Act, loans of some $225 million were made, a grant for New Brunswick interconnection of some $4 million, a loan and grant for Prince Edward Island interconnection of some $27 million, a loan for the Point Lepreau nuclear plant of $350 million, an offer for the Gull Island transmission of some $343 million, grants for interconnection studies for P.E.I. and Newfoundland of $600,000, a grant for the tidal program from 1968 to 1969 of $1.6 million, and for the tidal study which is now taking place of $1.5 million, as well as Atlantic Development Board grants for electric projects of $55 million. This gives a total of $1,127.7 million which the federal government has contributed toward energy

projects in Atlantic Canada and for the construction of these projects.

It would be well for us, also, to look at electrical rates across Canada. In March of this year the average rate across Canada was $23 per thousand kilowatt hours of electricity. By comparison, the Halifax rate at that time was $27.24 per thousand kilowatt hours. The Vancouver rate was almost $25—so they were both in the same ballpark. In the Ottawa area, the Kanata rate of Ontario Hydro is some $25.08 per thousand kilowatt hours. By comparison, the Charlottetown rate is higher, some $42 per thousand kilowatt hours. But I think we have to realize that all rates of electricity are going up in Canada. For instance, Ontario Hydro will be increasing its rate by some 22 per cent per year over the next five years. Manitoba Hydro has indicated that in April of this year its rate will be going up by some 28 per cent, and New Brunswick has indicated an increase of 12 per cent. So there are many areas in our country which have rates which at the present time are comparable with Halifax, and in practically every province these rates tend to be moving up.

I should also like to mention the exploration which will be taking place this year off the east coast under the auspices of Petro-Canada which will cost some $25 million in each of the next five years. This represents about 25 per cent of the budget of Petro-Canada. It is interesting to consider whether the official opposition, and especially those hon. members from Atlantic Canada, would support their leader's proposal to wind up Petro-Canada if the Conservatives ever were in power—which, of course, is very unlikely to happen for a very long time.

In reviewing some of the points I have made, I want to mention that Atlantic Canada does have some higher electrical rates, but coal rates and heating oil rates are comparable to other parts of Canada and those rates are subsidized by the federal government. The federal government has provided a great deal of assistance—almost $2 billion—over the last few years for electrical and other energy assistance to the maritime provinces. It intends to continue its assistance by providing for interconnections, the assistance I have already indicated as well as the assistance which it has already offered for nuclear plants in that area.

I think this is a strong indication of the kind of commitment the federal government has made, not only in the past but also in the future, to equalize opportunity in Canada and especially in Atlantic Canada.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I think that sometimes during these opposition day debates hon. members may wonder whether any real progress is made, particularly when dealing with very difficult issues for which the government has responsibility. It may well be argued after this debate that not much progress was made with respect to the government's altering its insensitivity and lack of concern with respect to the very serious problem of skyrocketing energy costs in the Atlantic provinces.

● (1720)

I suppose that after listening to the parliamentary secretary just a moment ago, and previously to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie), members on this side of the House might be consoled by the fact that at least to some degree we have their attention. While that may not seem like much progress to the people of Prince Edward Island or most of the citizens of the Atlantic provinces who are very concerned about this issue, I can tell my constituents and others that it is no mean feat to get the attention of this government. That we now have their attention, and the admission of the parliamentary secretary that there is a problem, is some progress. Perhaps when the subject comes up again in questions or debate they may treat it seriously enough to try to deal with it in some fashion.

The motion of the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) which is before the House is quite specific. It says that this government has failed to come up with any effective strategy for an energy policy for the Atlantic provinces, and in particular "deplores the callous attitude", and so on, with respect to the problem as it will affect many people in the Atlantic provinces in relation to heating their homes.

My former leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), referred to the "cavalier" attitude of the government, and the motion refers to its "callous" attitude. To this point I find it a more or less "unconscious" attitude. When the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources referred to a dense urban situation, I wondered if the use of the word "dense" could have a double meaning in this instance. I would direct the attention of the minister and his colleagues to a recent report of the National Utilities Service, an international organization which examines energy policies for 25,000 corporations. It says that in Canada energy costs will continue to rise fastest in the Atlantic region. Lest the minister and others assure themselves, with some kind of false concept, that we have reached the outer limits of the problem, I want to indicate them that this will likely get worse if it continues to be dealt with in the unconcerned manner expressed in the minister's speech today and his response to questions on the problem recently.

While the parliamentary secretary was forced to acknowledge that there is an alarming discrepancy between the average consumer costs for electricity in Charlottetown compared with any other part of the country, he did not refer to the fact that this estimate was taken before the announcement made by the provincial government that, because of all the other pressures it has been under with respect to its interdependence on the federal government, it will be forced to removed the subsidy of some 12 per cent for users of electricity in Prince Edward Island. This was before the meeting of the first ministers to be held this week which will try to arrive at some upward pricing formula for petroleum products. I cannot understand the sanguine attitude of the minister and the parliamentary secretary in regard to this serious problem.

I understand, of course, that the minister has other responsibilities and other pressures. Perhaps his orientation and basic frame of reference is from another part of the country. I cannot understand his somnolent attitude, however, when since 1969 the government has repeatedly announced the elimination of regional disparities as a cornerstone of its policy. I cannot understand how anyone can assess the logic of allowing this very large disparity to

grow in Atlantic Canada with regard to the basic cost of energy and the cost to the economy.

I do not think the minister was entirely candid about some of the information that he placed before the House this afternoon. He talked at some length about the inefficiencies of the present generation of electricity in Atlantic Canada, but did not relate it to the age of the units or the scale of units that we must work with, given the population in the area. One fact conveniently omitted was the actual usage of electricity in Atlantic Canada. In Prince Edward Island the kilowatt use per hour per customer is 5.146; in Newfoundland it is 7.104; in Nova Scotia, 5.633; in New Brunswick, 6.158; and the Canadian average is 8.170. This means that Prince Edward Island is consuming only about two-thirds of the average consumption on a per capita basis, of the rest of Canada.

These figures indicate that it is not the Atlantic provinces that should be lectured by the minister on the subject of energy conservation, seeing that at the present time they use less than the Canadian average. It seems to me that one of the reasons for this is that individuals are suffering very directly because of factors which have been in existence for some time, some of which have been exacerbated by the energy situation.

The abnormally high cost of electricity in Prince Edward Island, particularly Charlottetown where the average cost per consumer is $41.53 per month—that is before the increase which is to come shortly—compares badly with a town of the same size in Ontario where the average cost per month for electricity is $22.68. I am equally concerned with the effect on the industrial structure of the Atlantic provinces. The hon. member for Halifax dealt with this at some length, pointing out the discrepancy between the present energy policy with respect to the Atlantic provinces and the attempts of the government, through DREE, to alleviate regional disparities.

I should like to give an example of the type of problem we face in the Atlantic provinces. Prince Edward Island industries which are involved in exporting basic products such as potato processors—perhaps the most significant export industry—are worried about the effect on their competitive position. Power rates are higher in P.E.I. than anywhere else on the continent. One food processing company indicated that in January their electricity bill was $35,000, claiming that for a similar company in Ontario the bill would have veen $18,000. The problem is compounded by the additional burdens of distance from markets and communications. The government's position in regard to this question is totally illogical.

Referring to the over-all question of electrical costs, the APEC Newsletter of December, 1975, stated:

> It is obvious that higher electrical energy costs in the region point to this as one possible cause of continuing disparity.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the lack of concern expressed in the minister's speech this afternoon. At the end of his remarks, the hon. member for Halifax asked in specific terms what the government was going to do. It is all well and good to talk about the establishment of a much larger power grid or bringing a nuclear power plant into production some four or five years hence, or eventually starting a Fundy tidal project when studies and surveys have been completed; but problems that exist for the people in Atlantic Canada today and tomorrow are growing daily. Nowhere is this more acute than escalating electrical costs. The minister was somewhat critical of the hon. member for Don Valley for not speaking specifically to this point and making suggestions about what should be done. Somehow the minister forgets that he is responsible for energy, mines and resources. Many in my province wish that he could be transferred form that portfolio in the not too distant future.

● (1730)

Mr. Gillespie: I was quoting his release. He said he was going to make positive suggestions, but I did not hear them.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): There were suggestions. The minister showed, by not expressing an opinion, that he is without ideas. That is bad enough. But I am more worried because he seems to show no basic concern.

Mr. Gillespie: Read the record.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, not only have I read the record; I am about to quote the minister's previous comments.

Mr. Gillespie: How? Today's record has not yet been printed. How can you have read it?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I will not quote what the minister said today. Perhaps the minister will say why he no longer thinks this afternoon what he thought yesterday afternoon. I shall reach that point in a moment.

I want to deal with the minister's gratuitous comments concerning conservation. He hypocritically accused the Atlantic provinces of not being concerned about conservation. He talked about their hearts not being in it. I tell him that in Atlantic Canada we consume less energy per capita, on average, than people in the rest of Canada. We do it of necessity. I am concerned about the minister's hypocritical approach.

It is well known that in 1974, in the year following the OPEC embargo, every industrialized nation except Canada decreased its consumption of energy. Our consumption rose by 7.75 per cent. That is a publicly acknowledged statistic which I have not heard the minister refute. He talks about leadership, and about responsibility for conserving energy, but no government has been more irresponsible in conserving energy than the government which sits opposite us this afternoon.

Mr. Stanfield: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): He talked about establishing better insulation standards, as if provincial governments have sole responsibility in this area. Where has the minister been? Does he forget that his colleague, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson), is responsible for Central Mortgage and Housing, which sets these standards?

If he is worried about insulation standards not being applied in homes built in this country, why has he not leaned across his desk and conferred with the Minister of State for Urban Affairs? Or does he think that that minis-

ter has no influence with that Crown corporation? Suggesting that the provinces are not concerned about energy conservation is trying to pass the buck to the provinces. The minister's action was shoddy.

He suggested yesterday afternoon that Nova Scotia had not raised electric power rates substantially between 1958 and 1974; then he suggested that the rise in electric power rates has not been as great proportionately as the price rise in other commodities. I suggest that such statements could badly mislead this House and the general public. Allow me to quote some figures to the minister. We are talking about average, annual energy costs in the Atlantic provinces. I will compare those costs with other costs in other parts of the country and relate those costs to wages. For example, the average yearly wage or salary in Toronto is about $11,000 and the average annual cost of energy about $525, or roughly 4.8 per cent of income. Average annual income in Charlottetown is about $8,100, and the average annual cost of energy about $980, or about 12 per cent of income on average.

There is a disparity of 250 per cent in the proportionate annual cost of energy. I could quote other figures but do not have time. When the minister suggests that the cost of energy has risen less, proportionately, than the cost of other commodities, he is doing his own credibility a disservice and not dealing satisfactorily either with national or regional energy concerns in this country.

Mr. Gillespie: You do not believe that, do you?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I do. That is why I put the figures on record. Can the minister explain why the man in Charlottetown pays 12 per cent of income for energy, whereas the man in Toronto pays roughly 4.8 per cent? Has the federal government no responsibility in this regard?

Mr. Gillespie: Would the hon. member like to hear my figures?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Perhaps the minister could mention them some other time. My time is limited. I am making a few comments in order to assist the minister.

The minister talked about alternate forms of energy. He cannot seem to make up his mind. Today he seemed to suggest that there is merit in developing alternate sources of energy and in doing more research and development in this field. But what did he say yesterday? Answering the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), the minister said, as recorded at page 13059 of *Hansard*:

> The second point I should like to make is this: the main thing is to spend money where it can be most useful. I think in terms of solar energy, in terms of wind, in terms of tidal energy, in terms of bio-mass. In a number of these areas we shall have to move rather slowly because very large sums of money would not generate any immediate pay-back. All the experts tell me this is an area in which we can expect significant amounts of energy, but not for 15 years or more.

This afternoon the minister spoke more favourably of alternate energy sources, but this government is committed to spending only about 2 per cent of its total research and energy budget on alternate energy sources other than nuclear.

Time and again we have asked the minister if he is considering alternate energy sources. As far as he is concerned, energy sources apart from the nuclear source are simply a waste of time, or are to be developed in future and hence are scarcely worth considering at present. I ask the minister why the United States Government, which has been spending almost twice as much proportionately as we have in the last few years on alternate energy, has again doubled its budget in the last year? We live in a dream world. The minister thinks alternate energy sources are fantasies. Apparently he thinks it enough to show us the odd demonstration project, or another survey on Fundy tidal power. He thinks we are doing enough to find alternate energy sources. Frankly the government's position is less than satisfactory. Denmark, hardly an underdeveloped country, is sufficiently committed to developing alternate energy sources that it is preparing for the day when all its electricity will be generated by wind.

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

Mr. Ross Milne (Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased for the opportunity to participate in this debate which concerns all Canadians, particularly those in the maritimes, as the motion suggests. Without question the rising price of energy, as the minister said, has had devastating effects on practically every one in the world. When the world price of oil increased in a short period by a factor of four, hardly any person in the world was unaffected. Probably the people in the maritimes in Canada were affected more than other people in this country.

Hon. members raised several points today. I think the previous leader of the opposition raised a point which is of great concern. He wondered how rising energy costs will affect the industrial health of the maritime area. It is difficult for the individual homeowner to rationalize rapidly energy costs, costs which must be faced when people pay their energy bills.

● (1740)

Perhaps the more important question is what is the long term energy cost for industry in the maritimes. If industry cannot be competitive there is an unemployment problem, and many other social problems resulting from that. We should look carefully at some areas where it might be possible to improve energy efficiency within industry. In all of the conservation efforts that have been talked about and introduced, the area of the industrial sector is the one that has perhaps been overlooked the most to date.

I was most encouraged to have the opportunity of attending the meeting recently held in Ottawa with various energy groups meeting with the minister, and sensing what a tremendous difference there has been this year in industry as opposed to last year. In other words, they are now indicating that they sense the urgency of doing something about energy conservation in industry. At the present time they are doing a good deal of study and research in their own industrial sector on what can and should be accomplished in a certain time frame.

There is one basic question that has come up in this, and it is something we should not entirely pass over. When we had this substantial change in price for energy, and even some problems with availability, it brought home the fact that for the past 20 or 25 years we have been overlooking

the need to build a strong infrastructure in all parts of the country to deal with problems like this. It has been politic and even correct to be more concerned with glamorous types of projects in the industrial sector, from many points of view.

In retrospect, in not only the maritimes but many other areas of Canada, some of the infrastructure relating to the energy field has not been put in place. We are paying very dearly for it now.

Previous speakers made the point very well that the maritimes is not the only area where the cost of energy, particularly electrical energy, is increasing rapidly. This reflects a number of things. First was the putting off investing in capital projects at the time that they should have been advanced.

Initially when the price of energy started to move, people became very concerned about the impact on consumers. They set aside capital projects and capital investment in the energy fields that should have been proceeded with, thinking it would level off and there would be a more opportune time to do it in the future. The problem is that in terms of pricing, the future got worse. For new electrical utilities across Canada the construction program is costing a good deal of money. Interest rates are high. That is a problem. All of this adds up to some very large increases in the cost of energy.

It might be a good lesson for the future that when we are faced with a situation where costs are increasing and, where it makes sense, we should do something about it at the right time. We should have the courage and fortitude to do it then because putting it off will only will make the situation considerably worse.

Another point has been the fallacy of it being very opportune to go around the basic problem when we should attack it head on. The Maritimes is not the only area where this is a problem, that is, in terms of using fairly high quality energy, oil and natural gas, to generate electricity, rather than using coal substantially to do that. It was very understandable at the time, and this is prevalent throughout much of the United States, particularly the eastern seaboard where a good deal of the generation of electricity was changed from coal to natural gas and oil for environmental reasons and, perhaps in some cases, cost reasons.

If we have that period to run through again, it would make a good deal more sense to attack the pollution problem sincerely and work on the technology very hard, pay the price of pollution control, and continue to use coal as a fuel source. For a variety of reasons it is incorrect to use natural gas or oil to generate electricity at this point in time. This is needed for many other areas, many of which are related to higher technology and a good deal of employment.

There is a point upon which we take issue with the mover of this motion. I have had a good deal of difficulty with this since coming to this House. I refer to the debate in committee and in the House where the opposition opposes any government intervention in the energy field.

There was long and bitter debate on the Petroleum Administration Act and on the establishment of Petro-Canada. However, when there is a problem the first thing to surface is a motion asking what the government is doing. Members opposite once and for all will have to make up their minds about the role of energy. What are they in favour of the private sector doing, and of the public sector doing?

Had Petro-Canada not been established the problem in the maritimes would be a good deal more severe. As the parliamentary secretary indicated, there is a good deal of exploration ongoing through Petro-Canada, and more is planned for the future. If I am correct, between 20 and 25 per cent of its entire budget is for offshore exploration. This indicates an interest in making that area more self sufficient in energy.

It seems this type of approach is the answer to many of the outstanding problems, particularly in the Atlantic area. But it does not seem to be in tune with the debate we heard from the opposite side at great length some time ago opposing the establishing of Petro-Canada. I understand from the newspapers that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) says that if his party is elected to government, they will wind up Petro-Canada. I also note from the newspapers that since becoming leader he has visited the maritimes once. On his next trip he might wish to look at the energy situation a bit closer. Perhaps he will understand that Petro-Canada is a key part of the solution to the energy problem in the maritimes.

There is the other policy issue, and I just comment along that vein because these are difficult issues on both sides. Perhaps that is what the opposition has tried to be. I refer to the establishment of the Petroleum Administration Act. This act gives authority to negotiate one price across Canada. I cannot think of any area in Canada that benefited more by that than the maritimes.

These are policy initiatives the government has taken in the last year and a half, particularly the establishment of Petro-Canada and the Petroleum Administration Act, of which members opposite, particularly those from the maritimes, should be very strongly in favour.

There is both a short term and long term problem to be dealt with. In the long term the objective must surely be to make Canada, particularly the maritime area which is dependent on imported crude, as self sufficient in oil as possible. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Maine) will probably support this, when he speaks in a couple of minutes, that some of the ideas put forth today in terms of wind, solar, and tidal, great as they may be, are not short term answers. The only short term answer that we have nationally, and supposedly in the maritimes, is to have a fundamental commitment to a conservation program that works.

● (1750)

It has been suggested we should be making substantial use of solar, wind, and tidal power, but I do not think this is a good short term solution. First, the capital costs involved are enormous, and then again the technology still has a long way to go. If we were to count on these systems in the short term I think we would be disappointed.

I have some small knowledge from my own background of heating in the residential sector. I know that when electrical heating was introduced great emphasis was placed on home heating standards; most of the participating utilities spent a good deal of money and effort not only

to establish those standards but to make sure they were adhered to. Part of the problem may be that in some parts of the country the emphasis on inspection has been left to the industry itself, with the result that a number of sub-standard insulations have been put in place. I do not intend this as a reflection on builders and electricians, but this is a part of the argument one always has to make on the necessity of doing a good job of insulation when using that form of heating.

A few years ago, when the price of oil was relatively low, anyone who was not particularly interested in putting up a quality building or insulating to a high standard, installed oil heating. Today, as the price of oil keeps rising, we realize that it might have been better to have insisted on electric heating standards in the case of all types of fuel.

I hope the government will adopt a suggestion I have made on two or three occasions that consideration be given to providing some type of tax write-off in respect of energy conservation equipment such as is presently available in connection with devices designed to ensure a better environment. Industry has available to it a preferred tax position in respect of money spent on equipment to diminish environmental threats. Many times this equipment has worked against the best interests of conserving energy sources. It might well be in the best interests of the energy situation to extend an equivalent tax concession so that a company trying to conserve energy would gain the same tax advantage as one installing equipment to handle an environmental problem.

Part of the problem we face today is the high wastage of energy by industrial users. Those who are concerned about this energy loss and who wish to make their plants more efficient find it difficult to purchase any equipment of proven reliability. The government could play a useful role here by stimulating this sector; perhaps this could be done through assistance in development costs. In my opinion such a policy would pay off handsomely. Indeed, in the final analysis the government might well find itself in a plus position.

One only has to look at the situation in the commercial sector where energy conservation equipment is available "off the shelf". We are finding now that when any commercial building of importance is constructed in Canada consulting engineers and architects instal such equipment as a basic feature of the building. This is not the case in the industrial sector, however, although industry uses close to 50 per cent of all the energy consumed in Canada.

The case for the development of tidal power as a source of energy in the maritimes has been raised on a number of occasions. I believe the first debate I attended in this House was on that subject. I did not know much about it at that time but I spoke in favour of it, and I am glad to learn that a significant study of the prospects of such a scheme has now been completed. My hon. friend from Wellington has a far better background in science than I have, and I believe he will be making some comments on the role he sees for energy development in that sector.

Nuclear energy is one of the relatively short term answers. I noticed in the question period today that members on the other side of the House were expressing a good deal of opposition to the nuclear option. I rather feel they over-estimate the problem associated with the CANDU nuclear system. Had the nuclear option been put in place two years ago when the rise in oil prices first became apparent, it seems to me the maritimes today would be in a much better position. One thing which is overlooked very often is the fact that though the initial cost of establishing a nuclear plant is high, once they are in place the cost of production is extremely low—the cost of the uranium which is used can probably be doubled without causing the cost of the energy produced to rise more than 10 per cent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6.01 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate today one has had the tendency to get the impression that the energy crisis in the Atlantic provinces is confined primarily to two provinces, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. That, Sir, is just not the case. First of all, the magnitude of the problem stretches into every part of the region. For example in my own city of St. John's consumers are now paying the third highest energy costs in the country, and that in a province that has been blessed with an abundance of hydro resources.

The island of Newfoundland, as distinct from the whole province which takes in the great territory of Labrador with its vast storehouse of energy, depends on sources other than hydro—primarily thermal sources—for approximately 44 per cent of its total energy. That, of course, explains why energy costs are escalating in the island part of the province of Newfoundland. Indeed at the present time there is before the government of Newfoundland an application by the power companies for still further increases in power rates.

The principal hydro development in the province initially received a grant from the now defunct Atlantic Development Board which made possible the development of the great watershed of Baie d'Espoir, producing a total of 450 megawatts, which brought the total capacity of the island part of the province by 1970 up to 762 megawatts. All sources today within the province provide approximately 1,062 megawatts of energy.

The second biggest single source of energy in the province comes from the Churchill Falls power development. This great development has an approximate capacity of 34 billion kilowatt hours, by far the largest hydro power development in the world outside of the U.S.S.R. However, the bulk of the Churchill Falls output is locked up in a 65 year contract with Hydro Quebec, and in my estimation that contract has to be the single biggest sellout of energy resources in the history of Canada.

To give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, of why I say that, about the deal with the province of Quebec for hydro power from Churchill Falls works like this: for a fixed period of 40 years, with an extension of 25 years, all power

must be sold to the province of Quebec. This brings into the province of Newfoundland approximately $99 million a year. This power is now sold at 3.5 mills per kilowatt. Contrast this with the fact that the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, the largest utility in the province, presently has to pay 9.7 mills for its power at wholesale rates. Since there is currently an application before the province for a still further increase by the Newfoundland Hydro Power Commission that would boost that to 12.2 mills, obviously this will mean there will be a rate increase. Whether it will be that extensive or not remains to be seen.

The deal with Quebec provides for a de-escalation in the rate, and this will reduce the cost of energy to 2.4 mills by the end of the century. Newfoundland energy minister, recently speaking in the legislature of the province, had this to say:

> Churchill Falls energy today is worth about 15 mills per kilowatt-hour on the North American market.

Yet that power, Mr. Speaker, is locked into a 65 year deal with the province of Quebec at 3.5 mills. I say shame.

● (2010)

The minister went on to say:

> If we could get that price, Churchill Falls would be generating over $200 million in extra revenue for the province today.

In other words, we would be realizing from the sale of Churchill Falls power in today's prices over $300 million a year in revenue for the province.

In order to meet the needs of the island part of the province of Newfoundland two things must happen, otherwise we will have an energy crisis by 1980. There will be an actual shortage of energy in the province of Newfoundland by 1981. We either must have the capacity to produce the additional resources of the Churchill river, the lower Churchill known as the Gull Island project, or else we will have to depend upon thermogeneration. At present only 9 per cent of our energy resources come from this island part to the province. I am told that unless we can produce other sources of energy by tapping the resources of the lower Churchill or by renegotiating the deal with the province of Quebec, this will grow to 48 per cent by 1980. It is interesting to note that based on the present rate of inflation this means we would have to pay $16.50 a barrel of oil in 1980, which would mean that we would have to pay about $100 million a year to produce this additional energy source by 1980.

The minister made reference to the Gull Island project in his speech, albeit a very brief reference. I am sorry he did not enlarge upon the current policy of the government with respect to how hydro energy fits into the over-all government strategy. I am told by the Churchill Falls Power Corporation, for example, that in the Labrador part of Newfoundland at present there is an undeveloped potential of approximately 5,000 megawatts which, when added to the 5,225 megawatts flowing from Churchill Falls, amounts in Labrador alone to a hydro potential in excess of 10,000 megawatts. Yet it is interesting to reflect that the first ministers of the five eastern provinces meeting in Quebec addressed themselves to this vast potential and recommended to the government of Canada that hydro power be included in the total energy policy of the government. We must have government policies addressing themselves to the generation of hydro power, otherwise we will have a crisis of considerably greater proportions in the Atlantic provinces than we have at present.

This great undeveloped, unharnessed potential in the Labrador part of the province has to be developed, and will be developed eventually. But unless it is developed soon we will have a crisis of major proportions in Newfoundland. I am advised by the Newfoundland Power Commission that the Gull Island project has the best potential for meeting Newfoundland's present energy needs. However, the minister knows better than anyone else that Newfoundland is unable to finance that vast project on its own—there has to be federal participation, indeed there has to be substantial federal participation.

We know that the federal government has offered $341 million toward the development of the lower Churchill, but that is not enough. Because of the escalating costs, as a direct consequence of inflation, the total cost of developing and harnessing power from the lower Churchill is now in excess of $2 billion, and we must have greater federal participation. As a result of the attitude of the federal government, that project is at present in limbo. We cannot undertake the development necessary to transmit that power to the island part of Newfoundland, the substantial expenditures involved in building the hydro transmission lines, and the 11 mile tunnel across the Strait of Belle Isle, unless we have some assurance from the Government of Canada that it will reassess its position with respect to the development of the lower Churchill.

Of course the other alternative to meet the energy needs of the province of Newfoundland would be to retain some of the power that is now going into the province of Quebec for 3.5 mills. That power is worth today on the northern American market 15 mills. We should have the right to renegotiate that contract because, shortsighted as it was, it was entered into at a time when no one in Canada could foresee the energy crisis in which we find ourselves today as a result of the raising of oil prices by the OPEC countries. So we must be able to reopen that contract.

Negotiations have been taking place with the province of Quebec, but I am sorry to say that these negotiations have been fruitless. There has to be federal participation, we must have input from the federal government, in order to regain some of that power.

With the coming on stream of the James Bay project in Quebec, some of that power should be available to us. It is power which is now surplus to Quebec's needs and we should be able to regain some of it without having the gun put to our heads by the province of Quebec, and without being forced by that province to reopen something at the bargaining table which, in the opinion of province of Newfoundland and its people, is not negotiable, namely, the boundary between Quebec and Newfoundland.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Yet we are told by the province of Quebec through their minister of energy that if we want to buy back in excess of 300 megawatts, which we can now have under the contract and which we need in order to make it feasible to finance the transmission lines and the building of the tunnel across the Strait of Belle Isle to get that

power into the island part of the province of Newfoundland, we must be prepared to renegotiate the boundary. Indeed we are told that if we want that power we must be prepared to sell all the land around the head waters of the rivers flowing into the north shore of the St. Lawrence so that Quebec can tap that undeveloped resource potential. That is the same as asking us for a hunk of our territory, and we are not prepared to even consider that. But we are prepared to sit down and negotiate.

Surely we should be able to recap that power that is going into Quebec from Churchill Falls now and then flowing into Consolidated Edison in upper New York, and here is where the bargaining power of the federal government should be used to help one of the Atlantic provinces which is suffering the consequences of the energy crisis.

The consequence is very simple, and I am afraid this is something which the minister does not seem to understand, namely, that until we resolve this energy crisis in the Atlantic provinces you can forget about regional economic expansion because DREE policies are unproductive. No industry is going to settle in an areas which has an energy crisis because most industries require vast energy resources in order to be able to operate. I hope there can be some meetings of minds on this. I hope there can be some input by the Government of Canada, and I am hoping that the Government of Canada will take to heart seriously the recommendations of the five premiers that it consider hydro potential in the over-all energy policy of the government. With this realization there will hopefully flow a decision by the Government of Canada to assist in the development and the building of an eastern power grid which would tap all of these vast resources of the great Labrador storehouse, not for the good of Consolidated Edison in the state of New York, but for the good of eastern Quebec and the four Atlantic provinces.

● (2020)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Surely in that regard the national government has an ongoing responsibility with respect to regional development. If we are going to continue with the present DREE policies, then we must ensure that the energy infrastructure is in place. Otherwise all the regional incentives in the world will not entice industries to establish in power hungry provinces.

I can talk about the unemployment statistics of the four Atlantic provinces, and I can talk about the hardships of the consumers of electric energy in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and in eastern Newfoundland, but the fact is that if this region is to develop its full potential, then obviously the last major power resources in the region, that is, the undeveloped portion of the lower Churchill represented in the Gull Island project and the headwaters of the rivers flowing into the north shores of the St. Lawrence, have to be tapped. Once that decision is made we can think in terms of developing a regional eastern power grid which could be developed in the over-all context of a national power grid. It is only by that kind of thinking that we will have this great renewable source of energy developed for the good of the people of Canada and for the good of the people of the Atlantic provinces and Quebec.

[Mr. McGrath.]

I submit to the minister that he has more than a passive role to play. As the minister responsible for energy in Canada he has to provide leadership. We can certainly sympathize with the problems he has with respect to the cost of oil in Canada, but he has to realize that there are other sources of power in this country not yet developed, and the most important underdeveloped potential source of hydro power resides in Newfoundland, a portion of Quebec, and in that great flow of energy going into the Quebec grid from Churchill Falls, much of which is now flowing into New York state and which should be recaptured by a renegotiated contract based on more realistic bargaining in the context of today's energy crisis and used for the over-all development of the region. Some of that power must be brought back to Newfoundland, and some of that power, through the development of a regional grid, can be brought in to the power hungry Maritime provinces.

These are the kinds of questions to which we would have liked to have heard the minister address himself today, instead of taking the very defensive and passive attitude he took. Of course he has to be apologetic because of the present energy problem, as witnessed by the very serious problems in federal-provincial relations which are developing and as exemplified by the meetings which will take place in Ottawa later this week. He has to reassess the total energy picture today, and he has to be able to come to the conclusion, which is obvious and self-evident, that unless hydro power is included in the total energy policy of the government we will continue to have a crisis of very serious proportions in the four Atlantic provinces.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McGrath: Certainly.

Mr. Gillespie: I should like to ask the hon. member if he would clarify his position. If I understood him correctly, it seemed that he was advocating that the federal government move into the electrical power utilities in the provincial jurisdiction and impose a solution with respect to the power generated in the Atlantic community, and more particularly, the Labrador power. Is it his view that we should impose a solution?

The second question I should like to ask is whether he is advocating that the federal government impose an electrical grid on the Atlantic provinces regardless of what the feelings of the provincial premiers might be.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, obviously I did not get the message through to the minister, or he was not listening. What I am saying is that the Government of Canada should provide some leadership.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I suggest that the federal government should develop an energy inventory of the region, and in the light of that energy inventory assess what the needs of the region are and then work that out in the context of a regional power grid, which the five first ministers are advocating at the present time.

In reply to the minister's second point with respect to federal government involvement in what is essentially a

provincial jurisdiction, the minister could provide the same kind of leadership which was provided by the Atlantic Development Board when it made substantial capital grants toward power development, not only for the Baie d'Espoir power which developed as a result of a $25 million grant, but also for the power which was developed with federal government help on the upper Saint John river. That is the kind of help we want. That is the leadership we want.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic members in the House support this motion because it seeks to draw attention to the appallingly high costs of electric power in the Atlantic provinces and the hardship which follows therefrom, and seeks to censure the government because it has not yet presented any constructive policies to meet that situation, and also because we think that this is a good opportunity to discuss some of the things which might be done to improve the lot of the people in the Atlantic provinces. There can be no doubt about the fact that hardship is being suffered in the Atlantic provinces because of high electrical rates. I keep getting letters from people in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia—

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): And Manitoba.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): — enclosing their power bills, and how they are able to pay them is beyond me. The hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) says "and Manitoba". I should point out that his own Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) said in the House yesterday that Manitoba has the lowest power rates in Canada. The hon. member ought to remember that.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It has still doubled up, just the same.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If the hon. member wants to make a speech I will let him do so, but not on my time.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I can do that, too.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The hon. member ought to do it. He has a big voice. I should like to hear if he has anything to say.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I have a lot to say.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Not only have the high electrical rates caused hardship to individuals in the Atlantic provinces, but as the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Hogan) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield) pointed out this afternoon, they can have disastrous results for the economy of the Atlantic provinces. In order to be competitive today any industry must be able to get power at reasonably low cost, and I must say that I was disappointed to see the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) treat this matter in what I thought was a somewhat callous and offhand manner. He discussed the problem. He found fault with what everyone else had to say. He blamed almost everyone he could think of because of the plight of the Atlantic provinces, but he did not once come up with a concrete commitment as to what the federal government is prepared to do about this situation.

● (2030)

If I have any criticism of the motion presented by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) it is, first, that it did not give the reasons why the Atlantic provinces are in this predicament and, second, it did not make any concrete proposals on what might be done. Let me deal with those two items briefly.

Why are the Atlantic provinces in the position where their energy costs are higher than any place else in Canada? As a matter of fact their industrial power costs are 100 per cent higher, and in comparison to some provinces they are 150 per cent higher. The dream of Cape Breton for years, for instance, has been for a steel industry but there cannot be an economically viable steel industry there unless these power rates are substantially reduced.

We are in this situation, Mr. Speaker, because there has not been a coherent energy policy in Canada. I was interested to notice in this morning's paper that the Liberal leader in the province of Ontario said that yesterday in the Ontario legislature.

Mr. Woolliams: He has to say something.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The federal government has never come up with an over-all, integrated energy policy. We did have an oil policy which the administration of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) introduced in 1961 following the report of the Borden commission. That oil policy was a disaster. It was based on the assumption that we had unlimited supplies of oil and gas and could afford to sell 60 per cent of our production to the United States, without any thought that we had less resources than the United States and that our resources were dwindling very rapidly. That was carried on by the successor government of Mr. Pearson, and under the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the government has constantly refused to face up to the realities of the energy situation in Canada.

In 1969 the report of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources claimed that by 1990 we would not only be able to meet our own oil needs but also to export four million barrels of oil per day. By 1973 they have modified that somewhat and said we would be self-sufficient by 1985. Last week the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources brought in his so-called self-reliance program, in which he said that by 1985 we will be importing one third of our oil requirements. That statement is not quite accurate, Mr. Speaker. If you look at the figures in the report it is much higher than one third. I suggest that by 1985 we will probably importing over 50 per cent of our oil requirements and will probably be paying in the neighbourhood of $15 per barrel for it. That is a bill of $4½ or more, that the Canadian people will have to pay to import oil.

There has been no long term planning with respect to energy. I attended a federal-provincial conference 20 years ago at which we urged the federal government of that day to assist the provinces and to give leadership in establishing a national power grid. Because of the various time zones in Canada it would have been possible, by a national power grid, to have reduced the amount of installation for

peaking periods. That could have reduced capital costs and operating costs by about 25 per cent, and consequently reduced the cost of electric power. Some of the provinces on their own worked out arrangements on interconnection but the federal government has never put before the provinces a plan for for a national power grid such as has been done in many countries in Europe and other parts of the world.

It is distressing to look back over the last few years and realize the mistakes we have made with respect to the development of energy. The Atlantic provinces have become mainly dependent upon imported oil, which means that they will be paying ever increasing prices for it as the years go by. That means their economy will be vulnerable if at any time the OPEC countries decide to cut off supplies.

The Atlantic provinces have two major resources. They have large coal deposits, particularly in Cape Breton, and they had high potential. But they have done very little with them. Nova Scotia, which has large coal deposits, generates 62 per cent of its power from oil and only 23.5 per cent from coal. In Prince Edward Island virtually 100 per cent of their power is generated from oil. They have made very little use of the coal they have which is readily available.

With reference to hydro power, history will record with irony that the great Churchill Falls development has not benefit the consumers of Newfoundland. As the hon. member for St. John's East very properly pointed out, that power is sold to Quebec at 3½ mills, the most scandalously low price on this continent. What is more, Quebec has been selling some of that power on an interruptable basis to the State of New York after a mark-up of 200 per cent or 300 per cent. It is inconceivable that this great resource which could have helped the Atlantic provinces has not been used for that purpose.

The James Bay project, one of the largest in the world, is being developed in the province of Quebec and much of that power is for service to the United States. Power which was going to be used for a uranium enrichment plant is now going to be available. It will be interesting to see whether that power is also allocated to the United States at the very time the people of the Atlantic provinces need cheap electric power for hydro.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources asked the hon. member for St. John's East whether he would impose some controls on the provinces. I would point out to the minister that power cannot be exported from this country without the consent of the National Energy Board and that board is subject to policy decisions laid down by the government. If the government had wanted to make sure that the power stayed in Canada for the benefit of the people in the Atlantic provinces it could have done so if it had possessed the vision or courage to give leadership in this country with respect to power.

The result is, of course, that our energy policy has not been made here in Ottawa or by governments; in the main our energy policy has been made by powerful corporations which have used the energy resources of this country in whatever manner would bring the greatest financial return. Our quarrel with large corporations is not just that they take a higher share of the national income than they are entitled to; our objection also is the fact that they use their economic power to make major economic decisions without any regard to the public welfare or the public interest. That is certainly why the maritime provinces face the very difficult situation they do at the present time.

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

● (2040)

What can we do to remedy this situation? First we must recognize that the day of cheap, abundant oil supplies in Canada is over. Even Middle East reserves of oil may not last more than 35 or 40 years, which is not long in the life of a society or civilization. The price of oil will rise steadily.

Foster Associates, which did the study for the Syncrude consortium, showed in their working papers that they predicate the success of the Syncrude project in the Athabasca tar sands on a price starting at $15.50 per barrel and rising to $35 per barrel within the lifetime of the plants. We can get some idea of what oil will cost in the next 35 years. Therefore we must recognize that the Atlantic provinces face economic disaster if they continue their dependence on oil as a means of generating electric power. Perhaps they will be fortunate and find oil offshore; if they do that oil will be needed to produce petroleum products for fishermen's boats, and to power tractors on farms and cars. The entire world faces a growing shortage of oil. Increasingly, oil must be diverted away from the generation of electric power.

I suggest, first, that the federal government should step in and give financial assistance, particularly to Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, which depend largely on oil. When the government raises the price of oil on July 1 either to $9 or $9.50 per barrel, which probably will happen, the price rise will place a tremendous burden on those two provinces.

I agree that we need lead time to fing solutions to the energy difficulties of the Atlantic provinces. That lead time can only be bought if the federal government is prepared to make large sums of money available to enable the Atlantic provinces to generate electric power for a limited time with subsidized oil. But that is not the solution. It is only a temporary expedient which will give the Government of Canada and the governments of the Atlantic provinces time in which to deal with the major difficulties.

Second, we must consider the possibility of using coal, because the development of hydro and nuclear power are longterm projects. I shall return to that in a moment. I understand that practically all power plants in the maritimes, except one, are convertible and can use either oil or coal.

This afternoon the minister mentioned the high price which would have to be paid for coal. I point out that even if the government paid a subsidy on every ton of coal used for generating electric power, the cost would be less than what the government is now paying. It will pay less than what it now pays the oil companies in order to keep the price of oil down in Canada. If you work on the ratio of four to one, that is, four barrels of oil being equivalent to one ton of coal, even if the federal government paid $10 per ton on coal to enable the Atlantic provinces to have coal cheaply for generating electric power, the government

would pay less than it now pays the oil companies. Also, there is this important side effect: It would create employment in Canada for many unemployed and boost economic growth in the Atlantic provinces; on the other hand the money we pay the oil companies simply enriches the coffers of the OPEC countries.

The government should consider making available funds to enable additional coal seams to be opened on Cape Breton Island, and consider a subsidy program, to be in place for a stated period of time, to enable electric power to be generated in the Atlantic provinces at rates lower than possible at present.

This afternoon the minister talked of difficulties with sulphur in coal. I point out that we have been using sulphur coal in many parts of Canada for years. You can extract sulphur from the coal successfully if you use scrubbers which eliminate pollution. I remind the minister that the oil we have been burning east of the Ottawa Valley, which comes from Venezuela, is sulphur oil, and we have been able to eliminate the problem of pollution. I do not think the difficulty is serious. If the coal possesses an adequate BTU content and a subsidy is paid on it, it will be possible to bring down the cost of electric power generation to a reasonable figure.

The other possibilities are hydro or tidal power. I agree with the hon. member for St. John's East that we should renegotiate the agreements governing power generated at Churchill Falls. If it wants to renegotiate these agreements, the federal government can bring to bear much power. It can force the phasing out of the export of power, if we need the power in Canada. We would do if if we were at war, and we are war, at war against poverty and the lack of opportunity available to people in the Atlantic provinces.

Mr. McGrath: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The federal government should show leadership in bringing together Quebec and the Atlantic provinces, to see that some of the power being generated at James Bay can be used in the Atlantic provinces instead of going to the state of New York.

We should also keep in mind tidal power, the development of which faces snags. But it should be kept in mind as a possible source of power in the Atlantic provinces. We must also remember nuclear power. New Brunswick is already planning to produce nuclear power. It is possible that if the hydro power—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its indulgence. I shall take only a few moments more. I was saying that if coal thermal plants and hydro power do not meet the full energy requirements of the Atlantic provinces, nuclear power is a possibility down the road.

If we are to solve the energy problem of the Atlantic provinces we must set up an interprovincial grid. The minister asked the hon. member for St. John's East if he wanted to "impose" such a grid. I suggest that it is not necessary to talk about imposing a grid. I suggest that the federal government should sit down with the four Atlantic provinces and say, "Look, here is your situation; we can help you at present with oil, by giving financial assistance. We can help you to generate electricity by helping with coal. We can also help you to renegotiate some power contracts, but nuclear power down the road may be your ultimate answer. We are prepared not only to help you with the financing of a nuclear reactor, but with the building of an interprovincial grid". If the government were to say that, I am convinced that the premiers of the Atlantic provinces, facing the situation in which they presently find themselves, would readily comply.

I close by saying that ultimately we shall solve the energy difficulties of this country only if governments, federally and provincially, are given a greater voice in the decision-making process and are involved in long-range planning.

I agree with the minister that Petro-Canada must have an important role to play. I see one of my Tory friends shaking his head. I want to say to him that if there is any group of people in this House or in this country who ought to recognize the need for public intervention in the development of energy, it is the Conservative party. The man who piloted this whole idea was Sir Adam Beck who, when he set up Ontario Hydro which has produced one of the greatest power systems on this continent, did it with the slogan "The gifts of nature belong to the people". That is still true. Whether it is coal, gas, oil, hydro or nuclear power, these belong to the people. This government and the provincial governments have a responsibility to see that the gifts of the people are developed for the benefit of the people.

● (2050)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: I know the hon. member's time has expired, Mr. Speaker, but if the House agrees I would like to ask him a question.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: The distinguished member has always been most fair. He was quite critical of the national oil policy of 1962. I think he will agree with me that Saskatchewan and Alberta oil was brought to the Ottawa Valley. We exported to the western United States exactly what we imported from Venezuela. The reason was that the maritimes and Quebec could buy it cheaper in that fashion and we could export it to the United States in an equal amount; both exports and imports being equal so that we were self sufficient. That is the real reason the national oil policy was developed under the Diefenbaker government. We were exporting equal to the amount we were importing because it was cheaper for the maritimes and Quebec to do it in that fashion. That was the reason for the national oil policy which the Liberal party continued and which they endorsed. I hope the hon. member will be fair in that regard.

Energy

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair. However, I point out to the hon. member two things. First, his figures are wrong. The amount of oil which we imported was much less than we exported. We imported around 750,000 to 800,000 barrels a day and exported anywhere from 1.2 million to 1.5 million barrels a day. We exported almost twice as much as we imported.

Mr. Woolliams: It depends on what year you take.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): You can take it over the average of years and you get the same answer. Second, by making all of the area east of the Ottawa Valley dependent on imported oil we left that area in a very vulnerable position, and the people of the Atlantic provinces are paying the price today. Incidentally I came to Ottawa with the Independent Petroleum Producers Association of Canada to plead with the government at that time to extend the pipeline to eastern Canada to keep our oil in Canada so that we would be self sufficient against the day we would not be able to get imported oil at reasonable prices.

Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington): At last, Mr. Speaker, at long last someone else besides the federal government has recognized that there is an energy crisis in this country. The day of cheap energy is gone. The House, indeed the whole country, owes a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies). However, it is unfortunate that his flash of brilliance did not continue into the second half of his motion where he failed to present some solution to the problem.

The motion under debate, Mr. Speaker, represents another attempt by the opposition to have the federal government come to the rescue because a provincial government has been unable to manage its own affairs. They would have us believe that the skyrocketing price of energy has come as a complete surprise, when in fact the handwriting has been on the wall for at least the last two and a half years.

As has already been pointed out, the responsibility for electrical power generation rests with the provincial governments. It was the provincial governments which decided to burn oil to produce electricity. Security of supply was of less importance than low price in the decision to rely on foreign imports rather than western Canadian crude oil.

While the dramatic price increases which resulted from the actions of the OPEC members could not have been foreseen, the possibility of such action taking place always existed and therefore should have been allowed for. The Atlantic provinces are now paying the price for having chosen the wrong long term option. If the hon. members opposite choose to see a statement of fact as representing a callous attitude, then they are unduly sensitive. The free enterprise system, which they admonish us not to destroy, rewards those who make the right decision and penalizes those who are wrong. Surely no one who loses money in the stock market expects to be bailed out.

The federal government is being asked to bail out the Atlantic provinces now that they are faced with a serious situation. The opposition fails to recognize, however, the fact that the federal government has initiated, during the last two decades, a number of endeavours designed to provide that region with a stable and affordable source of electrical energy.

These have included loans under the Atlantic Provinces Power Development Act totalling $225 million, grants of over $3 million to study the possibilities of tidal power, a loan of $350 million for the Point Lepreau nuclear plant, a grant toward the New Brunswick-Nova Scotia interconnection of $4 million, and a loan and grant totalling $27 million toward the P.E.I. interconnection with New Brunswick. As well, the federal government has contributed $120 million in oil import compensation for the production of electricity. Over-all financial assistance totals more than $1.2 billion.

In a further attempt to stabilize the price of electricity the federal government has pressed the maritime provinces since 1972 to co-operate in an inter-provincial grid and has offered funds to support the establishment of such a network. Another product of federal initiative, Petro-Canada, plans to devote $25 million or 25 per cent of its exploration budget over the next five years to exploration for oil and gas on the east coast. Until the discovery and development of significant reserves, though, the maritime provinces, and especially Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, will have to rely on existing energy sources. It will be several years before any alternative sources become available.

Considering Nova Scotia's abundant coal supply it would appear logical to devote a larger amount of that fuel to electricity production in order to decrease reliance on oil. However, this does not provide a short term solution. Problems are encountered in transportation, including the need for sea rather than rail transport, and the upgrading of port facilities. The process of converting generating plants from oil to coal burning would be expensive both in time and money. Problems of air pollution from the high sulphur content coal must also be considered. It may be reasonably assumed that a three to five year lead time would be required before the use of coal would alleviate the problems currently being experienced. As world oil prices continue to rise, coal will look increasingly more attractive. At present the price of coal is tied to the price of oil, but there is no reason why that policy must be continued indefinitely.

Nuclear energy holds the answer to future requirements in the maritimes, but reactors cannot be built overnight. This is where the need for responsible long-term planning becomes very evident. Nova Scotia Light and Power has had an agreement with Imperial Oil Limited since January 1, 1970, and running to December 31 of this year, whereby the utility is guaranteed its fuel requirements at $1.75 per barrel—the cheapest oil in the world right now. Surely it did not take until 1976 for the province to realize that it was in a very favourable position because of that contract.

When it became clear that petroleum prices were rising, steps should have been taken immediately to prevent the situation now facing the population of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. As the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) demonstrated, the price of electricity remained constant in Nova Scotia from 1958 to 1974 while the cost of all other goods and services continued to rise. The province had a responsibility throughout that period to explore possible alternate energy forms,

especially after the OPEC oil price increase in October, 1973.

● (2100)

Although the outlook for the future appears dismal when one considers the lack of substitute energy forms, there is one very worth-while step that not only can but must be taken now, that is, to increase public awareness of the need to conserve energy. Every incentive must be offered to encourage a more responsible use of our energy resources. Unfortunately increased cost has proven to be the most effective incentive.

Significant increments in supply can be realized by lowering thermostats a few degrees and driving our cars only when really necessary, and then at lower speeds and with more efficient engines. Conservation is a priority before we begin to discuss new sources of energy to replace those we are using up at an unsustainable rate. Conservation is now. It is the immediate solution which will buy time until the other solutions can be implemented.

Hopefully it is becoming apparent to all Canadians that the federal government is not an endless source of funds ready to save publicly-funded enterprises or other governments within Canada from the excesses of poor management. Whether we are discussing electricity rates in the Atlantic provinces or the cost of the Olympic Games, the same problem emerges. The government has a responsibility to the taxpayers of Canada to ensure that their money is used in a responsible manner.

The hon. member for Don Valley wants more money for research and development. I entirely agree. It is one of the things I have been stressing for some time. But we cannot complain; in this time of restraint and budget cutting the government recently announced an increase of $9.7 million in funds available for energy research and development. This indicates how high a priority the government places on this line of endeavour. I understand, too, the provision of additional funds is presently under consideration in connection with the fusion program.

The hon. member wanted the government to change its priorities. He did not elaborate on that theme, but I would be very interested to hear what his priorities happen to be and how they happen to differ from those set out in government policy which are almost identical to what was suggested almost a year ago by the Science Council, an independent group to which the best brains in the country contribute. What does the hon. member or his party know that the best talent in the country doesn't?

As indicated both by government policy and by the conclusions of the Science Council, in the short term, conservation will buy us time and reduce demand. We will increase supply in the short term by using coal and nuclear fission. No new technology is needed in these fields; it is a matter of implementing what we already have. In the intermediate term, the oil and gas resources of the tar sands, the Arctic and the Atlantic offshore regions should be brought to the market place. In the long term, solar energy and energy from fusion should be the largest suppliers of our energy needs, but this will not be until the end of the present century. Energy produced as a result of novel techniques; e.g. wind, biomass, geothermal and tidal sources will not make any significant contribution until the end of the century.

The hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones) proposed the early use of tidal energy. He mentioned the several studies which have been carried out in this connection. Studies have certainly been made, but their conclusion is that it is not economic to proceed with such projects at the present time. Even if a decision were made to begin such a scheme today it would be many years before we could expect energy to be derived from that source.

The hon. member for Moncton also commented on insulation standards in his province. I happen to know that in his own riding there is an insulation factory under construction right now but the project has been delayed for many months because there has been no increased demand for insulation in that part of the country. The standards may exist but they are certainly not being implemented. Conservation is for now. Now is the time to save energy while we bring more energy on stream to supply our future needs.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down will be happy reading for Mr. Regan, the Premier of Nova Scotia, as an indication of the tremendous support his Liberal allies are giving to his province. It might have come from the back benches but that speech was applauded by everyone on the Liberal side. It was prepared and, we must assume, researched prior to delivery. It was not an off-the-cuff statement. It was Liberal policy and must be considered as such in view of the way in which it was presented.

The hon. member mentioned energy from wind. I do not want to speak in a derogatory way about anyone who advocates the conservation of energy or the exploitation of new forms of energy, but it might be of interest to the hon. member to learn that wind energy is so important in the Atlantic area that when a meeting connected with the preservation of the environment was held last week in New Brunswick they tried to run their PA system by means of batteries charged by a wind-driven generator. Their meeting was constantly interrupted because the fan failed to run; it did not generate any energy, the batteries ran down. That sort of situation, I suppose, is one to which he would relegate the Atlantic region. It is typical of Liberal party policy, historically and traditionally, to take that kind of position as their supporters look eastward.

Mr. Forrestall: Exactly so. It reminds me of what Mackenzie King said—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) has the floor. If the hon. member wishes to make a speech he can make it later on.

Mr. McCain: My hon. friend may be disturbing, but at least he has his feet on the ground and he has some knowledge of the requirements of the Atlantic provinces. He is therefore far ahead of some of those on your right, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose we might go to biomass as was suggested by the last speaker, but this is an alternative which has not

been researched by the Research Council; the process has not been developed in practical terms even for individual farm use. It is certainly worthy of research, and indeed one member on this side of the House has been promoting this suggestions for years—it has fallen on deaf ears until tonight, and now it becomes a practical source of energy which the Atlantic area ought to consider.

There is no question that we should consider conservation. It is a must. But up to this moment there has been very little concrete policy to indicate that the government itself is promoting research in this direction. Have we researched a new carburetor? Have we researched a new motor? Have we researched anything in this field which has become commercially viable? Not to date.

In the speech we just heard, we were called gamblers. I would point out that the Atlantic area and New Brunswick in particular have gone far ahead of some of the ideas which have been presented today. We have tried nuclear power but we were delayed by red tape for years. We have tried to take advantage of the need to refine offshore oil but we were denied this opportunity as a result of National Energy Board policy which refused to allow the refining and processing to go to the Atlantic area.

● (2110)

I think it is high time that we took a solid look at the Atlantic area. We have been given a couple of little books lately. I have not read them word for word, but I have studied them and I have asked others about them. I am told that the Atlantic provinces are not mentioned by name in these books anywhere. I have in my hand a news release which followed the tabling of these books and their presentation for public consumption. The Atlantic provinces are not referred to as a problem area in this news release. One must assume that the Atlantic provinces, in the mind of the government today, have no energy problem. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We have a study by the government that indicates that we must have self-reliance. This means reducing the vulnerability of Canadians to arbitrary changes in prices or the supply of imported energy by using domestic resources to the greatest extent possible, and protecting against interruptions in the supply of energy we must import. And, Mr. Speaker, we must import energy in the east. According to the study, a strategy of self-reliance does not mean self-sufficiency at any price unless, I might add, Mr. Speaker, it is for the maritimes.

We are going to reduce net Canadian dependence on imported oil in 1985 to one third of our total oil demands. Economists are predicting that this target will bankrupt us before we reach 1985, not only in the Atlantic area but in Canada as a whole. The next 10 to 15 years are crucial for both the short-term and long-term energy future.

Let me examine the situation in the Atlantic area. For example, let me talk about our residential energy. I would ask the hon. member who has just taken his seat to take what I propose to say into consideration. He should take some lessons from the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) who, though I disagree with him philosophically, has objectives that are admirable and much preferable to those on your right, Mr. Speaker. He has made a study of his subject and he knows what he is talking about. He was a credit to himself and he spoke as a supporter of a total over-all policy for the good of all Canada. He was not accusing anyone; he was merely pointing out the problems.

While the east has been experiencing energy shortages that could have been anticipated, the Government of Canada has been saying that oil in Alberta belongs to Alberta, that oil in Saskatchewan belongs to Saskatchewan, but that oil lying offshore in the Atlantic area belongs to Canada. The manipulation of offshore permits for drilling has been such that drilling has been discouraged. Those who have had the courage to drill have had to apply both provincially and federally, not knowing the regulations that the federal government would impose. I submit that the search for and development of energy off our coasts has been set back by at least ten years as a result of negative and controversial policies. Ask some of the responsible premiers of the Atlantic area what their opinion is.

Mr. Breau: That is nonsense.

Mr. McCain: The hon. member had better check with some of his political friends down there.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question.

Mr. McCain: Yes, when I am through. I should like to plead for one other position, Mr. Speaker, and it is this. The Atlantic premiers should at this time recognize the fact that, regardless of their political faith, their prime loyalty must be to the Atlantic area and to each other. The members of the Atlantic legislatures must recognize that in unity there is strength and in discord there is weakness. We have operated from a position of weakness for too many years. There are not many seats in the Atlantic area but there are enough to change a government. It is high time they recognized, as the west has already recognized, that there is no sympathy from those on your right, Mr. Speaker, for people in need anywhere in Canada, whether they be native people, maritimers or northerners. The needs of Quebec and Ontario are prime in the minds of those to Your Honour's right. The Atlantic premiers must recognize this and act as one. There have been too many quarrels among the premiers to have a united policy.

The Hon. Jugh John Flemming, a Conservative, started the maritime and Atlantic premiers get togethers. The next premier of New Brunswick practised politics and caused dissension to the point that unity could not be obtained among the premiers of the Atlantic area. He played politics with this crew of which the hon. member is a member and for which he must assume some blame.

We now find ourselves in the position where the Hon. Richard Hatfield, a Conservative, is pleading with the maritime premiers to take a united position, and the only thing interfering with that position is politics. It is becoming more and more obvious to maritimers at this time that the policies proposed and the united position won by Premier Richard Hatfield are indicative of the course they must follow if they are to survive remarks of the kind we have heard a moment ago which will, by the way, be widely read as Liberal policy in the Atlantic area. We will like that speech very much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the government propose that the pulp and paper industry use as money? On the basis of the cost of energy in the province of Nova Scotia, which is dependent upon oil, on the basis of the cost of energy required in New Brunswick which is derived from a combination of oil, nuclear and water power, which is still not competitive when related to the cost of power which is being distributed from Churchill Falls to Quebec, Ontario, and in a small way to New Brunswick, and on the basis of the cost of power located beside coalfields of almost limitless extent in the prairies and in British Columbia, how, is it proposed to keep the forest industry and its pulp and paper mills working?

I also ask, Mr. Speaker, how do those on your right expect a mining industry to survive which at the moment is dependent, not because of poor planning but because it has no alternative, on a thermal plant located in the northeast of New Brunswick to provide its power? How will it remain competitive? I suggest it will be among the earliest industries in the mining areas of Canada to close down if it becomes a marginal producer, and there will go the jobs that so many have pleaded so hard for in the northeast. Where will we get the money to pay for energy to operate farm machinery in the Atlantic area?

I suppose it is ridiculous to say that at some point we must pay a higher price for oil. But let me get one thing very clear, Mr. Speaker. The money that comes from higher prices for oil must be spent on research, exploration, and development. It must not be grabbed by the Government of Canada fallaciously under some policy that is intended to better Canada. We must step up all aspects of our energy structure, including conservation, but research, exploration, and development are essential. Those are the areas in which our money should be spent regardless of what may be the philosophy of those on my left and of many on Your Honour's right.

An hon. Member: That is all spelled out in the energy paper.

Mr. McCain: It is also spelled out in one of these little books that the tax structure has discouraged research, exploration and development. It is also spelled out in another of these little books that the tax structure has now been corrected. That statement has to be qualified and you have to go into the situation a little more deeply to see how much incentive is actually left. Mention is made somewhere that if you do not spend this money correctly you will not have very much of it left, perhaps 25 per cent. The government lays down rules and regulations governing how any additional money accruing to the oil companies may be spent. Those regulations are fickle; we have seen that throughout various years of government opposite.

I think it is absolutely necessary that the Government of Canada adopt some policies in the energy field. One of its proposals is to pay 50 per cent of the cost of studying new sources of generation. Another is to finance 50 per cent of a distribution line, and the government might finance 50 per cent of a construction program. The figures read off by the last speaker did not amount to the $300 million that was put into one project by the federal government, namely, Syncrude, which admittedly will produce oil but at a price that will make it uneconomic to transport to any other area of Canada. That oil must be used on the spot or nearby if it is to be used practically and economically.

The amount of moneys the government has said will be spent in the Atlantic area comes to just a little bit more than what the government has chosen to spend in one lump sum on the Syncrude project. I do not quarrel with putting money into the Syncrude project. It could come virtually under the heading of research, if you wish, Mr. Speaker, because some element of research is required. But I submit that a new look must be taken at undeveloped sources of energy.

Should we look at a new way to extract coal from the Nova Scotia fields? Should there be a new, more productive and more economic way of extracting such coal as may be left in New Brunswick? Should it be the development of existing hydro power which may be in neighbouring provinces but which might be the salvation of energy prices in the Atlantic area? Should it be the removal of restrictions with respect to exploration offshore, thus removing the uncertainty of knowing where I stand if I find oil? To whom will I pay the tax, the federal government or the provincial government? Who will let me remove it, the federal government or the provincial government? What is the conflict that exists?

● (2120)

Are we in the position in which Premier Moore says we are? "It is all mine", says Premier Moore, and I support him. Or are we in the compromise position of Mr. Regan who says "We will let you have some"? These are items which will have to be resolved and these are uncertainties which must be resolved.

It is time that Quoddy power was developed. Reasons were given why it was economically unfeasible. One of the reasons was that there was no sale for the total possible production of the tidal power which might be generated in the Bay of Fundy. This has been an ongoing piece of research which has been continued since the 1920's by U.S. forces. An application was presented to the Government of Canada for permission to go ahead in the late 1900's, and it was presented by a constituent of mine who was their lawyer. It was not considered feasible by Canadians, although it was by Americans, but we never resolved that dispute because we did no research into it. We know there has been some problem with respect to the economics of it and that it was not economical initially.

We now have the techniques; we know that at the present prices it is probably viable. It should now be immediately researched and, if necessary, the Government of Canada should finance the development. It should not subsidize it but I think it should finance it and operate it if it so wishes—that is the government's privilege—and the energy should be available for the Atlantic area. Initially some of it would have to be exported because the market is not at home.

We have alternatives. We have a broad range of interprovincial, federal, co-operative programs which could bring power electrically from other sources. We have coal, although we need more research on it; we have Quoddy power, which should be researched. We need an immediate answer, not a commission which would start its study in 1976 and report only in 1979. Now is the time when the

research needs to be done. We have an industry which will not be competitive with Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia or any other part of Canada or with world-wide competitors if we do not get some kind of rational federal program to give us energy at competitive prices, which we cannot have now.

Mr. Breau: Would the hon. member entertain a question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is not the decision of the hon. member because his time has expired. The only way in which he can answer a question is by unanimous consent. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eudore Allard (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies)—

[*English*]

Mr. McCain: You have had your chance to speak for New Brunswick. You have been in the House for a long time but you have not spoken for New Brunswick yet.

Mr. Breau: I am on the list.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to express my gratitude and extend my thanks to the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) who introduced that motion which in my opinion deserves very special consideration.

There is no doubt that the prospection for traditional oil resources has decreased more quickly than expected by the National Energy Board. Just the same the federal government must meet as much as possible the energy requirements of Canada with our own resources.

In that connection, on April 27 last, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) tabled in the House a paper entitled "An Energy Strategy for Canada". To that end the federal government is considering making Canada self-sufficient in energy within the next ten years. However, Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well that three years ago, that is in June 1973, the present government published a paper on its energy policy which was to make Canada self-sufficient by approximately 1983. And barely three years later after that publication, we were told once again that Canada will be self-sufficient only in 1986.

● (2130)

It is therefore easy to realize that the ten-year goal set by the Canadian government has deteriorated from year to year. On several occasions I asked for the unanimous consent of the House, pursuant to Standing Order 43, to discuss some measures the federal government had to bring in to save energy as much as possible. As usual, my proposals did not receive unanimous consent. Among some motions that I wanted to move, there was one to maintain daylight saving time throughout the year.

I am convinced that this measure would enable the federal government to save thousands of barrels of oil, not to mention electricity. All that is needed is to recall the experiment conducted in the United States in 1973, which proved to be very conclusive when one considers the saving of energy that was realized, that is 2.5 per cent. Moreover, we have ready access to wind energy which appears as a replacement formula, specially for a country like ours where the winter season limits the possibilities of solar energy.

Mr. Speaker, since the days of cheap oil are over and those of oil itself are numbered, why should we not take advantage of the energy potential of the wind which is really tremendous in our beautiful country?

Mr. Speaker, what I find really curious in all this is to see that the federal government does not yet have real means to assess scientifically the Canadian oil and gas supplies which it has up to now consistently overestimated. We, in the Social Credit party of Canada, deeply feel that this government should establish, with the consent and the participation of the provinces, a Canadian energy resources board. That board would be responsible for the assessment of the energy requirements for the next 25 years and the availability of adequate supplies to meet those requirements. For the moment, as I was saying a while ago, our energy resources cannot be scientifically assessed, yet it would be really urgent to see that our energy resources be rightly assessed, given the fact that we consume much oil and that this energy source is not renewable.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) also announced that the price of Canadian oil would move up to the level of the world price. But one way or another, it was to be expected, considering that the present government has always lacked foresight, as far as I can remember. Because of the inability of the government to develop an efficient energy strategy, Canadian taxpayers will pay even more for oil.

There is no doubt that a real policy cannot be separated from a global economic policy. Now, as was foreseeable, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources announces sharp increases in oil and gas prices. But before announcing such increases, did the government realize that they would have a direct impact on inflation in Canada, that this so-called energy policy is working directly against the price and wage control policy of the Trudeau government? In this document, the minister invites taxpayers to save energy, oil in particular, when the policy of the Department of Transport encourages air rather than rail transportation. Is there anything to understand in all this, Mr. Speaker? I, for one, cannot understand. It is inconsistent to the point of being staggering.

Under those circumstances, one may consider, Mr. Speaker, that Canada stands at a crossroads where not only the future of its oil industry but of its whole economy is at stake. May we seriously continue to produce enough oil from Canadian sources to satisfy domestic demand or must we become increasingly dependent on foreign oil as we are at present?

We all know that huge oil and natural gas supplies have been discovered in the Arctic and that we now have the technology required to develop oil from tar sands in super-

ficial fields and at the same time process it into thick oil. Indeed, our great country has huge potential supplies of crude oil and natural gas. It also has limitless coal supplies that can be processed into gas or synthetic oil, but in order to really develop new sources of hydrocarbons in Canada, the Canadian government must spend over $50 billion to achieve the goal it has set for 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be helpful to recall that as a whole, less than $9 billion have been spent these past few years on exploration and development. And what about inflation of construction costs which increase by 40 to 50 per cent each year, a problem which is becoming more and more serious?

Mr. Speaker, let us be realistic, our economic policy is such as to continously promote an increase in capital at the expense of the work and purchasing power of our fellow citizens. At any rate, one can easily realize that with our present laws, the rich are making net profits of millions of dollars, the effect of which is to substantially reduce the purchasing power of Canadians.

Those who suffer most from this situation, Mr. Speaker, are low wage earners and those citizens who do not have a sufficient purchasing power, simply because the present financial system does not reflect the reality. As a matter of fact, the present system finds no justification in the nature of things and perpetuates a wrong conception of money in a human society.

Before going any further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from an article published in "*Le Soleil*" on March 25:

> Through interest rates, a huge financial spider-web surrounds us and becomes tighter, leaving us just alive . . . or nearly so.
>
> As it snowballs, interest accumulates and centralizes money in the hands of a select group of financiers . . . On the other hand, being hunted down from all sides, the small people are divided against themselves, abandoned and exploited by their leaders who are eager to get rich, they are left at the mercy of these loathsome heartless financiers in top hats; they have no revolver but from their ivory tower they are more efficient than the armed forces in making us accept smoothly a way of life which is impossible, disgusting, even revolting and which does not take human values into account, in which money prevails.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the present financial system prevents consumers from really living. It prevents them from enjoying the advantages of their association because it eradicates these advantages which should belong to all citizens; if Canadians are to take real advantage of the fruits of their association, it is absolutely necessary to put financial credit in line with real credit or social credit, if you wish. In other words, we should be putting money and credit in line with what Canadians produce and supply.

A little further, the same article went on to say:

> These financiers represented by chartered banks, ably disguised by the Bank of Canada which makes only pocket money with 8 per cent of the money supply of the country, while they are making the rest—92 per cent of the nation's credit.

It must be said that a country should not buy money: it should create it itself so as not to owe it to anyone else. That is strictly a sovereign right, that belongs to the state. In other words, a government cannot administer a country if it continues to buy money abroad, thus distorting and disrupting the economy.

With multipliers, single strokes of the pen, chartered banks convert the wealth of the country into money and unjustly cash in interests in the process. They take over our wealth, become the masters, the tyrants from whom we must ask permission to draw a breath. Nothing will change, Mr. Speaker, unless we have the courage to ask the government to alter this importing monetary system, to which we owe directly the hardships of most Canadians and the ceaseless borrowing and indebtedness of our municipalities, the provinces and the central government.

If the Maritime provinces better controlled their money, today we would not have to deplore their shortage of energy, and especially, the price those people now have to pay for their energy and will have to pay in the future for heating and transportation. That, Mr. Speaker, is the main source of energy our government should put at the disposal of the people; in that way, many other energy problems would be solved automatically. Mr. Speaker, those are the few notes I took with a view to supporting the motion of the hon. member for Don Valley.

● (2140)

[*English*]

Miss Coline Campbell (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to rise on this opposition day and contribute my views on the problem of the Atlantic region energy crisis. First of all I should like to congratulate the minister for "An Energy Strategy for Canada."

Mr. Paproski: You don't mean that.

Miss Campbell: It is certainly full of good suggestions for the provinces to take up. Energy is not just a problem in the Atlantic provinces and in particular Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; in Canada it has become a very grave problem. Internally we hear rumours of disputes between the provinces, and internationally the United States has still not forgiven us for cutting back our oil exports. Other countries are also finding things difficult.

The problem has been recognized by the government which has held many federal-provincial meetings, the most recent in March this year, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) intends to meet with provincial premiers on Thursday when I am sure this will be one of the main topics to be discussed.

The provincial minister in my province of Nova Scotia, the Hon. Bill Gillis, spent a good part of his Easter recess touring Canada to look at existing energy systems and the long range potential to serve the needs of the people and to bring the problems of Nova Scotia to the attention of all Canadians.

Governments, both federal and provincial, are working toward solutions. It just happens that we are a big country. Many areas in the world are in worse shape than we are and we hear about that, but when one area of Canada is in trouble, such as Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia, it seems that the rest of Canada does not recognize the dilemma. In fact New Brunswick is not too eager to look at the interprovincial grid lines and other systems.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss Campbell: Well, we cannot arrive at a solution. I just mention that for members of the opposition. Is it unreasonable to say at this time, perhaps Nova Scotia is in

trouble but the solution we obtain for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island should help all the provinces as well as Canada? It is time for us to forget our regionalism in the light of such a problem. We as a province enjoyed having access to the cheap oil producing countries, therefore we did not get subsidies on pipelines or on oil and gas production in the west. We do not have gas piped to us on the trans-Canada pipeline and we do not have oil pipelines. In fact, we do not have any oil. Unfortunately we are at present in need of some attention from both the federal and provincial governments across Canada and priority should be given to us by other provinces at this time for our future plans.

Nova Scotia depends on oil-fired electricity generation for 65 per cent of its needs, with an additional 23 per cent being supplied by coal-fired generation. The rest is in water. In the search for a form of power to reduce the province's dependence on oil the Nova Scotia Power Corporation is looking very closely at the coal situation. As has been mentioned today, the use of coal might well offer an offset to oil costs since most thermal plants could be modified to switch from oil to coal. Before this happens, however, the coal—which is currently hitched to the cost of oil—would have to be made attractive in price. Again, coal generated power is not the long term solution—even though Nova Scotia holds good coals reserves—as pollution and environmental problems become magnified. At present, however, an accrued benefit is that incomes are circulating throughout the province. As well, the province has stated that any further expansion will be coal generated.

What are the alternatives? Perhaps tidal power development and the possible importation of power from Quebec and Labrador, but both projects would take many years to materialize.

At this time I should like to refer to an article, "Energy by Fundy Tides," by R. H. Clark, which appeared in the *Canadian Geographical Journal* of Novemeber, 1972. Clark stated that the one and only area in Canada and in fact in North America where it is feasible to harness tide waters for energy purposes is in the Bay of Fundy. The world's most powerful tides are experienced in the inlets and estuaries of the Bay of Fundy. We also have the highest tides in the world, achieving up to 53 foot tides. Many locations have been indicated as ideal in the Bay of Fundy. Studies of tidal power have been going on since 1915. In 1967 the Atlantic Tidal Power Programming Board was established to deal with the study. It cost $2.5 million when it was finished in 1969. It reiterated former studies, that is, a tidal power development is technically but not economically feasible.

Because of the quadrupling in oil prices brought about by the formation of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), however, the federal government, along with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, instituted the Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Review Board on February 29, 1972. This board was charged with reviewing the detailed findings of the report done by the Atlantic Tidal Power Programming Board. The preliminary investigations of the Tidal Power Review Board were made public in November, 1974, in which it was noted that tidal power's economic position had significantly improved, vis-à-vis oil-fired electrical generation, since 1969. I wonder what the position would be today if updated.

The latest study, as recommended by the Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Board, was announced in November, 1974. To be known as the Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Study, it is to cost some $3 million and will again be sponsored by the federal government, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—with the federal government putting up half the funds for the investigation. Nova Scotia, which is more affected by oil price increases than New Brunswick and is thus vitally interested in tidal power development, has been concerned for quick advancement of the study. Its purpose is to make a more in-depth study of certain areas. In my view the Annapolis Basin or Digby, which are not being studied at this time, would probably be prime locations because there are no mud deposits as there are up higher. Mud seems to be one of the problems in establishing tidal power.

In the case of tidal power, if construction commenced in 1980—after completion of the current study ended—it would still take ten years to 1990 before first power was produced—and this is assuming all schedules were met and no technical drawbacks were encountered.

The first, and to date only, operating industrial scale tidal power project in the world is a double flow turbine plant located at Rance near St. Malo in France. It cost $80 million to build approximately ten years ago. Great Britain is now looking at that project and France is also looking at it.

I should like to read from a very interesting article entitled "Fringe Energy" which appeared in *The Economist* of March 27. Under the subheading "Water" the article states:

> On the Rance estuary in France, the first major effort to harness tides to generate electricity is seven years old and has proven a greater success than expected. It is said to generate electricity more efficiently than other hydro electric sites and has worked at virtually full capacity since 1973 without failure. There is now talk of a second French tidal plant, but a decision is still far off.

● (2150)

> Britain is still flirting with the idea of tapping Channel tides for electricity, but drawn-out discussions on the Severn estuary tidal barrage are continuing. The chief drawbacks to tidal projects are the costs. The Severn project could eventually cost much more than the estimated $3 billion.

I bring this point up because one of the assets of tidal is that it is not exhaustible, unless the tides go out and do not come back.

Mr. Gillespie: That would be lunar power.

Miss Campbell: I do not profess to be a scientist. I merely want to compare the $3 billion estimated cost with the $10 billion the federal government plans to invest in the exploration and the development of unknown areas. That is how much we shall spend in the next ten years in our search for oil and gas.

Perhaps Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and other provinces should bring this matter up at some provincial conference. The $10 billion figure does not take into account the subsidized cost of oil and the need for subsidized oil in future. Actually by mid-summer this year the subsidy for the Atlantic provinces will amount to about $1 billion.

The Point Lepreau nuclear project was estimated to cost between $400 and $500 million. It will be in full operation in six to ten years. But my sources tell me that the estimated cost is now $700 million. Further, nuclear power is an exhaustible source of energy, and the costs will probably be much higher than estimated. Tidal power is not exhaustible, as I said. The Atlantic provinces should consider as a priority the development of tidal power, and perhaps bring up the subject at the next federal-provincial conference.

An alternative solution is to import power from outside Nova Scotia, for example, from Quebec or Labrador. But we have no interprovincial flow of power. For instance, power cannot be transmitted interprovincially as crude oil and gas can be through an interprovincial pipeline.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I do not think the present speaker who has the floor wishes to be inaccurate, but I submit that there is provision for a power interconnection. It is being constantly extended in New Brunswick. It was pioneered in New Brunswick and is hooked up to Nova Scotia. It can bring power from Churchill Falls to Nova Scotia.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, with respect that is not a question of privilege. The hon. member has his sources of information, and I have mine. I do not see evidence of any existing interprovincial flow of energy which could reach Gull Island.

Mr. McCain: There is provision for transmitting power right now from Churchill Falls to Halifax. The system is in place now.

Miss Campbell: I understand that New Brunswick and Quebec will not allow us to be involved in this. I understand, for instance, that the project at Gull Island could go ahead if it has markets, but there is no interprovincial grid to carry the energy, as there is in the case of interprovincial gas.

Mr. McCain: Nonsense.

Miss Campbell: I ask, should this not be a national priority? As an aside let me say that perhaps Atlantic union would bring one benefit. We should not triple expenditures in the Atlantic provinces and most of our provincial problems would be done away with if there were one system in the Atlantic provinces for carrying energy. I say that as an aside. That should not prevent the National Energy Board from becoming involved with the question of the interprovincial flow of energy. This has already been done in the case of oil and gas.

I think that we should look beyond the interest of the provinces and consider questions of national importance. Under the Churchill Falls agreement Newfoundland perhaps is not receiving as much as it should. When the time of the agreement runs out, Quebec will be the sole bidder for that power. I suggest that no province except Quebec will be in the position to bid for the power.

That brings me to another point. In the last few years in Canada we have seen cartels arise in the west and cartels arise in the east. Nationalism goes out of the door when one begins to think in terms of provincial priorities rather than national priorities. I feel that the provinces should be entering into arrangements and taking advantage of the federal government's new energy strategy for Canada. They should consider energy self-reliance within 10 years. But their endeavours should be directed to new areas.

I return again to tidal power. Tidal power is not new, as it has worked at Rance, and other countries are looking into its effectiveness as an endless source of energy. Let the province consider this source of energy. At present we are heading into unchartered areas. We are entering unknown areas. For example, we do not know how much oil and gas we will find; what is the lifetime of nuclear power, and what is the cost of coal and the cost of delivery.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) said that in the next ten years we shall spend more than $10 billion in 1975 dollars on exploration and development with regard to oil and gas. So, why not consider tidal power? It is proven and certainly an inexhaustible source. We could consider this possibility without lessening our search for oil and gas.

Perhaps the provinces should strongly stress conservation measures at this time. The insulation of homes should become a priority and there is need, for a scheme which will involve an incentive to individuals, perhaps with easy financing. No doubt we could lower room temperatures without any of us being hurt. The short term elements of saving will be in the conservation area, and we will be looking at coal-generating power. But let us not think that Nova Scotia is unique, and that other areas will not be looking at the example we set. I feel that the provinces should take advantage of the schemes laid out in "An Energy Strategy for Canada", particularly at page 28 where it is said that:

> The Government of Canada will continue its policy of funding 50 per cent of approved studies of interprovincial and interregional electrical interconnections, and financing up to 50 per cent of the capital cost of approved projects. In view of the objective of minimizing Canadian dependence on imported oil, the federal government believes that the development of regional electrical interconnections, particularly in eastern Canada, should be accelerated.

I see that it is almost ten o'clock. I look forward to greater consideration by all provinces of what I consider a national issue and I do hope that the best solution will be achieved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock it is my duty to inform the House that, pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 58, the proceedings on the motion have now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Debate

INDUSTRY—TEXTILES—REFUSAL OF DUPONT TO PUT INTO PRODUCTION NEW POLYESTER YARN PLANT BECAUSE OF LOW-PRICED IMPORTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote three paragraphs out of the 1975 annual report by the Dupont of Canada Company Ltd:

The net sales amounted to $410,219,000, that is an 11 per cent increase over 1974, which is mainly attributable to higher prices to the consumer.

The net profit in 1975, including extraordinary items, reached $2,419,-000 or 28 cents per ordinary share, compared to $21,491,000, or $2.70 per ordinary share in 1974.

Construction works on the latest of the company buildings, the Coteau plant, near Montreal, have progressed at a satisfactory pace in 1975, and the operation of the facilities for Dacron polyester yarn is expected in late 1976.

[*English*]

In the letter which the Dupont Company addressed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commence (Mr. Jamieson) on March 26 of this year they point out that the present position of the polyester yarn industry has arisen for two reasons. First, imports of garments, fabrics, and yarns have pre-empted over 50 per cent of this market. The nature and the extent of these imports has caused major problems for the industry. Some are from low cost countries, some are normal competition from developed countries, and some are distress priced imports from developed countries. In total they have risen from about 25 million pounds in 1970 to over 50 million pounds in 1975.

● (2200)

This situation was exacerbated by a sudden market slowdown in the U.S. yarn market in January which has led to a collapse in prices. U. S. producers are now selling below their cost. Sales and offerings by U.S. producers have driven Canadian prices down from about $1.30 per pound to just over $1 per pound over the last two months.

The import supply line is a long one, particularly for fabrics and garments. Import supplies cannot be quickly cut back. As a result, when a market slowdown occurs, virtually all of the adjustment is directed to domestic suppliers. Thus when imports have 50 per cent of the market and there is 20 per cent market slowdown, the domestic suppliers can be cut back by as much as 40 per cent suddenly.

The company have just had to reduce their operating rates in their polyester facility at Kingston from 90 per cent of capacity to 50 per cent as a direct result of the above import pressures. This volume reduction, combined with the price reductions, are causing them to incur serious losses. In addition their market development program to support the fall start-up of their large new facility at Coteau du Lac is in a state of disarray. The company were to soon start hiring and training over 300 employees and now this is a questionable plan.

Employment is also being affected at Kingston. They are trying to avoid a layoff there by transferring workers to other parts of the plant, by building inventories till summer vacation period and by sharply cutting back student hiring for vacation relief.

Through the Canadian Textiles Institute they, in company with Celanese Canada and their throwster customers, have brought the polyester yarn problem to the attention of the Textile and Clothing Board and have asked them to make an urgent investigation leading hopefully to the quick implementation of remedial measures.

The Du Pont Company then comment on their new facility at Coteau du Lac. This plant can make a significant contribution to the domestic economy and to the balance of trade. It will be a serious setback to all associated with this venture if it is made non-viable by imports, particularly since it is the most modern facility of its kind in the world and well able to deal effectively with normal competition.

The company vice-president who wrote this letter to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce concludes that this is an urgent matter for Du Pont of Canada as they are faced with a decision on Coteau du Lac in the next few weeks. Therefore they are asking for a review of the polyester textured yarn situation at the earliest convenience following the board's recommendation.

This same gentleman, the executive vice-president of Du Pont of Canada, appeared before the Senate Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce on February 18 of this year. He outlined the position as he found it to the Senators, and received a sympathetic hearing. He stressed the need for urgency in arriving at some decisions.

That is why I posed my question to the minister when the company announced that, due to the delay and the tardiness in arriving at a decision, it was forced to stop the introduction of its new plant at Coteau du Lac which was built at a cost of $50 million, resulting in a loss of 325 employment opportunities at Coteau du Lac and a layoff of 125 permanent employees at Kingston and the decision, as I mentioned earlier, to cut back entirely on their summer student hiring program, some 200 positions.

In view of these circumstances I implore the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to realize that we cannot wait several months. We must have a decision in the very immediate future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) for expressing his concern to the House about the expansion of the Du Pont company which planned the construction of a new $50 million polyester plant at Coteau. He indicated to us how many jobs would be created by such expansion and also expressed his interest concerning the generation of summer jobs for students.

This matter is all the more interesting that it concerns a dynamic and efficient company. As the vice-president of Du Pont said when he appeared before the banking, trade and commerce committee, all the studies undertaken by the government and by experts from outside indicate that Du Pont can compete with most of the foreign countries as regards production costs. He was speaking, at that time, of polyester yarn. Once again, I quote: "We can meet our responsibilities towards the consumer".

The government has received many protests because of the problems faced by polyester yarn producers and caused by bad market conditions and the supposedly disastrous reduction of import prices.

In February 1975, the Textile and Clothing Board recommended to the previous minister the imposition of a surtax on certain polyester yarn imports. This could only be done under Article XIX of the GATT, which provides the following criteria, and I quote:

> Emergency Action on Imports of Particular Products
>
> 1. (*a*) If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the effect of the obligations incurred by a contracting party under this Agreement, including tariff concessions, any product is being imported into the territory of that contracting party in such increased quantities and under such conditions—

I could read the rest of the article, but I shall refer the hon. member to Article XIX. It was decided that, under this article, evidence of import increases alone could not justify the proposed surtax at that time. In view of this decision and other circumstances, it was decided to maintain a certain surveillance with an import control list.

During the second half of 1975, the polyester yarn market improved considerably, but a reduction seems to have occurred just recently. The Textile and Clothing Board has already started an urgent investigation on this situation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying that following comments made during the hearings of the Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, it was decided to ask an advisory committee to study present conditions and the future outlook of the textile and clothing industries, as well as their business situation; to examine the administration of the policy concerning import competition; and once again, to examine the timeliness, in view of present legislation and instruments, of implementing the policy under articles 3 and 4 of the Agreement on Textile Trades and of Article XIX of the GATT; to report its conclusions and recommendations to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce by June 30, 1976. And finally, I wish to ensure the hon. member that the minister will deal immediately with this report and that we shall inform the industry as soon as we receive it.

[*English*]

POST OFFICE—CLOSING OF CANTEEN AT CALGARY—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, on April 26 I raised a question with the Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) regarding a third attempt to close the canteen at the Calgary Post Office terminal. I return to the subject tonight because this is the third attempt to discontinue canteen service to the postal workers on the graveyard shift when morale is lowest, and again on weekends, another difficult time for Post Office workers.

● (2210)

The first time it occurred the Postmaster General and I happened to be visiting the terminal at the opening ceremony. The hon. gentleman was so incensed that he immediately reordered the canteen opened on the basis of the fact that if you are going to maintain good morale you must provide good working conditions. When it occurred again, it evoked the same immediate response.

I was pleased to see in the Postmaster General's reply that he was going to investigate the matter. He said:

> I would be surprised if no food is available to employees on the graveyard shift or any other shift.

Later on he said:

> Obviously, well fed postmen on the midnight shift will do a lot to increase morale.

So we are in agreement thus far. Just to indicate that the canteen has in fact closed let me say that I receive regular communiqués from the CUPW people in the Calgary Post Office and they inform me that the canteen in the Calgary mail processing plant is to be closed for the midnight shift and for weekends beginning April 1, 1976. In one letter they say:

> The reasons given last time were that Caterplan was incurring losses in revenue. The Post Office, I understand, agreed to underwrite the losses. This was one of the more positive investments made by the Post Office.

The letter was signed by Jim Hall, Business Agent of CUPW in Calgary.

This might seem like a small issue but it is in line with the thesis that the Postmaster General has been preaching since the new year. According to an article by Guy Demarino in the Montreal *Gazette* issue of January 30:

> . . . Postmaster General Bryce Mackasey has begun unveiling his Post Office salvation plan.
>
> His philosophy is that only co-operation between postal workers and management can save the Post Office from future disaster . . . Mackasey is ready, he says, "to set up employee-management teams in one or more Post Offices" . . . "Each team will set its own goals and decide how to achieve them," Mackasey said in a recent Montreal speech. Supervisors will no longer tell employees what to do and how to do it, they'll ask how they think it should be done . . .
>
> Mackasey knows "It won't be easy. In the inside workers are bitter and suspicious. There isn't a lot of trust on either side. But we need their help, so we'll have to convince them that we are sincere".

The Calgary Post Office happens to have one of the labour management committees to which the Postmaster General has referred in the quotations by Mr. Demarino of the Montreal *Gazette*. They meet regularly with the management of the Post Office and they try to come to grips with the little irritants that concern good human relationships. This particular Post Office is an excellent example of the malaise to which the Postmaster General has referred on many occasions which infested the Post Office Department and caused all the problems that are only too well known in this country. I refer to the 24 wildcat illegal strikes between 1970 and 1975, for example. I trust that now the investigation has been carried out this particular irritant will be resolved.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the hon. member that this is not a small issue. I believe—and I think the minister agrees—that perhaps the most pressing problem in the Post Office is corporate morale, the esprit de corps which has not been present for a long time. I think there is another very serious problem and that is the very high cost differential between revenue and cost in the Post Office. In this situation we are caught between two very difficult problems, one of morale and one of cost. Let me give you some background.

The canteen at the Calgary postal plant is operated by the Canadian National Institute for the Blind for the Department of Public Works. When it was first opened in April of 1975, full, 24 hour service was provided. It soon became apparent to CNIB that this service was not being used to a great extent, and during its first 12 months of operation $20,000 was lost. As a result service during the night shifts and at weekends was reduced to vending machine service.

A senior officer of Canada Post Office prevailed on CNIB to restore full service. This was done, but just before last Christmas CNIB proposed withdrawing completely and the service was stopped. Again the intervention of a CPO official prevented this.

As of April 1 last discussions between DPW and Treasury Board have brought about a changed relationship between caterers and employers in all federal government departments across the country. The new arrangement allows caterers to withdraw from unprofitable situations while at the same time limiting their profit to 6 per cent on productive shifts. While the Calgary situation did not bring this change about, the change does affect the Calgary problem. Canada Post Office continues to look for alternative ways to provide equal service to all shifts.

Both the Postmaster General and myself are concerned to see that everything possible is being done to provide the level of service necessary to maintain the morale of the postal workers.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—REQUEST FOR ESTIMATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT RATE AND LEVEL OF INFLATION FOR THE YEAR

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, on March 16 I put a question and a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). If I may repeat my question, first of all I asked:

Considering that last month's brightening of the unemployment picture proved transitory and noting that the unemployment rate has remained near 7 per cent for nearly a full year, can the minister tell the House when improvement in the unemployment rate may be expected and what he anticipates the unemployment rate to be for the balance of this calendar year?

Unfortunately rather than give the House the information to which I believe hon. Members are entitled—certainly the Department of Finance officials have some estimate of the unemployment level in Canada for the coming year, if not even for two years ahead—the minister used a stall. He said there was a budget coming down and that in the context of the budget he would be pleased to refer to that matter.

Then I asked a supplementary question as follows:

In view of the minister's forecast of a 5 per cent rate of growth in the economy in the current year, could he explain the basis of his forecast of the rate of growth at 5 per cent with a specific indication of job creation for the year, the level of inflation he anticipates and the trade deficit for the current calendar year?

Again the minister unfortunately said:

Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do that in a budget debate.

This is nothing but a stall. Earlier this evening I had an example in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of a very deliberate stall on the part of administration members who sit on that committee. They were, in short, protecting the minister from any further questioning. I think it is too bad that the government has chosen to put a shroud of secrecy around what is the favourable or unfavourable nature of our economic indicators in the country.

[Mr. McRae.]

● (2220)

In tonight's adjournment debate I sincerely hope that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Trudel) will shed some light on these important subjects. Budget or not, there is no reason why the people of Canada should not be given the true facts as to what the Finance Department of the government believes to be in store for the coming years. I say that because in sharp contrast to what is happening here in Ottawa we find that in Washington the administration and Congress are going out of their way, year by year, to give more and more detail as to what they see in the nature of the economic future of unemployment, inflation, real growth, their trade deficit and their own budgetary deficits, and in fact it is now the law of the land in the United States that they have to show these figures at least two years in advance. In short, instead of talking only about the 1977 fiscal year at the present time, it is now the law in the United States that they have to be showing 1977 and 1978 figures.

They have even gone beyond that. In the President's economic report and in the annual report of the council of economic advisers in Congress they are giving a five year estimate as to what is to be anticipated along the lines of unemployment, employment, and the trade figures. For example, I find it very startling that while we cannot extract these figures from this administration, in the United States they are predicting that their output from 1975 through to 1981 on an annual basis will be 5.9 per cent per year, and they point out that their inflation rate will be somewhere around 4 per cent by the year 1981. That is the type of openness they are now experiencing as far as the administration and Congress in the United States are concerned. Unfortunately the public in Canada is not being given this type of information. That is the purpose of my question.

I believe that tonight the parliamentary secretary should be able to indicate what his department is anticipating. After all, the government is asking for an estimate to clear $19 million for some 690 personnel. Incidentally that estimate is 15.5 per cent higher than last year, well above the 8 per cent guideline the government is asking other people to abide by under the anti-inflation program. With that type of personnel, including highly technical people and economists, there is no reason that the parliamentary secretary tonight cannot indicate to us what the government estimates to be the employment level for fiscal 1976-77, what the government anticipates the unemployment level will be for those two years, what it sees as the inflation level for those two years, what it sees to be the real growth in this country for those two years, what it anticipates the trade deficits to be, both on a merchandise basis and on a total trade deficit basis, and what the budgetary deficits, based on the current expenditures and revenue forecasts which are available to the government, are likely to be in fiscal 1977-78.

Those are the two years we are asking about, and I believe it is time that the Minister of Finance and the administration started to take the people of Canada and the members of this House into their confidence, because if they want co-operation in an anti-inflation program the least they can do is to be open with the Canadian public as to what their own estimates are.

That is the purpose of this debate tonight, and I hope it will be worth while and that we will learn, for example, the anticipated real growth for 1976. We know that it was only 0.2 of 1 per cent last year, in spite of the fact that the former minister of finance at one time predicted it would be over 4 per cent. That is why I suggest that the government is now hesitant to make forecasts of real growth. It has been so wrong over the last two to three years that it is now a little timid about offering forecasts in case they prove to be wrong. That is not the purpose of a forecast. A forecast is an honest estimate of the officials of the government as to what they see ahead for our economy.

That estimate is really public property and should be open to review by those in the financial community, economists, universities, businessmen, and members of this House. That is what I am seeking tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member does not expect me to cover in three minutes all the points he mentioned.

However, I would like to answer one of the charges he made when he said that the minister had refused to answer the questions asked in committee. I would urge hon. members to read the report of the committee meetings. The minister repeated time and again that he was ready to answer all the questions that the hon. member for York-Simcoe or his colleagues would like to ask him. And I think that the report prepared by the House employees will prove that.

Mr. Speaker, he raised another point, but I am wandering away from his question. I shall come back to it before my time is up. He talked about the 15 per cent increase, and it has been proved that they were only talking about the ½ per cent left from the 15 per cent. The political argumentation in committee deserves also to be mentioned.

Answering directly the question of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) about the economic prospects for Canada, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) indicated that he will deal with all these questions in May, as is usual, in the budget speech. Declarations about the economic prospects are not usually made while the budget is being prepared, just before it is submitted to Parliament.

During the last few months, and I agree with the hon. member, independent research institutions have made a certain number of careful statements about the economic situation and the economic prospects for Canada. Among these are declarations from the Conference Board in Canada, from the Institute of Quantitative Analysis of the University of Toronto, from Informetrica Ltd., and from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). For 1976, all those organizations are expecting a higher output in Canada, a significant increase in employment, a slowdown of inflation rates and an improvement of the current account situation in Canada.

In Canada, financial institutions, labour organizations and enterprises also published their forecasts which however are of a rather smaller scope. In spite of some discrepancies there seems to be a certain unanimity as in the case of the four big organizations mentioned above.

As for job creation, the hon. member should note that if the economy were to progress at a rate of 5 per cent as he said in his question, the number of jobs would have to increase by more than 220,000 so that national productivity reaches or slightly exceeds the 2 per cent provided in the white paper "Attack against Inflation".

As to inflation rates, we should mention that none of the independent research agencies and no serious economic observer suggested that a basic rate other than 8 per cent, would be more appropriate to establish the basic protection factor provided under the terms of the anti-inflation program.

Finally, with the economic recovery in the United States and the rest of the world, Canadian exporters will be in a better position than they were recently.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I did not deal with all the other subjects raised by the hon. member, but the minister or myself will be in a better position to do so before the committee or the House as mentioned in the budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10 . 30 p.m.

END OF VOL XII